

---

Subject: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 12:35:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 17:55:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first 'Discovery'

<snip>

Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 18:47:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 19:40:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first ÆDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> <snip>  
>>  
>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>  
> Well, no, not really.  
>  
> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>  
> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
> Is that racist?  
>  
> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>  
> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>  
> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
> racist?  
>  
If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 19:55:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oih684\$jog\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> <snip>  
>>>

>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>  
>> Well, no, not really.  
>>  
>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>> Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>  
>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>> racist?  
>>  
> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

:(

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 20:37:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Rhino

On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> <snip>  
>>>  
>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>  
>> Well, no, not really.  
>>

>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>> Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>  
>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>> racist?  
>>  
> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>  
I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the  
cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white  
males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white guy  
who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can complain that  
we've been completely excluded?

--  
Rhino

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 21:18:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oih9j4\$upd\$2@dont-email.me>,  
Rhino <no\_offline\_contact@example.com> wrote:

> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> <snip>  
>>>>  
>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>>

>>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>  
>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>> Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>  
>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>> racist?  
>>>  
>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
>> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>  
> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the  
> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white  
> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

That's exactly what it means, except it excludes white females too in the case of Nancy Drew.

> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white guy  
> who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can complain that  
> we've been completely excluded?

The IMDb cast list includes Jason Isaacs, who's British and Jewish  
Doug Jones, who looks to be a white American, but I think he's playing  
an alien  
and the gay character played by Anthony Rapp  
That's all that are listed as being in all 15 terrible episodes.

They have a white guy playing a Klingon - that outta make Michael Dorn's turtle head explode.

<http://ncc-1031.com/the-crew-of-the-uss-discovery/>

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 21:20:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> > Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first ÆDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> <snip>  
>>>>  
>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>  
>>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>  
>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>> Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>  
>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>> racist?  
>>>  
>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
>> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>  
> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the  
> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white  
> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>  
> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white guy  
> who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can complain that  
> we've been completely excluded?  
>  
Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
  
Especially not Kirk.  
  
--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 21:42:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 5:18 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oih9j4\$upd\$2@dont-email.me>,

> Rhino <no\_offline\_contact@example.com> wrote:

>

>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first i½iscoveryÂ¹

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> > <snip>

>>>> >

>>>> > Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!

>>>>

>>>> Well, no, not really.

>>>>

>>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?

>>>>

>>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.

>>>> Is that racist?

>>>>

>>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?

>>>>

>>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>>

>>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that

>>>> racist?

>>>>

>>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all

>>> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

>>>

>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the

>> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white

>> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

>

> That's exactly what it means, except it excludes white females too in the case of Nancy Drew.

>

>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white guy

>> who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can complain that

>> we've been completely excluded?

>

> The IMDb cast list includes Jason Isaacs, who's British and Jewish

<https://ewedit.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/000259034hr.jpg?w=2000>

I liked Jason Isaacs in AWAKE and THE OA.

> Doug Jones, who looks to be a white American, but I think he's playing  
> an alien

I think he is the top photo on this page (based upon the photo further  
down the page):

<http://www.treknews.net/2017/05/18/star-trek-discovery-trailer-breakdown/>

> and the gay character played by Anthony Rapp

>

> That's all that are listed as being in all 15 terrible episodes.

According to IMDB, that would be three of the six people that appear in  
every episode.

> They have a white guy playing a Klingon - that outta make Michael Dorn's turtle head explode.

hee hee.

> <http://ncc-1031.com/the-crew-of-the-uss-discovery/>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 21:45:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:

>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> > <snip>

>>>> >

>>>> > Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!



>>>>  
>>>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>>  
>>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>>  
>>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> again.  
>>>> Is that racist?  
>>>>  
>>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>>  
>>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>>  
>>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> racist?  
>>>>  
>>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>  
>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>  
>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>  
> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>  
> Especially not Kirk.

Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?

....and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 22:09:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oihdjh\$ci8\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

>  
>

> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
 >> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
 >>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
 >>>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
 >>>> > In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
 >>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> >> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> <snip>  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Well, no, not really.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
 >>>> > again.  
 >>>> > Is that racist?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
 >>>> > racist?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
 >>>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
 >>>>  
 >>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
 >>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
 >>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
 >>>  
 >>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
 >>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
 >>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
 >>>  
 >> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
 >> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
 >> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
 >> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
 >>  
 >> Especially not Kirk.

>  
> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?

Probably.

They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

--  
Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 23:01:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> > On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> >> again.  
>>>> >> Is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> >> racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes

>>>> > all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >  
>>>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>>  
>>>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>>  
>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>  
>>> Especially not Kirk.  
>>  
>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>  
> Probably.  
>  
> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 23:18:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oih684\$jog\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>>  
>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>  
>> Well, no, not really.

>>  
>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>> Is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>  
>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>  
>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>> racist?  
>  
> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

Wow, it's turning out to be a repeat of the Ghostbusters fiasco.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2017 23:20:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oihdcu\$c0b\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus@aol.com wrote:  
> On 6/22/2017 5:18 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> Rhino <no\_offline\_contact@example.com> wrote:  
>>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first ï¿½discoveryÂ¹  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>>> > Is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>> >  
>>>> > You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> > racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
>>>> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>>  
>>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the  
>>> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white  
>>> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>  
>> That's exactly what it means, except it excludes white females too in the case of Nancy Drew.  
>>  
>>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white guy  
>>> who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can complain that  
>>> we've been completely excluded?  
>>  
>> The IMDb cast list includes Jason Isaacs, who's British and Jewish  
>  
> <https://ewedit.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/000259034hr.jpg?w=2000>  
> I liked Jason Isaacs in AWAKE and THE OA.  
>  
>> Doug Jones, who looks to be a white American, but I think he's playing  
>> an alien  
>  
> I think he is the top photo on this page (based upon the photo further  
> down the page):  
> <http://www.treknews.net/2017/05/18/star-trek-discovery-trailer-breakdown/>

Oh, shit, it's the Travel Agent!

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 00:17:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 6/22/2017 4:18 PM, Ubiquitous wrote:

> In article <ih684\$jog\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>  
>>>> > Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first Å'DiscoveryÅ¹  
>>>>

>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>  
>>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>  
>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>> Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>  
>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>> racist?  
>>  
>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes all  
>> dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>  
> Wow, it's turning out to be a repeat of the Ghostbusters fiasco.  
>  
I blame Melissa McCarthy for that. Racism (or in that case sexism) had  
nothing to do with it. It was just an unfunny person who should never  
have been lead in anything despoiling another movie we have fond  
memories of.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 00:24:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>  
>  
> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first ÆDiscovery¹  
>>>> >>

>>>> >>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> <snip>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> > again.  
>>>> > Is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> > racist?  
>>>> >  
>>>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>>  
>>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>  
>>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>  
>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>  
>> Especially not Kirk.  
>  
> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>  
> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,



I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 02:00:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oihmt3\$7tb\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>

>>

>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:

>>>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>>> > On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> <snip>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Well, no, not really.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -

>>>> >> again.

>>>> >> Is that racist?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that

>>>> >> racist?

>>>> >>

>>>> > If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> > all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >  
>>>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>>  
>>>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>>  
>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>  
>>> Especially not Kirk.  
>>  
>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>  
>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?  
>  
> No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 04:14:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
> In article <oihmt3\$7tb\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> > On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> >> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first ï¿½discoveryÂ¹  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> <snip>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> >>> again.  
>>>> >>> Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> >>> racist?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> >> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> > I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> > the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> > white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> > I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> > guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> > complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>> Especially not Kirk.  
>>>>>>>

>>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>>  
>>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?  
>>  
>> No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
>> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
>> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
>> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
>> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
>> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)  
>  
> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.  
>  
Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to  
watch subsequent episodes of?  
  
--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 05:19:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oi4bg\$4pd\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oihmt3\$7tb\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> > On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> >> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> >>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> >>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first  
  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>> <snip>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> >>>>> again.  
>>>> >>>>> Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> >>>>> racist?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> >>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> >> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> >> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> >> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> >> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>>> > male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>>> > non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>>> > any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Especially not Kirk.  
>>>>  
>>>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>>>  
>>>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?  
>>>  
>>> No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
>>> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
>>> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
>>> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
>>> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
>>> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)  
>>

>> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.  
>>  
> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to  
> watch subsequent episodes of?

I wonder that as well, but their entire business plan revolves around that assumption.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 11:23:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/22/2017 8:24 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> > On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> <snip>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> >> again.  
>>>> >> Is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> >> racist?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> > all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >  
>>>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>>  
>>>> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>>  
>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>  
>>> Especially not Kirk.  
>>  
>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>  
>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?  
>  
> No idea.

Rainn Wilson.

> All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

That at least explains why you think that all the minority characters of  
this 'diverse cast' came from one ethnic group.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 11:23:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>>> > ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

>>>>

>>>> No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I

>>>> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into

>>>> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG

>>>> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the

>>>> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,

>>>> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

>>>

>>> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.

>>>

>> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to

>> watch subsequent episodes of?

>

> I wonder that as well, but their entire business plan revolves around

> that assumption.

I presume it's b/c you'll like it so much that you'll subscribe.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 11:25:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/23/2017 12:14 AM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.

>>

> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to

> watch subsequent episodes of?

I do that all the time with the AmazonPrime pilots and I used to do it  
with the Hulu shows when they offered the first episode free. I've also  
done it with shows that air on STARZ, HBO, Showtime, etc...

The idea is to see what is out there. At some point, maybe it will be  
something worth paying for a new service to see...or something to look  
out for when it eventually makes its way to other services.

---



Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 11:31:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,  
Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> > On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> >> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>  
  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Well, no, not really.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> >>> again.  
>>>> >>> Is that racist?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> >>> racist?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> >> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> > the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> > white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> > guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> > complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>> >  
>>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>>> male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>>> non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never

>>>> any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>>  
>>>> Especially not Kirk.  
>>>  
>>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>  
>> Probably.  
>>  
>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>  
> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was  
> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

Stupid retcon TNG dating.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 15:47:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/23/2017 4:23 AM, Obveeus wrote:

>  
>  
> On 6/22/2017 8:24 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:  
>>>> > On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> >> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> <snip>  
>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Well, no, not really.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -

>>>> >>> again.

>>>> >>> Is that racist?

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that

>>>> >>> racist?

>>>> >>>

>>>> >> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes

>>>> >> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

>>>> >>

>>>> > I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in

>>>> > the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual

>>>> > white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

>>>> >

>>>> > I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white

>>>> > guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can

>>>> > complain that we've been completely excluded?

>>>> >

>>>> Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero

>>>> white male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from

>>>> one non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were

>>>> never any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.

>>>>

>>>> Especially not Kirk.

>>>>

>>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?

>>>

>>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

>>

>> No idea.

>

> Rainn Wilson.

>

Doesn't seem like a good fit for the Harry Mudd we knew.

>> All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I haven't

>> heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into this,

>> I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG medical

>> insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
>> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for  
>> it, I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)  
>  
> That at least explains why you think that all the minority characters of  
> this 'diverse cast' came from one ethnic group.  
>  
I make no assumption about that for this show. That comment was based  
on other shows touted as being "diverse" for doing that.

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 15:50:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/23/2017 4:23 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:  
> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> > On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
>>>> > haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
>>>> > this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
>>>> > medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
>>>> > subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
>>>> > I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)  
>>>>  
>>>> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.  
>>>>  
>>> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to  
>>> watch subsequent episodes of?  
>>>  
>> I wonder that as well, but their entire business plan revolves around  
>> that assumption.  
>>  
> I presume it's b/c you'll like it so much that you'll subscribe.  
>  
Why would I subscribe to a service that I wouldn't be able to use? I'm  
guessing that a significant percentage of people who have new hardware  
and the latest software won't be able to stream it since that appears to

be the case with every other streaming service. (Hell, YOUTUBE sometimes throttles their feed to me!) And I don't have anything close to "current" H/W or S/W. I can't afford the new hardware and the new software won't run on what I do have.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 18:04:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,  
> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

<snip>

>>>

>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

>>

>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was  
>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

>

> Stupid retcon TNG dating.

>

Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime Timeline.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 18:21:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <594d583f\$0\$711\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,  
>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>  
>  
>  
> <snip>  
>  
>>>>  
>>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
>>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>>>  
>>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was  
>>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>>  
>> Stupid retcon TNG dating.  
>>  
>  
> Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime  
> Timeline.

: (

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 18:31:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:  
> In article <594c049d\$0\$728\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first OEDiscovery<sup>1</sup>  
>>

>>  
>>  
>> <snip>  
>>  
>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!  
>  
> Well, no, not really.  
>  
> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?

They did not refer to criticism concerning the ship.  
And no ship after the original one was as pretty. EVER! The first is still the best. No argument there.

>  
> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
> Is that racist?

They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.  
And yeah, everyone with even half a braincell knows it's another reboot / timeline. That is very obvious. They should come clean about that.

>  
> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?

Nope. But that's not the issue either.  
Do I have a lot of confidence? Nope.  
But I will say this about Star Trek Discovery: I will give it a fair chance, like I gave JJ /one/ chance. And thus far I only have the DVD of his 2009 film. I did not bother getting the sequels in my collection.  
I will give Discovery a chance, and if I don't like it I won't bother watching more. I made that mistake with Star Trek Voyager and that one still hurts!

>  
> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

I would go with obnoxious.

>  
> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
> racist?  
>

The criticism they actually DID refer to was the diversity of the cast.  
Some people have problems with that diversity. And \*THAT\* was the issue.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 19:25:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/23/2017 at 06:23 AM:

> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> > On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>

>>>> >> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

>>>> >

>>>> > No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I

>>>> > haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into

>>>> > this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG

>>>> > medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the

>>>> > subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,

>>>> > I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

>>>>

>>>> If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.

>>>>

>>> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to

>>> watch subsequent episodes of?

>>

>> I wonder that as well, but their entire business plan revolves around

>> that assumption.

>

> I presume it's b/c you'll like it so much that you'll subscribe.

Did you type that with a straight face? I mean, I'm hoping that the final product is tons better than that first trailer, but...

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre

"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---



Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 19:37:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 16:37:22 -0400, Rhino wrote:

> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the  
> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white  
> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

You can bet there will be white male villains.

--  
Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 20:02:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <594d583f\$0\$711\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>

>> Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,

>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>

>>

>>

>> <snip>

>>

>>>> >

>>>> > They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they

>>>> > mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before

>>>> > the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's

>>>> > flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

>>>>

>>>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was

>>>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

>>>

>>> Stupid retcon TNG dating.

>>>

>>

>> Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime

>> Timeline.

>

> :(

>

Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later episode.

If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling was to set TNG around 2300.

I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which better suits what was going on in TOS.

And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the year 2200).

So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 20:05:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 23-6-2017 om 21:37 schreef Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz:

> On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 16:37:22 -0400, Rhino wrote:

>

>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the

>> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white

>> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

>

> You can bet there will be white male villains.

>

Harry Mudd.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 20:07:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/23/2017 12:37 PM, Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz wrote:

> On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 16:37:22 -0400, Rhino wrote:

>

>> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in the

>> cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual white

>> males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

>

> You can bet there will be white male villains.

>

Worse, he's Harry Mudd!

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 20:33:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <594d73f2\$0\$827\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:

> Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:

>> In article <594d583f\$0\$711\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>> Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:

>>

>>> Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,

>>>> Ubiquitous <[weberm@polaris.net](mailto:weberm@polaris.net)> wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>  
>>> <snip>  
>>>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>>>> >> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years  
>>>> >> before  
>>>> >> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>>>> >> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>>>> >  
>>>> > According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264  
>>>> > was  
>>>> > when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>>> Stupid retcon TNG dating.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime  
>>> Timeline.  
>>  
>> :(  
>>  
>  
>  
> Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from  
> Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would  
> be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later episode.  
>  
> If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling  
> was to set TNG around 2300.  
>  
> I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a  
> guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that  
> shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which  
> better suits what was going on in TOS.  
>  
> And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states  
> that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language  
> version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the  
> year 2200).  
>  
> So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.

TNG was originally in the first year (or years) of the 24th Century, so  
call it 2301. It was also 78 years after real Trek, so call real Trek  
2223 (we don't know \*where\* in real Trek, so there's some leeway). Mr.  
Scott's Guide to the Enterprise put TMP in 2222 (IIRC). All of that  
worked just fine. Then at the end of TNG's first season, Data tells the

guys from the past that it's "By your calendar two thousand three hundred sixty four." and they decided that rather than admit Data (or credited writers Maurice Hurley and/or Deborah McIntyre and/or Mona Clee\*) got it wrong they've been retconning ever since. Of course it never helped that Encounter at Farpoint stuck in an extra world war. And then some idiot decided it would be cute if TOS eps took place exactly 300 years after they aired ...

\*note that this is the only Trek McIntyre or Clee ever wrote. I've wondered if McIntyre is related to Vonda N. McIntyre who wrote all that terrible fanfic before finagling her way into writing bad novelizations.

BTW, good to see you again Wouter! :)

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 20:55:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 23-6-2017 om 22:33 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <594d73f2\$0\$827\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>

>> Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> In article <594d583f\$0\$711\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> > In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> <snip>

>>>>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they

>>>> >>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years

>>>> >>> before

>>>> >>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's

>>>> >>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

>>>> >>

>>>> >> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264

>>>> >> was

>>>> >> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Stupid retcon TNG dating.  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime  
>>>> Timeline.  
>>>>  
>>> :(  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from  
>> Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would  
>> be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later episode.  
>>  
>> If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling  
>> was to set TNG around 2300.  
>>  
>> I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a  
>> guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that  
>> shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which  
>> better suits what was going on in TOS.  
>>  
>> And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states  
>> that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language  
>> version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the  
>> year 2200).  
>>  
>> So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.  
>  
> TNG was originally in the first year (or years) of the 24th Century, so  
> call it 2301. It was also 78 years after real Trek, so call real Trek  
> 2223 (we don't know \*where\* in real Trek, so there's some leeway). Mr.  
> Scott's Guide to the Enterprise put TMP in 2222 (IIRC).

I have that one too somewhere. :-)

> All of that  
> worked just fine. Then at the end of TNG's first season, Data tells the  
> guys from the past that it's "By your calendar two thousand three  
> hundred sixty four." and they decided that rather than admit Data (or  
> credited writers Maurice Hurley and/or Deborah McIntyre and/or Mona  
> Clee\*) got it wrong they've been retconning ever since. Of course it  
> never helped that Encounter at Farpoint stuck in an extra world war.  
> And then some idiot decided it would be cute if TOS eps took place  
> exactly 300 years after they aired ...

Maybe in part influenced by the episode 'Miri', but I might give them too much credit for it to be that.

>  
> \*note that this is the only Trek McIntyre or Clee ever wrote. I've  
> wondered if McIntyre is related to Vonda N. McIntyre who wrote all that  
> terrible fanfic before finagling her way into writing bad novelizations.  
>  
> BTW, good to see you again Wouter! :)  
>

Likewise! :-)

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2017 21:07:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 08:35:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls

Hardly.

I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for this series.

Why don't these jackwagons create their own universe to play in, rather than continue to meddle with Trek?

--

Hammer

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

In article <594d803a\$0\$802\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 23-6-2017 om 22:33 schreef anim8rfsk:

>> In article <594d73f2\$0\$827\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>

>>> Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> In article <594d583f\$0\$711\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> >> In article <oiitcv\$6po\$5@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> > <snip>

>>>> >

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming

>>>> >>>> they

>>>> >>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years

>>>> >>>> before

>>>> >>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet -

>>>> >>>> OBSESSION's

>>>> >>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264

>>>> >>> was

>>>> >>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Stupid retcon TNG dating.

>>>> >>

>>>> >

>>>> > Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime

>>>> > Timeline.

>>>>

>>>> :(

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>> Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from

>>> Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would

>>> be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later

>>> episode.



>>>  
>>> If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling  
>>> was to set TNG around 2300.  
>>>  
>>> I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a  
>>> guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that  
>>> shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which  
>>> better suits what was going on in TOS.  
>>>  
>>> And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states  
>>> that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language  
>>> version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the  
>>> year 2200).  
>>>  
>>> So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.  
>>  
>> TNG was originally in the first year (or years) of the 24th Century, so  
>> call it 2301. It was also 78 years after real Trek, so call real Trek  
>> 2223 (we don't know \*where\* in real Trek, so there's some leeway). Mr.  
>> Scott's Guide to the Enterprise put TMP in 2222 (IIRC).  
>  
> I have that one too somewhere. :-)

:)

>  
>> All of that  
>> worked just fine. Then at the end of TNG's first season, Data tells the  
>> guys from the past that it's "By your calendar two thousand three  
>> hundred sixty four." and they decided that rather than admit Data (or  
>> credited writers Maurice Hurley and/or Deborah McIntyre and/or Mona  
>> Clee\*) got it wrong they've been retconning ever since. Of course it  
>> never helped that Encounter at Farpoint stuck in an extra world war.  
>> And then some idiot decided it would be cute if TOS eps took place  
>> exactly 300 years after they aired ...  
>  
> Maybe in part influenced by the episode 'Miri', but I might give them  
> too much credit for it to be that.

Yeah, we have to ignore Miri (although quite frankly if you showed me  
Mayberry today, I'd say it was at least 100 years old).

We also have to ignore Decker in TMP, but that's easy, 'cause Decker was  
an idiot. :)

>  
>  
>>  
>> \*note that this is the only Trek McIntyre or Clee ever wrote. I've

>> wondered if McIntyre is related to Vonda N. McIntyre who wrote all that  
>> terrible fanfic before finagling her way into writing bad novelizations.  
>>  
>> BTW, good to see you again Wouter! :)  
>>  
>  
> Likewise! :-)

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 02:20:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <oijd4t\$V3g\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net says...

>

> On 6/23/2017 4:23 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:

>> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> On 6/22/2017 7:00 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> >> On 6/22/2017 2:45 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>> ...and did you see who is playing Harry Mudd?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> No idea. All I really know about the casting is the lead is someone I  
>>>> >> haven't heard of before and Michelle Yeoh apparently got shanghaied into  
>>>> >> this, I assume because of a desperate need to keep her American SAG  
>>>> >> medical insurance or some such. Since I wouldn't be able to afford the  
>>>> >> subscription fee and wouldn't be able to stream it if I did pay for it,  
>>>> >> I have no need to pay attention except for the fun of mocking it. :)

>>>> >

>>>> > If you get CBASS you can see the first ep free. Lucky for me, I don't.

>>>> >

>>>> >>> Why would I watch a first episode of a show I know I won't be able to  
>>>> >>> watch subsequent episodes of?

>>>>

>>> >>> I wonder that as well, but their entire business plan revolves around  
>>> >>> that assumption.

>>>

>> >>> I presume it's b/c you'll like it so much that you'll subscribe.

>>>

> >>> Why would I subscribe to a service that I wouldn't be able to use? I'm

- > guessing that a significant percentage of people who have new hardware
- > and the latest software won't be able to stream it since that appears to
- > be the case with every other streaming service. (Hell, YOUTUBE
- > sometimes throttles their feed to me!)

What makes you think that that has anything to do with your hardware?

- > And I don't have anything close
- > to "current" H/W or S/W. I can't afford the new hardware and the new
- > software won't run on what I do have.

A Chromecast is 35 bucks.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 16:21:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

- > Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:
- >>
- >> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.
- >> Is that racist?
- >
- > They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.

Maybe, but maybe not. You can't add new diversity to an established franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist. It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 19:06:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

> Trek

> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything

> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.

Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer anvils these days.

Not only that, but there's this, as well:

<https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-roddenberry-s-box.html>  
(or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

From the start of the article:

QUOTE

Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed in too negative a light.

That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J. Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in more depth than ever before.

END QUOTE

So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just an ensign."

I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has \*already\* damaged this franchise.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 19:49:15 GMT

On 6/24/2017 12:06 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>> Trek

>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>> Everything

>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.

>

> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

> anvils these days.

>

> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>

> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-roddenberry-s-box.html>

>

> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>

> From the start of the article:

>

> QUOTE

> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed

> in too negative a light.

>

> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in

> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.

> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in

> more depth than ever before.

> END QUOTE

>

> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline

> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my

> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just

> an ensign."

>

> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is

> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has

> \*already\* damaged this franchise.

>

Don't tempt me to post my review of Star Dreck again where I point out that the crew of Abrahm's Enterprise had less discipline than a Somali pirate boat.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 20:16:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oimd05\$7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>> Trek  
>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>  
> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
> anvils these days.  
>  
> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>  
> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-rod-oddenberry-s-box.html>  
> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>  
> From the start of the article:  
>  
> QUOTE  
> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
> in too negative a light.  
>  
> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
> more depth than ever before.  
> END QUOTE  
>  
> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
> an ensign."  
>  
> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has

> \*already\* damaged this franchise.

racist

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 21:02:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 02:49 PM:

> On 6/24/2017 12:06 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>> Trek

>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>> Everything

>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.

>>

>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>> anvils these days.

>>

>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>

>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-rodtenberry-s-box.html>

>>

>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>

>> From the start of the article:

>>

>> QUOTE

>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed

>> in too negative a light.

>>

>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in

>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.

>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in

>> more depth than ever before.

>> END QUOTE

>>

>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline

>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>> an ensign."  
>>  
>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>  
> Don't tempt me to post my review of Star Trek again where I point out  
> that the crew of Abraham's Enterprise had less discipline than a Somali  
> pirate boat.

Heh. Like I said, the writer above was being charitable with the  
"stretched" bit. TV and movie writers these days seem to prefer to write  
to an audience that shuns things like self-control and self-discipline.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love  
you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 21:04:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 24-6-2017 om 18:21 schreef Doc O'Leary:  
> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>  
>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>> Is that racist?  
>>  
>> They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.  
>  
> Maybe, but maybe not. You can't add new diversity to an established  
> franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the  
> depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without  
> representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek  
> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
> It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an  
> agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.  
>

So, what's exactly new to a diversity that has established the concept



of 'INFINITE Diversity in Infinite Combinations'? I'd say that already covers at least ALL Diversity already. :-)

And how would it not represent actual population distributions? Is that only a matter of percentages or a representation of (all) possibilities?

This discussion reminds me of a speech made by Joss Whedon in 2006, which was about (strong) women (characters) specifically, but might apply here as well.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cYaczoJMRhs>

It will cease being an issue the moment the questions on the 'why' cease.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 21:05:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>> Trek

>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything

>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.

>>

>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>> anvils these days.

>>

>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>

>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-r>

>> [oddenberry-s-box.html](http://oddenberry-s-box.html)

>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>  
>> From the start of the article:  
>>  
>> QUOTE  
>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>> in too negative a light.  
>>  
>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>> more depth than ever before.  
>> END QUOTE  
>>  
>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>> an ensign."  
>>  
>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>  
> racist

Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J. is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse the show gets.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 21:44:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>> In article <oim05\$7I\$3@dont-email.me>,  
 >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
 >>

>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
 >>>> Trek  
 >>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
 >>>> Everything  
 >>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
 >>>

>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
 >>> anvils these days.  
 >>>

>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
 >>>

>>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-rod-berry-s-box.html>  
 >>> e-r  
 >>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
 >>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
 >>>

>>> From the start of the article:  
 >>>

>>> QUOTE  
 >>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
 >>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
 >>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
 >>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
 >>> in too negative a light.  
 >>>

>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
 >>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
 >>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
 >>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
 >>> more depth than ever before.  
 >>> END QUOTE  
 >>>

>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
 >>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
 >>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
 >>> an ensign."  
 >>>

>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
 >>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
 >>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
 >>>

>> racist  
 >

> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
> the show gets.

But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2017 23:37:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/24/2017 2:44 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> > Trek  
>>>> > \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> > Everything  
>>>> > I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>>>>  
>>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> anvils these days.  
>>>>  
>>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>>  
>>>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-earth-oddenberry-s-box.html>  
>>>> e-r  
>>>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>>  
>>>> From the start of the article:  
>>>>  
>>>> QUOTE  
>>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

>>>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> in too negative a light.  
>>>>  
>>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>>>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>>>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>>>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> END QUOTE  
>>>>  
>>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> an ensign."  
>>>>  
>>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>  
>>> racist  
>>  
>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>> the show gets.  
>  
> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>  
Which is why I hate this "diverse" BS. I have no problem with having  
various combinations of skin tones and both sexes filling roles. What I  
do have a problem with is the scream-it-in-my-face "See how diverse we  
are" to justify that they ARE being deliberately racist. It doesn't  
matter \_what\_ group you are treating unequally, treating \_any\_ group  
unequally is racist.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <oimst8\$phr\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net says...

>  
> On 6/24/2017 2:44 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >> Trek  
>>>> >> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >> Everything  
>>>> >> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> > anvils these days.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside>  
>>>> > e-r  
>>>> > oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> > (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > From the start of the article:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > QUOTE  
>>>> > Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
>>>> > - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> > by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> > Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> > in too negative a light.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> > been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>>>> > recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>>>> > Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>>>> > more depth than ever before.  
>>>> > END QUOTE  
>>>> >  
>>>> > So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> > and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my

>>>> > self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> > an ensign."  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> > a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> > \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>>  
>>>> racist  
>>>  
>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>> the show gets.  
>>  
>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>  
> Which is why I hate this "diverse" BS. I have no problem with having  
> various combinations of skin tones and both sexes filling roles. What I  
> do have a problem with is the scream-it-in-my-face "See how diverse we  
> are" to justify that they ARE being deliberately racist. It doesn't  
> matter \_what\_ group you are treating unequally, treating \_any\_ group  
> unequally is racist.

This is social justice warring for you though. Another reason that we  
have a bumbling idiot who nobody will ever accuse of being a Social Justice  
Warrior in the White House.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 01:27:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oimst8\$phr\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/24/2017 2:44 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oimjvf\$05k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >> Trek  
>>>> >> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >> Everything  
>>>> >> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >> exist.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> > anvils these days.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>  
>>>> > id  
>>>> > e-r  
>>>> > oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> > (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > From the start of the article:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > QUOTE  
>>>> > Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
>>>> > - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> > by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> > Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> > in too negative a light.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> > been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>>>> > recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>>>> > Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>>>> > more depth than ever before.  
>>>> > END QUOTE  
>>>> >  
>>>> > So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> > and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> > self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> > an ensign."  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> > a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> > \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>>  
>>>> racist  
>>>  
>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and



>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>> the show gets.  
>>  
>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>  
> Which is why I hate this "diverse" BS. I have no problem with having  
> various combinations of skin tones and both sexes filling roles. What I  
> do have a problem with is the scream-it-in-my-face "See how diverse we  
> are" to justify that they ARE being deliberately racist. It doesn't  
> matter \_what\_ group you are treating unequally, treating \_any\_ group  
> unequally is racist.

Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 02:43:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/24/2017 5:04 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
> Op 24-6-2017 om 18:21 schreef Doc O'Leary:  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>>  
>>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -  
>>>> again.  
>>>> Is that racist?  
>>>  
>>> They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.  
>>  
>> Maybe, but maybe not. You can't add new diversity to an established  
>> franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the  
>> depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without  
>> representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek  
>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>> It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an  
>> agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.  
>>  
>

- > So, what's exactly new to a diversity that has established the concept
- > of 'INFINITE Diversity in Infinite Combinations'? I'd say that already
- > covers at least ALL Diversity already. :-)
- >
- > And how would it not represent actual population distributions? Is that
- > only a matter of percentages or a representation of (all) possibilities?
- >
- >
- > This discussion reminds me of a speech made by Joss Whedon in 2006,
- > which was about (strong) women (characters) specifically, but might
- > apply here as well.
- >
- > <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cYaczoJMRhs>
- >
- >
- > It will cease being an issue the moment the questions on the 'why' cease.

The original series had a black female on the bridge. Also an Asian male. Also a Russian male. Also an alien. There was only one good old white boy there. Now, the new show has a 'diverse cast' and many people here are complaining about it...I guess just because they can't handle the word diverse? maybe it is because the good old white boy isn't the 'leader'? Maybe it is because there will be a gay character? The whole point of the original series was to espouse diversity and half a century later it still can't happened without people asking 'why'.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 02:59:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oin7ol\$K4s\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

- > On 6/24/2017 5:04 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:
- >> Op 24-6-2017 om 18:21 schreef Doc O'Leary:
- >>> For your reference, records indicate that
- >>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:
- >>>
- >>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:
- >>>> >
- >>>> > I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -
- >>>> > again.
- >>>> > Is that racist?
- >>>>
- >>>> They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.
- >>>
- >>> Maybe, but maybe not. You can't add new diversity to an established

>>> franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the  
>>> depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without  
>>> representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek  
>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>>> It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an  
>>> agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.

>>>

>>

>> So, what's exactly new to a diversity that has established the concept  
>> of 'INFINITE Diversity in Infinite Combinations'? I'd say that already  
>> covers at least ALL Diversity already. :-)

>>

>> And how would it not represent actual population distributions? Is that  
>> only a matter of percentages or a representation of (all) possibilities?

>>

>>

>> This discussion reminds me of a speech made by Joss Whedon in 2006,  
>> which was about (strong) women (characters) specifically, but might  
>> apply here as well.

>>

>> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cYaczoJMRhs>

>>

>>

>> It will cease being an issue the moment the questions on the 'why' cease.  
>

> The original series had a black female on the bridge. Also an Asian  
> male. Also a Russian male. Also an alien. There was only one good old  
> white boy there. Now, the new show has a 'diverse cast' and many people  
> here are complaining about it...I guess just because they can't handle  
> the word diverse? maybe it is because the good old white boy isn't the  
> 'leader'? Maybe it is because there will be a gay character? The whole  
> point of the original series was to espouse diversity and half a century  
> later it still can't happen without people asking 'why'.

The leader is still the good old white boy. I haven't seen anybody  
complaining about diverse (which CBS defines as 'no whites allowed') -  
I've just seen STD striking back, claiming that's what people are  
complaining about. All the complaints I've seen are about the ugly  
ship, terrible FX, idiocy of the now fired but still being paid  
showrunner, awful behind the scenes people, marketing scam, er, scheme,  
multiple delays, total lack of continuity, and yet another batch of  
bloody new Klingons. They aren't defending \*that\* because none of it's  
defensible, so they're making up a fight.

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 07:47:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 25-6-2017 om 03:27 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <oimst8\$phr\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>

>> On 6/24/2017 2:44 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >

>>>> >> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >>> Trek

>>>> >>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> >>> Everything

>>>> >>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>> exist.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >> anvils these days.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>  
>>>> >> id

>>>> >> e-r

>>>> >> oddenberry-s-box.html

>>>> >> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> From the start of the article:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> QUOTE

>>>> >> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

>>>> >> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

>>>> >> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

>>>> >> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> >> in too negative a light.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

>>>> >> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in

>>>> >> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.

>>>> >> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in

>>>> >> more depth than ever before.

>>>> >> END QUOTE

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> >> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> >> an ensign."  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> >> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > racist  
>>>>  
>>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

Not every complaint is racist. They only referred to the actual racist complaints.

Discovery has plenty of other issues.

>>>>  
>> Which is why I hate this "diverse" BS. I have no problem with having  
>> various combinations of skin tones and both sexes filling roles. What I  
>> do have a problem with is the scream-it-in-my-face "See how diverse we  
>> are" to justify that they ARE being deliberately racist. It doesn't  
>> matter \_what\_ group you are treating unequally, treating \_any\_ group  
>> unequally is racist.  
>  
> Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'  
>

So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?  
Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 12:55:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Sat, 24 Jun 2017 22:43:02 -0400, Obveeus wrote:

> Now, the new show has a 'diverse cast' and many people  
> here are complaining about it...I guess just because they can't handle  
> the word diverse?

Maybe it's because they are using Trek as a vehicle for their agenda instead of looking to make an interesting show to watch. All Trek series had their stupid social agendas in there somewhere (The Outcast, anyone?) but original Trek was sold as "wagon train to the stars," not "Hey look, we care about diversity, no straight white guys in the main cast!"

--  
Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 16:28:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <594f6a7e\$0\$739\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 25-6-2017 om 03:27 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <oimst8\$phr\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/24/2017 2:44 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >>>> Trek  
>>>> >>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>>> Everything  
>>>> >>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>>> exist.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >>> anvils these days.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> [https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-ou](https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-oddenberry-s-box.html)  
>>>> >>> ts  
>>>> >>> id  
>>>> >>> e-r  
>>>> >>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> QUOTE  
>>>> >>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>> unspoken  
>>>> >>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> >>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
>>>> >>> portrayed  
>>>> >>> in too negative a light.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> >>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially  
>>>> >>> in  
>>>> >>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen  
>>>> >>> J.  
>>>> >>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet  
>>>> >>> in  
>>>> >>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >>> END QUOTE  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
>>>> >>> discipline  
>>>> >>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm  
>>>> >>> just  
>>>> >>> an ensign."  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which  
>>>> >>> is

>>>> >>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> racist  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>  
>  
> Not every complaint is racist. They only referred to the actual racist  
> complaints.  
>  
> Discovery has plenty of other issues.  
>  
>  
>>>>  
>>> Which is why I hate this "diverse" BS. I have no problem with having  
>>> various combinations of skin tones and both sexes filling roles. What I  
>>> do have a problem with is the scream-it-in-my-face "See how diverse we  
>>> are" to justify that they ARE being deliberately racist. It doesn't  
>>> matter \_what\_ group you are treating unequally, treating \_any\_ group  
>>> unequally is racist.  
>>  
>> Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'  
>>  
>  
> So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?  
> Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)

I'm not saying that. I'm saying that's how CBASS uses the term, because  
A) they're deeply stupid and 2) they're racist.

And 'we' won't see this fall - I'm not going near this crapfest. I'm  
especially not \*paying\* for it.

They'd have to cameo The Shat to get me to bootleg it.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---



Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 16:57:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 25-6-2017 om 18:28 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <594f6a7e\$0\$739\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

<snip>

>>>

>>> Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'

>>>

>>

>> So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?

>> Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)

>

> I'm not saying that. I'm saying that's how CBASS uses the term, because

> A) they're deeply stupid and 2) they're racist.

>

> And 'we' won't see this fall - I'm not going near this crapfest. I'm

> especially not \*paying\* for it.

I already have Netflix (NL edition). In recent months they've gained every Trek TV show, including TAS, and Discovery will be part of that line up.

>

> They'd have to cameo The Shat to get me to bootleg it.

>

LOL

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 17:36:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <594feb74\$0\$731\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

```
> Op 25-6-2017 om 18:28 schreef anim8rfsk:
>> In article <594f6a7e$0$739$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,
>> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:
>
>
> <snip>
>
>>>>
>>>> Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'
>>>>
>>>
>>> So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?
>>> Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)
>>
>> I'm not saying that. I'm saying that's how CBASS uses the term, because
>> A) they're deeply stupid and 2) they're racist.
>>
>> And 'we' won't see this fall - I'm not going near this crapfest. I'm
>> especially not *paying* for it.
>
> I already have Netflix (NL edition). In recent months they've gained
> every Trek TV show, including TAS, and Discovery will be part of that
> line up.
```

In America, you have to pay for a new service, CBS Access, to see Trek  
and then limited reruns of other stuff, and it still has freaking  
commercials unless you pay again for a higher level of service!

```
>>
>> They'd have to cameo The Shat to get me to bootleg it.
>>
>
> LOL
```

:)

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 20:12:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> So, what's exactly new to a diversity that has established the concept  
> of 'INFINITE Diversity in Infinite Combinations'? I'd say that already  
> covers at least ALL Diversity already. :-)

We need to bring in the comic book geeks to school us all on just how  
bad an idea it is to have Infinite Earths. I'll just take the  
opportunity to relay a quote I recently read:

“Civilization is the process of reducing the infinite to the finite.”  
Oliver Wendell Holmes

Star Trek was *\*not\** about “infinite” anything. It was/is a creation to  
show a particular future for human society. As I said, when they  
wanted to cover something with any amount of controversy in our daily  
lives, they did it best when they did it through the “strange new  
worlds” that they found on their voyages.

> And how would it not represent actual population distributions? Is that  
> only a matter of percentages or a representation of (all) possibilities?

Again, it's about *\*how\** the representation is presented, and *\*especially\**  
how it reflects the representation already established for the Trek  
universe. If the Star Fleet of Kirk's day wasn't 90% trans (or whatever  
the new Trek is pushing), the writers have the burden of demonstrating a  
realistic way to get from whatever they're depicting as 10 years prior to  
the Trek we already know.

I'm not saying it can't be done, but it is a *\*heavy\** burden to taken on  
above and beyond having to tell good stories that are *\*independent\** of  
whatever diversity agenda they're pursuing. That's why older Trek  
(including TNG) was so great. The diversity was just *\*there\**; who was  
what wasn't a part of the story unless it made *\*sense\** to make it part  
of the story. I don't recall anyone putting out press releases patting  
themselves on the back for making a Chief Engineer black, or blind!

These days, things appear to be tending more towards “fan service” (in  
all its forms), and I think that's a shame. The problem is not *\*that\**  
diversity is pushed, but that it is pushed in places where it makes no  
sense to push it. True Trek fans didn't stop watching when they put  
different races or genders (or whatever) on the screen, but I certainly  
*\*did\** decide to tune out when (among other things) they started going  
the route of base fan service when it came to putting *\*just\** their hot  
female characters on the screen (like 7 of 9's outfit or T'Pol's (along

with that whole “decontamination” setup)). As much as I liked the T&A, I can easily find that kind of softcore action online, and it just was out of place for the particular stories they were telling in the Trek universe.

- > This discussion reminds me of a speech made by Joss Whedon in 2006,
- > which was about (strong) women (characters) specifically, but might
- > apply here as well.
- >
- > <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cYaczoJMRhs>
- >
- >
- > It will cease being an issue the moment the questions on the 'why' cease.

The distinction I'd highlight is the one of “strong \_\_\_\_\_ characters”. I quote one of Whedon's great female ones in my .sig, but to me it's not about what is filling in that blank. Fill it in with anything you'd like and I'm likely going to be onboard, \*if and only if\* you don't make the focus about that agenda \*more\* than the strength of the characters or the stories that are being told. Like softcore porn, I can find unnuanced depictions of racial/gender/whatever issues online or in the news or on Reality TV shows. There is no need to keep torpedoing the Trek universe with the sort of ham-handed approach I'm seeing taken with these newer shows.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 20:33:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Obveeus <[Obveeus@aol.com](mailto:Obveeus@aol.com)> wrote:

- > The original series had a black female on the bridge. Also an Asian
- > male. Also a Russian male. Also an alien. There was only one good old
- > white boy there. Now, the new show has a 'diverse cast' and many people
- > here are complaining about it...I guess just because they can't handle
- > the word diverse? maybe it is because the good old white boy isn't the
- > 'leader'? Maybe it is because there will be a gay character? The whole
- > point of the original series was to espouse diversity and half a century
- > later it still can't happened without people asking 'why'.

No, the question some of us are asking is simply: \*How\* does this make sense in the Star Trek universe? I'm not being sold on an interesting new addition to the franchise, I'm being sold on an unrelated agenda \*that I've already purchased in my present day reality\*. I mean, hell, I worked jobs 15 years ago with more gay people than have ever gotten major screen time on a Trek show. I never really cared for one damn second about their "diversity", I just cared that they were doing an awesome job. It remains to be seen (by those who are going to bother to pay to see it) whether or not this new Trek is anywhere close to watchable, or if it is just another retread of an agenda that could have actually been \*better\* done as a cheaper Reality TV show.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 22:44:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <s66dnVchnoHTs83EnZ2dnUU7-KudnZ2d@giganews.com>,  
Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

```
> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:
>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:
>>> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:
>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:
>>>> > On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:
>>>> > > On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:
>>>> > >> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:
>>>> > >>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:
>>>> > >>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:
>>>> > >>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:
>
>>>> > >>>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first

>>>> > >>>>>
>>>> > >>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!
>>>> > >>>>
>>>> > >>>> Well, no, not really.
>>>> > >>>>
>>>> > >>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?
>>>> > >>>>
>>>> > >>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -
>>>> > >>>> again.
>>>> > >>>> Is that racist?
>>>> > >>>>
```

>>>> > >>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?  
>>>> > >>>>  
>>>> > >>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.  
>>>> > >>>>  
>>>> > >>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that  
>>>> > >>>> racist?  
>>>> > >>>>  
>>>> > >>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes  
>>>> > >>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.  
>>>> > >>>  
>>>> > >> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in  
>>>> > >> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual  
>>>> > >> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?  
>>>> > >>  
>>>> > >> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white  
>>>> > >> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can  
>>>> > >> complain that we've been completely excluded?  
>>>> > >>  
>>>> > > Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white  
>>>> > > male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one  
>>>> > > non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never  
>>>> > > any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>> > >  
>>>> > > Especially not Kirk.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>>>  
>>>> Probably.  
>>>>  
>>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
>>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>>>>  
>>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was  
>>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>>  
>> Stupid retcon TNG dating.  
>  
> They changed it?

Yeah, Data got it wrong, and they decided to change all of real Trek and  
a year of TNG to match.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2017 22:44:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> On 6/22/2017 5:20 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>>> > On 6/22/2017 1:37 PM, Rhino wrote:

>>>> >> On 2017-06-22 3:40 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>>> >>> On 6/22/2017 11:47 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >>>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 14:35 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls as the first

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Good article. Sonequa and George nailed it!

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Well, no, not really.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I hate the ship design. Is that racist?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong -

>>>> >>>> again.

>>>> >>>> Is that racist?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I hate the creatives that I've heard of - is that racist?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I hate CBS because THEY are racist.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> You don't even have to \*know\* the cast to hate this show. Is that

>>>> >>>> racist?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> If anyone who is in any way racist has heard of the show, then yes

>>>> >>> all dislike of the show is racist. I thought you knew that by now.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >> I'm curious to know if there is even one heterosexual white male in

>>>> >> the cast or does their vision of "diversity" exclude heterosexual

>>>> >> white males altogether because, you know, its 2017?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I wonder if they'll "throw us a bone" in the form of a single white

>>>> >> guy who has a really low-prestige job, just so that no one can

>>>> >> complain that we've been completely excluded?

>>>> >>

>>>> > Since the whole point of a diverse cast is to punish the hetero white

>>>> > male and a show that is made up of characters who are all from one

>>>> > non-Caucasian ethnic group is considered diverse, no there were never

>>>> > any hetero white males in Star Fleet in the new timeline.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Especially not Kirk.  
>>>>  
>>>> Has he even joined Star Fleet yet at the time of this new series?  
>>>  
>>> Probably.  
>>>  
>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they  
>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before  
>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's  
>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>>  
>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was  
>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>  
> Stupid retcon TNG dating.

They changed it?

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:02:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> > Trek

>>>> > \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> > Everything

>>>> > I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.

>>>>

>>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>>>> anvils these days.

>>>>

>>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>>



>>>> [https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-earth-rod-](https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-earth-roddenberry-s-box.html)  
>>>> [ddenberry-s-box.html](https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-earth-rod-denberry-s-box.html)  
>>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>>  
>>>> From the start of the article:  
>>>>  
>>>> QUOTE  
>>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
>>>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> in too negative a light.  
>>>>  
>>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>>>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>>>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>>>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> END QUOTE  
>>>>  
>>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> an ensign."  
>>>>  
>>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>  
>>> racist  
>>  
>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>> the show gets.  
>  
> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love  
you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:11:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>> Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> >>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming they

>>>> >>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years before

>>>> >>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet - OBSESSION's

>>>> >>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,

>>>> >>

>>>> >> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and 2264 was

>>>> >> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.

>>>> >

>>>> > Stupid retcon TNG dating.

>>>>

>>>> Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime

>>>> Timeline.

>>>

>>> :(

>>>

>>

>> Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from

>> Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would

>> be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later episode.

>>

>> If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling

>> was to set TNG around 2300.

>>

>> I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a

>> guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that

>> shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which

>> better suits what was going on in TOS.

>>

>> And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states

>> that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language

>> version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the

>> year 2200).

>>  
>> So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.  
>  
> TNG was originally in the first year (or years) of the 24th Century, so  
> call it 2301. It was also 78 years after real Trek, so call real Trek  
> 2223 (we don't know \*where\* in real Trek, so there's some leeway). Mr.  
> Scott's Guide to the Enterprise put TMP in 2222 (IIRC). All of that  
> worked just fine. Then at the end of TNG's first season, Data tells the  
> guys from the past that it's "By your calendar two thousand three  
> hundred sixty four." and they decided that rather than admit Data (or  
> credited writers Maurice Hurley and/or Deborah McIntyre and/or Mona  
> Clee\*) got it wrong they've been retconning ever since.

I was not aware of that, but they could have used the "by your calendar" as an escape.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:20:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirf1d\$9ev\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>> Op 23-6-2017 om 20:21 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> > Op 23-6-2017 om 13:31 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>>> They keep saying this takes place 10 years before Kirk. Assuming  
>>>> >>>> they  
>>>> >>>> mean '10 years before Kirk took over the Enterprise' or '10 years  
>>>> >>>> before  
>>>> >>>> the first episode of TOS' then, yes, he was in Starfleet -  
>>>> >>>> OBSESSION's  
>>>> >>>> flashbacks take place 11 years before season 2,  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> According to Wikipedia, "Star Trek: Discovery" begins in 2254 and  
>>>> >>> 2264 was  
>>>> >>> when Kirk took command of the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Stupid retcon TNG dating.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yes, that was an error. But sadly now the case for most of the Prime

>>>> > Timeline.  
>>>>  
>>>> :(  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Funny thing is, in 'Encounter at Farpoint', Data says he graduated from  
>>> Starfleet in '78.... Which would place that in I think 2278. 2378 would  
>>> be really silly in the light of 2364 mentioned by Geordi in a later  
>>> episode.  
>>>  
>>> If 2278 is true, for that episode, than I think that their first inkling  
>>> was to set TNG around 2300.  
>>>  
>>> I have somewhere in my collection (I don't remember the exact title) a  
>>> guide to the history of ships named 'Enterprise', with a timeline that  
>>> shifts the now 'official' timeline some 60 years into the past. Which  
>>> better suits what was going on in TOS.  
>>>  
>>> And if I'm not mistaken the text on the cover of the TMP novel states  
>>> that it is set at the beginning of the 23d century. (the German language  
>>> version of Star Trek (TOS) (Raumschiff Enterprise) says it is in the  
>>> year 2200).  
>>>  
>>> So, sadly there was a shift of over half a century.  
>>  
>> TNG was originally in the first year (or years) of the 24th Century, so  
>> call it 2301. It was also 78 years after real Trek, so call real Trek  
>> 2223 (we don't know \*where\* in real Trek, so there's some leeway). Mr.  
>> Scott's Guide to the Enterprise put TMP in 2222 (IIRC). All of that  
>> worked just fine. Then at the end of TNG's first season, Data tells the  
>> guys from the past that it's "By your calendar two thousand three  
>> hundred sixty four." and they decided that rather than admit Data (or  
>> credited writers Maurice Hurley and/or Deborah McIntyre and/or Mona  
>> Clee\*) got it wrong they've been retconning ever since.  
>  
> I was not aware of that, but they could have used the "by your calendar" as  
> an escape.

But they're too stupid.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:22:26 GMT

In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >> Trek

>>>> >> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> >> Everything

>>>> >> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will

>>>> >> exist.

>>>> >

>>>> > Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>>>> > anvils these days.

>>>> >

>>>> > Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>> >

>>>> > <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>

>>>> > id

>>>> > e-r

>>>> > oddenberry-s-box.html

>>>> > (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>> >

>>>> > From the start of the article:

>>>> >

>>>> > QUOTE

>>>> > Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

>>>> > - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

>>>> > by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

>>>> > Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed

>>>> > in too negative a light.

>>>> >

>>>> > That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

>>>> > been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in

>>>> > recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.

>>>> > Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in

>>>> > more depth than ever before.

>>>> > END QUOTE

>>>> >

>>>> > So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline

>>>> > and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my

>>>> > self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> > an ensign."  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> > a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> > \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>>  
>>>> racist  
>>>  
>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>> the show gets.  
>>  
>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>  
> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How badly does \*that\* bode?

Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:46:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

> On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 08:35:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls

>

> Hardly.

>

> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
> this series.

Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:52:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>> Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>> Is that racist?

>>

>> They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.

>

> Maybe, but maybe not. You can't add new diversity to an established  
> franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the  
> depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without  
> representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek  
> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
> It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an  
> agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.

I don't think writers know how to be subtle any more.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:57:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 25-6-2017 om 19:36 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <594feb74\$0\$731\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>  
 >> Op 25-6-2017 om 18:28 schreef anim8rfsk:  
 >>> In article <594f6a7e\$0\$739\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
 >>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
 >>  
 >>  
 >> <snip>  
 >>  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'  
 >>>> >  
 >>>>  
 >>>> So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?  
 >>>> Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)  
 >>>  
 >>> I'm not saying that. I'm saying that's how CBASS uses the term, because  
 >>> A) they're deeply stupid and 2) they're racist.  
 >>>  
 >>> And 'we' won't see this fall - I'm not going near this crapfest. I'm  
 >>> especially not \*paying\* for it.  
 >>  
 >> I already have Netflix (NL edition). In recent months they've gained  
 >> every Trek TV show, including TAS, and Discovery will be part of that  
 >> line up.  
 >  
 > In America, you have to pay for a new service, CBS Access, to see Trek  
 > and then limited reruns of other stuff, and it still has freaking  
 > commercials unless you pay again for a higher level of service!

Still commercials? :-(

--  
 Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

l iam=mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
 Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:57:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



In article <oimfgv\$uf8\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net wrote:  
> On 6/24/2017 12:06 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>> anvils these days.  
>>  
>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>  
>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-rodtenberry-s-box.html>  
>>  
>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>  
>> From the start of the article:  
>>  
>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>> unspoken - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a  
>> rule laid out by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says  
>> that members of Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with  
>> each other or portrayed in too negative a light.  
>>  
>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially  
>> in recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
>> Gretchen J. Berg say the show will explore conflict between members  
>> of Starfleet in more depth than ever before.  
>>  
>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>> an ensign."  
>>  
>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>  
> Don't tempt me to post my review of Star Dreck again where I point out  
> that the crew of Abrahm's Enterprise had less discipline than a Somali  
> pirate boat.

Please feel free to do it. :-)

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 17:59:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 26-6-2017 om 19:22 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >>> Trek

>>>> >>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> >>> Everything

>>>> >>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will

>>>> >>> exist.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>>>> >> anvils these days.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>

>>>> >> id

>>>> >> e-r

>>>> >> oddenberry-s-box.html

>>>> >> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> From the start of the article:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> QUOTE

>>>> >> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken

>>>> >> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

>>>> >> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

>>>> >> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed

>>>> >> in too negative a light.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

>>>> >> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in

>>>> >> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.

>>>> >> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in

>>>> >> more depth than ever before.

>>>> >> END QUOTE

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> >> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> >> an ensign."  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> >> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > racist  
>>>>  
>>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> the show gets.  
>>>  
>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>  
>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>  
> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>  
> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>

Another Reboot. That much is certain.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:02:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <59514b16\$0\$839\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

```
> Op 25-6-2017 om 19:36 schreef anim8rfsk:
>> In article <594feb74$0$731$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:
>>
>>> Op 25-6-2017 om 18:28 schreef anim8rfsk:
>>>> In article <594f6a7e$0$739$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,
>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <snip>
>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> >> Which is why I won't watch CBASS, who define 'diverse' as 'non-white'
>>>>>> >>
>>>>>> >
>>>>>> > So, there are no 'white' characters on Discovery?
>>>>>> > Well, we'll see it this fall I guess. :-)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'm not saying that. I'm saying that's how CBASS uses the term, because
>>>>>> A) they're deeply stupid and 2) they're racist.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And 'we' won't see this fall - I'm not going near this crapfest. I'm
>>>>>> especially not *paying* for it.
>>>>
>>> I already have Netflix (NL edition). In recent months they've gained
>>> every Trek TV show, including TAS, and Discovery will be part of that
>>> line up.
>>
>> In America, you have to pay for a new service, CBS Access, to see Trek
>> and then limited reruns of other stuff, and it still has freaking
>> commercials unless you pay again for a higher level of service!
>
> Still commercials? :-(
```

Yep. Pay extra, watch it on your computer instead of your TV, still commercials.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:03:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>> On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 08:35:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>

>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls

>>

>> Hardly.

>>

>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>> this series.

>

> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>

Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part of that. It was the writers. They failed.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:16:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >>> Trek  
>>>> >>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>> Everything  
>>>> >>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>> exist.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >> anvils these days.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-re-space-outs>  
>>>> >> id  
>>>> >> e-r  
>>>> >> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> QUOTE  
>>>> >> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat unspoken  
>>>> >> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> >> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or portrayed  
>>>> >> in too negative a light.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> >> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially in  
>>>> >> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen J.  
>>>> >> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet in  
>>>> >> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >> END QUOTE  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>>> >> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>>> >> an ensign."  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>>> >> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > racist  
>>>>  
>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> >>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.

>>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> the show gets.

>>>

>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>

>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>

> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
> badly does \*that\* bode?

>

> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).

If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:46:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:03:25 +0200, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

And after re-watching the series a couple of years ago, having been  
critical of it during its original airing, I will say that in  
retrospect it was not that terrible. It was still Trek. It had its  
really dumb moments and some insufferable characters, and the "Borg  
Chick" thing is more transparent than Scotty's aluminum, but in the  
end it was still Trek.

--

Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:58:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 26-6-2017 om 20:16 schreef Obveeus:

>  
>  
> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >>>> Trek  
>>>> >>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>>> Everything  
>>>> >>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>>> exist.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >>> anvils these days.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> id  
>>>> >>> e-r  
>>>> >>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> QUOTE  
>>>> >>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>> unspoken  
>>>> >>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule  
>>>> >>> laid out  
>>>> >>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
>>>> >>> portrayed  
>>>> >>> in too negative a light.



>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding  
>>>> >>> - has  
>>>> >>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history,  
>>>> >>> especially in  
>>>> >>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
>>>> >>> Gretchen J.  
>>>> >>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of  
>>>> >>> Starfleet in  
>>>> >>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >>> END QUOTE  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
>>>> >>> discipline  
>>>> >>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though  
>>>> >>> I'm just  
>>>> >>> an ensign."  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote,  
>>>> >>> which is  
>>>> >>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> racist  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> > damage  
>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> > J.J.  
>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> > worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>

>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>  
> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

Enterprise addressed that in the Augment arc.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 18:59:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 26-6-2017 om 20:46 schreef Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz:

> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:03:25 +0200, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
>  
>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>  
> And after re-watching the series a couple of years ago, having been  
> critical of it during its original airing, I will say that in  
> retrospect it was not that terrible. It was still Trek. It had its  
> really dumb moments and some insufferable characters, and the "Borg  
> Chick" thing is more transparent than Scotty's aluminum, but in the  
> end it was still Trek.  
>

You are kinder than I am.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:08:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 11:16 AM, Obveeus wrote:

>  
>  
> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiereg\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >>>> Trek  
>>>> >>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>>> Everything  
>>>> >>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>>> exist.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >>> anvils these days.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outs>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> id  
>>>> >>> e-r  
>>>> >>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> QUOTE  
>>>> >>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>> unspoken

>>>> >>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule  
 >>>> >>> laid out  
 >>>> >>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
 >>>> >>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
 >>>> >>> portrayed  
 >>>> >>> in too negative a light.  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding  
 >>>> >>> - has  
 >>>> >>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history,  
 >>>> >>> especially in  
 >>>> >>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
 >>>> >>> Gretchen J.  
 >>>> >>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of  
 >>>> >>> Starfleet in  
 >>>> >>> more depth than ever before.  
 >>>> >>> END QUOTE  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
 >>>> >>> discipline  
 >>>> >>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
 >>>> >>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though  
 >>>> >>> I'm just  
 >>>> >>> an ensign."  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote,  
 >>>> >>> which is  
 >>>> >>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
 >>>> >>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> racist  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
 >>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
 >>>> > damage  
 >>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
 >>>> > J.J.  
 >>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
 >>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
 >>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
 >>>> > worse  
 >>>> > the show gets.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
 >>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
 >>>  
 >>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
 >>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>  
> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

That's one of the things we're complaining about!

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:10:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>

>>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> the show gets.

>>>

>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>

>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>  
> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>  
> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better because we're making it all different!"

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:12:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>

> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiereg\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older

> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).

Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older ship or the newer one.

> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

That was stupid, too, and it was another good example of people thinking that they're being creative or clever when they make entirely unnecessary changes to what's already been established.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:13:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 10:57 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:

> In article <oimfgv\$uf8\$1@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net wrote:

>> On 6/24/2017 12:06 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>

>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>> anvils these days.

>>>

>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>

>>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-outside-roddenberry-s-box.html>

>>>

>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>

>>> From the start of the article:

>>>

>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>> unspoken - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a  
>>> rule laid out by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says  
>>> that members of Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with  
>>> each other or portrayed in too negative a light.

>>>

>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially

>>> in recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
>>> Gretchen J. Berg say the show will explore conflict between members  
>>> of Starfleet in more depth than ever before.  
>>>  
>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of discipline  
>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm just  
>>> an ensign."  
>>>  
>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which is  
>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>  
>> Don't tempt me to post my review of Star Trek again where I point out  
>> that the crew of Abraham's Enterprise had less discipline than a Somali  
>> pirate boat.  
>  
> Please feel free to do it. :-)  
>  
Silly rabbit. Just remember, you asked for it.

~~~~~  
You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of command.

TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the military was really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes, they bend things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a TV show, but their starting point was a working military. Characters stay at their posts. Kirk didn't tell his subordinates how to do a task, he just said "do it". Every time he sits down there's a yeoman handing him a report to read and sign. How often did we see Picard doing paperwork?

With the re-boot movie they display a level of military discipline that Somali pirates would laugh at. Civilian cargo and fishing vessels have better discipline than the 2009 version Starfleet! In the middle of an action while at General Quarters a bridge officer leaves his post, without even telling anyone let alone asking permission or arranging a replacement, to go interfere with a superior officer doing their job in a different part of the ship! (Literally running thru the ship yelling "I can do that!"?!?!?) One of the duties of an executive officer is to play Devil's Advocate for his CO, presenting alternatives and pointing out potential problems with the CO's plans. Its both to help his own training and to serve as a necessary sounding board for his CO. In the re-boot, when Spock is in command his reaction to his exec (Kirk) disagreeing is to literally throw him off the ship! And do you really want me to go in to the whole idea of a cadet who hasn't even graduated being given command of a major ship ahead of literally thousands of more



senior, more experienced officers? All of which would be horrid whether it was a Trek movie or some new setting.

~~~~~

The 2009 movie crew had a level of discipline that makes Somali pirates look like elite special forces. While the original crew was the trained, disciplined crew of a military ship. The original Kirk wouldn't have had to worry about the original Chekov suddenly leaving his station on the bridge, during a red alert, without even informing anyone let alone requesting permission, to run thru the ship shouting "I can do that! I can do that!" so he can push a superior officer away from their station and interfere with the job they were doing.

The original Kirk may have been the youngest in Starfleet to ever get command of a Starship, but he did it by graduating from the academy and working his way up the ranks. He \_didn't\_ go directly from "suspended for cheating" to Captain, jumping half-a-dozen ranks and thousands of superiors, because some now dead ex-captain happened to know his father and had "a good feeling" about him.

The original Scotty was an experienced, calm, engineer who could be depended on no matter how bad the situation got. The "new" Scotty's reaction to seeing two officers having a fist fight on the bridge is "Oh, I like this ship. Its exciting!" \*retch\*

~~~~~

Abrams took characters I liked and respected and turned them into asshats that I wouldn't share public transit with while putting them in a universe that made no sense. TOS may have simply retold old fables and morality tales but at least they were decent stories told by decent writers. Abrams doesn't care about story except as an excuse for expensive FX and "Wouldn't It Be Cool" shots.

J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and masturbated with the other.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:21:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>> On Thu, 22 Jun 2017 08:35:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> Sonequa Martin-Green torpedos the trolls

>>>>

>>>> Hardly.

>>>>

>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>>>> this series.

>>>>

>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>>

>>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part

>>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:22:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 12:10 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down

>>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its

>>>>> > damage

>>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if

>>>>> > J.J.

>>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and

>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> > worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
> because we're making it all different!"  
>  
DING DING DING DING DING. By George, I think he's finally got it!

;)

--
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:22:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 10:52 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:  
> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>> Op 22-6-2017 om 20:47 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> I hate that they're getting well established Trek history wrong - again.  
>>>> Is that racist?  
>>>>  
>>> They did not refer to criticism concerning the timeline.  
>>>  
>> Maybe, but maybe not. You canâ€™t add new diversity to an established

>> franchise like Star Trek, especially via retcon, without addressing the  
>> depictions of diversity in the existing story lines. Or without  
>> representing \*actual\* population distributions in a society. Trek  
>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory. Everything  
>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will exist.  
>> It's hard to have high expectations for \*any\* show that is pushing an  
>> agenda that has nothing to do with telling a great story.

>

> I don't think writers know how to be subtle any more.

>

Writers wouldn't know subtle if it bit them on the ass. :)

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:24:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 6/26/2017 11:46 AM, Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz wrote:

> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:03:25 +0200, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

>

>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>

> And after re-watching the series a couple of years ago, having been  
> critical of it during its original airing, I will say that in  
> retrospect it was not that terrible. It was still Trek. It had its  
> really dumb moments and some insufferable characters, and the "Borg  
> Chick" thing is more transparent than Scotty's aluminum, but in the  
> end it was still Trek.

>

Just proves how low Star Trek 2009 has set the bar.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:28:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
  
>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
> because we're making it all different!"

I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:30:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >>>> Trek  
>>>> >>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>>> Everything  
>>>> >>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>>> exist.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >>> anvils these days.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-oddenberry-s-box.html>  
>>>> >>> ts  
>>>> >>> id  
>>>> >>> e-r  
>>>> >>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> QUOTE  
>>>> >>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>> unspoken  
>>>> >>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out  
>>>> >>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
>>>> >>> portrayed  
>>>> >>> in too negative a light.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has  
>>>> >>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially  
>>>> >>> in  
>>>> >>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen  
>>>> >>> J.  
>>>> >>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet  
>>>> >>> in  
>>>> >>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >>> END QUOTE

>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
>>>> >>> discipline  
>>>> >>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm  
>>>> >>> just  
>>>> >>> an ensign."  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which  
>>>> >>> is  
>>>> >>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> racist  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>  
> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

They explained that. STD gets it wrong.

--

Join your old RAT friends at

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:30:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <59515945\$0\$799\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 26-6-2017 om 20:16 schreef Obveeus:

>>

>>

>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> >>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >>>>> Trek

>>>> >>>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> >>>>> Everything

>>>> >>>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will

>>>> >>>>> exist.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>>>> >>>> anvils these days.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> <https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-odds>

>>>> >>>> uts

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> id

>>>> >>>> e-r

>>>> >>>> oddenberry-s-box.html

>>>> >>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> From the start of the article:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> QUOTE



>>>> >>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>>> unspoken  
>>>> >>>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule  
>>>> >>>> laid out  
>>>> >>>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >>>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
>>>> >>>> portrayed  
>>>> >>>> in too negative a light.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding  
>>>> >>>> - has  
>>>> >>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history,  
>>>> >>>> especially in  
>>>> >>>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
>>>> >>>> Gretchen J.  
>>>> >>>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of  
>>>> >>>> Starfleet in  
>>>> >>>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >>>> END QUOTE  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
>>>> >>>> discipline  
>>>> >>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though  
>>>> >>>> I'm just  
>>>> >>>> an ensign."  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote,  
>>>> >>>> which is  
>>>> >>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> racist  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >> damage  
>>>> >> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >> J.J.  
>>>> >> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >> worse  
>>>> >> the show gets.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>>

>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>  
>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>  
>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>  
>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>>  
>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>  
>  
> Enterprise addressed that in the Augment arc.

Enterprise was a holonovel. :)

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:31:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirivu\$6m5\$1@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> > departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> > in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> > is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> > hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new

>>>> > comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> > the show gets.  
>>>>  
>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>>  
>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>  
>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>  
>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>  
> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
> because we're making it all different!"

Racist

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:35:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>

>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>>>

>>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>  
>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>  
>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>  
>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>  
> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older  
> ship or the newer one.

<http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:40:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 3:13 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and  
> the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of command.  
> TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the military was  
> really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes, they bend  
> things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a TV show, but  
> their starting point was a working military. Characters stay at their  
> posts.

This is simply not true. The show illogically (for any real military)  
had the leader, Kirk, always beaming down into unknown conditions. Many  
of the rest of the bridge crew illogically beamed down frequently as  
well. Outside of Spock and Uhura, none of those people should/would  
have ever had a reason to have been bopping down to new planets on a  
whim in any realistic 'military' show.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 19:44:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiriqi\$qq0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> > In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:

>>>> >>>>> Trek

>>>> >>>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.

>>>> >>>>> Everything

>>>> >>>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will

>>>> >>>>> exist.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer

>>>> >>>> anvils these days.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> [https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-re-space-ou](https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-re-space-oddenberry-s-box.html)

>>>> >>>> ts

>>>> >>>> id

>>>> >>>> e-r

>>>> >>>> oddenberry-s-box.html

>>>> >>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> From the start of the article:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> QUOTE

>>>> >>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat

>>>> >>>> unspoken

>>>> >>>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid out

>>>> >>>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of

>>>> >>>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or

>>>> >>>> portrayed

>>>> >>>> in too negative a light.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding - has

>>>> >>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history, especially

>>>> >>>> in

>>>> >>>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and Gretchen

>>>> >>>> J.  
 >>>> >>>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet  
 >>>> >>>> in  
 >>>> >>>> more depth than ever before.  
 >>>> >>>> END QUOTE  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
 >>>> >>>> discipline  
 >>>> >>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
 >>>> >>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm  
 >>>> >>>> just  
 >>>> >>>> an ensign."  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote, which  
 >>>> >>>> is  
 >>>> >>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
 >>>> >>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> racist  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
 >>>> >> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
 >>>> >> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
 >>>> >> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
 >>>> >> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
 >>>> >> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
 >>>> >> the show gets.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
 >>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
 >>>>  
 >>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
 >>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
 >>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
 >>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
 >>>>  
 >>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
 >>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
 >>>  
 >>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
 >>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
 >>>  
 >> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
 >> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
 >>  
 >> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
 >> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
 >> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>  
> They explained that.

Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

> STD gets it wrong.

Once you've opened up the world to 'make them look different whenever you want', I'm not sure it matters. Whatever the case, though, the new DISCOVERY show will look much better if they avoid going back to the original dippy Klingon look.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:07:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirnfk\$b29\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>  
>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older

>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>>  
>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older  
>> ship or the newer one.  
>  
> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

Not so much 'groovy' as 'ugly' and note that they're using the wrong era phasers.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:08:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirnv7\$dvns1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 03:16 PM:  
>>>> >>>> In article <oimd05\$n7l\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 11:21 AM:  
>>>> >>>>> Trek  
>>>> >>>>> \*used\* to smartly address current social issues via allegory.  
>>>> >>>>> Everything  
>>>> >>>>> I read about this new show seems to indicate no such subtlety will  
>>>> >>>>> exist.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Yep. Most writers -- especially the younger ones -- seem to prefer  
>>>> >>>>> anvils these days.



>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Not only that, but there's this, as well:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> [https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-](https://www.newsarama.com/35070-star-trek-discovery-to-explore-space-oddenberry-s-box.html)  
>>>> >>>>> ou  
>>>> >>>>> ts  
>>>> >>>>> id  
>>>> >>>>> e-r  
>>>> >>>>> oddenberry-s-box.html  
>>>> >>>>> (or <http://tinyurl.com/ycczjbym>)  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> From the start of the article:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> QUOTE  
>>>> >>>>> Star Trek: Discovery will break the longstanding - but somewhat  
>>>> >>>>> unspoken  
>>>> >>>>> - "Roddenberry's Box" rule of the Star Trek universe - a rule laid  
>>>> >>>>> out  
>>>> >>>>> by Star Trek creator Gene Roddenberry which says that members of  
>>>> >>>>> Starfleet cannot be shown in deep conflict with each other or  
>>>> >>>>> portrayed  
>>>> >>>>> in too negative a light.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> That rule - that Starfleet members must be ultimately upstanding -  
>>>> >>>>> has  
>>>> >>>>> been stretched a few times in the series' 50 year history,  
>>>> >>>>> especially  
>>>> >>>>> in  
>>>> >>>>> recent films. But Discovery's showrunners Aaron Harberts and  
>>>> >>>>> Gretchen  
>>>> >>>>> J.  
>>>> >>>>> Berg say the show will explore conflict between members of Starfleet  
>>>> >>>>> in  
>>>> >>>>> more depth than ever before.  
>>>> >>>>> END QUOTE  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> So in addition to a lack of subtlety, we can expect a lack of  
>>>> >>>>> discipline  
>>>> >>>>> and an overall attitude of "My opinion WILL be heard because my  
>>>> >>>>> self-esteem matters and I have a right to be heard. Even though I'm  
>>>> >>>>> just  
>>>> >>>>> an ensign."  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I also like the "especially in recent films" bit in that quote,  
>>>> >>>>> which  
>>>> >>>>> is  
>>>> >>>>> a kind way of pointing out one of the many ways that Team Abrams has  
>>>> >>>>> \*already\* damaged this franchise.

>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> racist  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>> damage  
>>>> >>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >>> J.J.  
>>>> >>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >>> worse  
>>>> >>> the show gets.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>>>>  
>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>  
>> They explained that.  
>  
> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>  
>> STD gets it wrong.  
>  
> Once you've opened up the world to 'make them look different whenever  
> you want', I'm not sure it matters. Whatever the case, though, the new  
> DISCOVERY show will look much better if they avoid going back to the  
> original dippy Klingon look.

Or if they ashcanned the series right now.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:23:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 4:07 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oirnfk\$b29\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> >>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>> >

>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How

>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?

>>>> >

>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so

>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

>>>>

>>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older

>>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).

>>>

>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older

>>> ship or the newer one.

>>

>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>  
> Not so much 'groovy' as 'ugly' and note that they're using the wrong era  
> phasers.

Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series) rather than the phaser from the scrapped pilot stuff in The Cage episode isn't likely to offend many people beyond the few here who are just going to insist on being offended by anything/everything with the new series. The new show may suck royally and it may be entirely irrelevant since few people will be watching anyway, but people need to find better things to gripe about.

The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's outfit not being flaggy enough.

Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the ships no longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting randomly out of the back like was coda?

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:26:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:22 PM:

> On 6/26/2017 12:10 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >> damage  
>>>> >> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >> J.J.  
>>>> >> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >> worse  
>>>> >> the show gets.

>>>> >  
>>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>>  
>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>  
>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>  
>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>  
>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>  
> DING DING DING DING DING. By George, I think he's finally got it!  
>  
> ;)

I've never been confused on this particular issue. If the people behind these "reimaginings" were truly gifted, then they would come up with something new and original instead of opting to bastardize someone else's previous work. But they don't want to admit to themselves, let alone anyone else, that they're incompetent, so they try to hide their lack of talent behind a lot of stupid changes that, at best, accomplish nothing and, at worst, make them look even more stupid than they already do. I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms. You can't make this stuff up.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:27:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:  
> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>>>> >> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down

>>>> >> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage

>>>> >> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.

>>>> >> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and

>>>> >> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new

>>>> >> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse

>>>> >> the show gets.

>>>> >

>>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>>

>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>

>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How

>>> badly does \*that\* bode?

>>>

>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so

>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

>>

>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to

>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better

>> because we're making it all different!"

>

> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.

They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic and creative.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre

"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:28:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:31 PM:

> In article <oirivu\$6m5\$1@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> >> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> >> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> >> the show gets.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> > 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>>  
>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>  
>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>  
>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>  
>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>> because we're making it all different!"  
>  
> Racist

I'm trying to "reimagine" the concept of racism. How am I doing so far?

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love  
you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:29:03 GMT



Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>

>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>

>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >

>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>>

>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How

>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?

>>>>

>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so

>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

>>>

>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older

>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).

>>

>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older

>> ship or the newer one.

>

> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)

Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't be present on Discovery.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre

"This is where you end up when your parents don't tell you they love you." – Clive Babineaux, iZOMBIE

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics



Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 20:57:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 12:40 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>

>

> On 6/26/2017 3:13 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>

>> You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and  
>> the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of  
>> command. TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the  
>> military was really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes,  
>> they bend things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a  
>> TV show, but their starting point was a working military. Characters  
>> stay at their posts.

>

> This is simply not true. The show illogically (for any real military)  
> had the leader, Kirk, always beaming down into unknown conditions. Many  
> of the rest of the bridge crew illogically beamed down frequently as  
> well. Outside of Spock and Uhura, none of those people should/would  
> have ever had a reason to have been bopping down to new planets on a  
> whim in any realistic 'military' show.

>

Senior officers did exactly that during the Age of Exploration. I did  
also say they bend things for production purposes.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 21:03:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Another Reboot. That much is certain.

Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
set in the classic "Prime" timeline. That's why doing what they're  
doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with  
Enterprise. It's just dumb to depict things 10 or 100 years prior to  
Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our

tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a reboot.

Either that or, like I'm sure I've said before, someone needs to sit down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\** production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 21:28:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <oirnfk\$b29\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to *\*any\** complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does *\*that\** bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we *\*know\** what stuff should look like.  
>>>

>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>>  
>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older  
>> ship or the newer one.  
>  
> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

I note that the headline here is "Star Trek: Discovery first look at a groovy new transporter room."

"Groovy"? How old are these people?

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 21:36:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirqim\$2j\$3@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:31 PM:  
>> In article <oirlvu\$6m5\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>>> In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>> damage  
>>>> >>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >>> J.J.  
>>>> >>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >>> worse  
>>>> >>> the show gets.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>  
>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>  
>> Racist  
>  
> I'm trying to "reimagine" the concept of racism. How am I doing so far?

You're winning the race!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 21:36:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:  
>  
>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>  
> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
> set in the classic "Prime" timeline. That's why doing what they're  
> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with  
> Enterprise. It's just dumb to depict things 10 or 100 years prior to  
> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our  
> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have been a  
> reboot.  
>  
> Either that or, like I'm sure I've said before, someone needs to sit  
> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully

> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*  
> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

>

The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 21:39:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 2:36 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oirqim\$N2j\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:31 PM:

>>> In article <oirivu\$6m5\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

>>>> > In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down

>>>> >>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its

>>>> >>>> damage

>>>> >>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if

>>>> >>>> J.J.

>>>> >>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and

>>>> >>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new

>>>> >>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the

>>>> >>>> worse

>>>> >>>> the show gets.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> >>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>>  
>>> Racist  
>>  
>> I'm trying to "reimagine" the concept of racism. How am I doing so far?  
>  
> You're winning the race!  
>  
So he's the lead racist?

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 22:04:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>  
>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
>> set in the classic "Prime" timeline. That's why doing what they're  
>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with  
>> Enterprise. It's just dumb to depict things 10 or 100 years prior to

>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our  
>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a  
>> reboot.  
>>  
>> Either that or, like I'm sure I've said before, someone needs to sit  
>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**  
>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>  
> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their  
> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what  
> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the  
> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
> "creatives" want it to be their vision that controls.

That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't  
(some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
Cochrane as a black woman.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 22:29:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 16:23:18 -0400, Obveeus wrote:

> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)  
> rather than the phaser from the scrapped pilot stuff in The Cage episode  
> isn't likely to offend many people beyond the few here who are just  
> going to insist on being offended by anything/everything with the new  
> series. The new show may suck royally and it may be entirely irrelevant  
> since few people will be watching anyway, but people need to find better  
> things to gripe about.

Personally, I couldn't care less that the visual effects are  
different. I am perfectly fine with that. It doesn't bother me at  
all if the bridge looks more advanced or the Klingons look a little  
different. Don't care.

My complaint (probably too strong a word, it's just a show) is that



the people making the show have made a concerted effort to make big social justice BS a huge issue for it, to the point of re-writing canonical history of the Trek universe to do it, and to make this totally unrealistic view of no straight white males in sight 10 years before Kirk. That's a nonstarter for good fiction especially in an established universe. They have an agenda to push. There were some horrible agenda EPISODES of other Trek, like The Outcast, where they basically tell us that Riker was attracted to someone with an underdeveloped penis and you should be happy about that, but that was one (awful) episode. These guys are going all in on in-your-face snowflake-revolution-in-space, and screw your Trek timeline, we are going to shove all of our SJW wet dreams into this show because it's better than what was already there.

--

Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 22:33:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

--

Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 22:38:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>



>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.

>>>

>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

theyâ€™re

>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other

>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>> Enterprise. Itâ€™s just dumb to depict things 10 or 100 years prior to

>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our

>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have been a

>>> reboot.

>>>

>>> Either that or, like Iâ€™m sure Iâ€™ve said before, someone needs to sit

>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully

>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*

>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a

>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

>>>

>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their

>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what

>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the

>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other

>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the

>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.

>

> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't

> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch

> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never

> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram

> Cochrane as a black woman.

>

I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their egotistic

"I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"

problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.

Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch something  
of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:01:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>>  
>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

>>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our  
>>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a  
>>>> reboot.  
>>>>

>>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**  
>>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>>

>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their  
>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what  
>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the  
>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>> "creatives" want it to be their vision that controls.  
>>>

>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't  
>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>

> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their egotistic  
> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>  
> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch something  
> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was

> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.

Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making eps of Trek ...

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:25:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can

>>>> >>> cry

>>>> >>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to

>>>> >> pull off

>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>> >

>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at

>>>> > it. How

>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?

>>>> >

>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so

>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.

>>>>

>>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older

>>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).

>>>

>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older

>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>  
>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>  
> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship  
> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't  
> be present on Discovery.

As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:26:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 5:28 PM, A Friend wrote:  
> In article <oirnfk\$b29\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 01:16 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 1:22 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > In article <oiregd\$9tl\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >>> In article <oimjvf\$o5k\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>>> The transporter preview image that has been shown is from the older  
>>>> ship, not the more current ship (Discovery).  
>>>

>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older  
>>> ship or the newer one.

>>

>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>

>

> I note that the headline here is "Star Trek: Discovery first look at a  
> groovy new transporter room."

>

> "Groovy"? How old are these people?

Approximately the same age as other STAR TREK viewers. ;-P

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:29:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,

> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>>>> > For your reference, records indicate that

>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Another Reboot. That much is certain.

>>>> >

>>>> > Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

doing what

>>>> > doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other

>>>> > intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> > Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our

>>>> > tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a

>>>> > reboot.

>>>> >

sit

>>>> > down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully

>>>> > coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**

>>>> > production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> > real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>> >  
>>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their  
>>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what  
>>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the  
>>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
>>>>  
>>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't  
>>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>>>  
>> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their egotistic  
>> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>>>>  
>> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch something  
>> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>>>  
> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making eps of Trek ...

Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:46:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 4:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> > For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>> >

>>>> > Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be doing what

>>>> > doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>> > intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> > Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because our  
>>>> > tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a  
>>>> > reboot.  
>>>> >

sit

>>>> > down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> > coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**  
>>>> > production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> > real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>> >

>>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put their  
>>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what  
>>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing to the  
>>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> "creatives" want it to be their vision that controls.

>>>

>>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't  
>>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>> Cochrane as a black woman.

>>>

>> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their egotistic  
>> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.

>>

>> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch something  
>> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.

>

> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making eps of Trek ...

>

"But then it won't be MY Star Trek!!!"

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---



Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:47:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>  
>

> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>>>> >> For your reference, records indicate that

>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

why

>>>> >> doing what

>>>> >> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other

>>>> >> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> >> prior to

>>>> >> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just because

>>>> >> our

>>>> >> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have been a

>>>> >> reboot.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> needs to sit

>>>> >> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully

>>>> >> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**

>>>> >> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a

>>>> >> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

>>>> >>

>>>> > The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put

>>>> > their

>>>> > own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with what

>>>> > others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing

>>>> > to the

>>>> > ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other

>>>> > Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the



>>>> > "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
>>>>  
>>>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives" won't  
>>>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>>>  
>>> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their egotistic  
>>> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>>> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>>>  
>>> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch something  
>>> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>  
>> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making eps  
>> of Trek ...  
>  
> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of  
> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.

He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2017 23:57:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>

>>

>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>>>> >>> For your reference, records indicate that

>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
 why  
 >>>> >>> doing what  
  
 >>>> >>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
 >>>> >>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with  
  
 >>>> >>> prior to  
 >>>> >>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just  
 >>>> >>> because our  
 >>>> >>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have  
 >>>> >>> been a  
 >>>> >>> reboot.  
 >>>> >>>

>>>> >>> needs to sit  
 >>>> >>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
 >>>> >>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*  
 >>>> >>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
 >>>> >>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
 >>>> >>>

>>>> >> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put  
 >>>> >> their  
 >>>> >> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with  
 >>>> >> what  
 >>>> >> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing  
 >>>> >> to the  
 >>>> >> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
 >>>> >> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
 >>>> >> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
 >>>> >

>>>> > That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"  
 >>>> > won't  
 >>>> > (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
 >>>> > source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
 >>>> > seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
 >>>> > Cochrane as a black woman.  
 >>>> >

>>>> > I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their  
 >>>> > egotistic  
 >>>> > "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
 >>>> > problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
 >>>> >

>>>> > Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch

>>>> something  
>>>> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>>> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>>  
>>> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making  
>>> eps of Trek ...  
>>  
>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of  
>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.  
>  
> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....

The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 00:24:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <ois6q5\$ttv\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> >>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> >>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
  
>>>> >>>>> doing what

>>>> >>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>> >>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> >>>> prior to  
>>>> >>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just  
>>>> >>>> because our  
>>>> >>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly *\*should\** have  
>>>> >>>> been a  
>>>> >>>> reboot.  
>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> needs to sit  
>>>> >>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> >>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all *\*future\**  
>>>> >>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> >>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put  
>>>> >>> their  
>>>> >>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with  
>>>> >>> what  
>>>> >>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing  
>>>> >>> to the  
>>>> >>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> >>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> >>> "creatives" want it to be their vision that controls.

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"  
>>>> >> won't  
>>>> >> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>>> >> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>>> >> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>>> >> Cochrane as a black woman.

>>>> >>  
>>>> > I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their  
>>>> > egotistic  
>>>> > "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>>>> > problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.

>>>> >  
>>>> > Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch  
>>>> > something  
>>>> > of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>>> > unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.

>>>>  
>>>> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making  
>>>> eps of Trek ...

>>>

>>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of

>>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.  
>>  
>> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....  
>  
> The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only  
> real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm  
> dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to  
> Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.

You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
'worst of series, crime against humanity'

Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 01:17:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oirqh1\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:  
>> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>> damage  
>>>> >>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >>> J.J.  
>>>> >>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >>> worse  
>>>> >>> the show gets.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>>  
>> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.  
>  
> They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their  
> method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic  
> and creative.

Plus socially-relevant and diverse.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 01:27:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-5A9A20.18171326062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

> In article <oirqh1\$2j\$2@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:  
>>> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>>> damage  
>>>> >>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >>>> J.J.  
>>>> >>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the

>>>> >>>> worse  
>>>> >>>> the show gets.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>>  
>>> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.  
>>  
>> They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their  
>> method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic  
>> and creative.  
>  
> Plus socially-relevant and diverse.

Meaning "no whites allowed"

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 01:29:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 5:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <ois6q5\$ttv\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> >>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
>>>> >>>>>>> set in the classic

>>>> >>>>> doing what

>>>> >>>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>> >>>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> >>>>> prior to  
>>>> >>>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just  
>>>> >>>>> because our  
>>>> >>>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have  
>>>> >>>>> been a  
>>>> >>>>> reboot.  
>>>> >>>>>>

before, someone

>>>> >>>>> needs to sit  
>>>> >>>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> >>>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*  
>>>> >>>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> >>>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put  
>>>> >>>> their  
>>>> >>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with  
>>>> >>>> what  
>>>> >>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing  
>>>> >>>> to the  
>>>> >>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> >>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> >>>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
>>>> >>>>>



>>>> >>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>>> >>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>>> >>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>>> >>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their  
>>>> >> egotistic  
>>>> >> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>>>> >> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch  
>>>> >> something  
>>>> >> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>>> >> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making  
>>>> > eps of Trek ...  
>>>>  
>>>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of  
>>>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.  
>>>  
>>> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....  
>>  
>> The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only  
>> real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm  
>> dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to  
>> Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.  
>  
> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>  
> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>  
I am proud to say that I have successfully avoided seeing any of #3  
beyond the few frames of TV ads before I could skip ahead on the DVR. I  
think I got away with only minor mental damage.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 01:31:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 6:27 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <atropos-5A9A20.18171326062017@news.giganews.com>,  
> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <oirqh1\$n2j\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:  
>>>> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>>>> damage  
>>>> >>>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if  
>>>> >>>>> J.J.  
>>>> >>>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the  
>>>> >>>>> worse  
>>>> >>>>> the show gets.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >>>>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off  
>>>> >>>>> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> >>>>> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> >>>>> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> >>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> >>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>>> >>>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>>> >>>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>>>  
>>>>> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.  
>>>>  
>>>>> They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their  
>>>> method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic  
>>>> and creative.

>>  
>> Plus socially-relevant and diverse.  
>  
> Meaning "no whites allowed"  
>  
Say all the white men financing all this.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:07:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

BTR1701 sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 08:17 PM:

> In article <oirqh1\$2j\$2@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>

>> Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:

>>> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down

>>>> >>>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its

>>>> >>>> damage

>>>> >>>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if

>>>> >>>> J.J.

>>>> >>>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and

>>>> >>>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new

>>>> >>>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the

>>>> >>>> worse

>>>> >>>> the show gets.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> >>> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> >> something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> >> enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> >> transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>> >

>>>> > I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How

>>>> > badly does \*that\* bode?

>>>> >  
>>>> > Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> > we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>>>  
>>> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.  
>>  
>> They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their  
>> method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic  
>> and creative.  
>  
> Plus socially-relevant and diverse.

And these days, the "socially relevant" bit seems to translate to "as dysfunctional as you can make it so that the characters are as unlikable as possible."

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:08:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the older  
>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>>  
>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>  
>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship  
>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't  
>> be present on Discovery.  
>>  
>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or the TMP one way back when?

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:23:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <ois6q5\$ttv\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>>>> >>>>> For your reference, records indicate that

>>>> >>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

>>>> >>>>>> set in the classic

>>>> >>>>>> doing what

>>>> >>>>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other

>>>> >>>>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> >>>>>> prior to

>>>> >>>>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just

>>>> >>>>>> because our

>>>> >>>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have  
>>>> >>>>> been a  
>>>> >>>>> reboot.  
>>>> >>>>>

before, someone

>>>> >>>>> needs to sit  
>>>> >>>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> >>>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*  
>>>> >>>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a  
>>>> >>>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put  
>>>> >>>> their  
>>>> >>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with  
>>>> >>>> what  
>>>> >>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing  
>>>> >>>> to the  
>>>> >>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> >>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> >>>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>>> >>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>>> >>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram  
>>>> >>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their  
>>>> >> egotistic  
>>>> >> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>>>> >> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch  
>>>> >> something  
>>>> >> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>>> >> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making  
>>>> > eps of Trek ...  
>>>>  
>>>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of  
>>>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.  
>>>  
>>> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....  
>>  
>> The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only

>> real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm  
>> dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to  
>> Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.  
>  
> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>  
> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.

Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:25:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>>> >  
>>>>> > Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>>> > came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>>> > older  
>>>>> > ship or the newer one.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>>  
>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship  
>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't  
>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>  
>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>  
> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
> the TMP one way back when?

STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those dangerous contraptions.

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:35:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <ois6k\$asq\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 5:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <ois6q5\$ttv\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>>>> In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>>>>>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>>>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>>>>>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be  
>>>>>>>>>>> set in the classic

>>>>>>>>> doing what

>>>>>>>>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>>>>>>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

100

>>>>>>>>> years  
>>>>>>>>>> prior to  
>>>>>>>>>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just  
>>>>>>>>>>> because our  
>>>>>>>>>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have  
>>>>>>>>>>> been a  
>>>>>>>>>>> reboot.  
>>>>>>>>>>>



>>>> >>>>>> someone  
>>>> >>>>>> needs to sit  
>>>> >>>>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully  
>>>> >>>>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*  
>>>> >>>>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become  
>>>> >>>>>> a  
>>>> >>>>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put  
>>>> >>>>>> their  
>>>> >>>>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with  
>>>> >>>>>> what  
>>>> >>>>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing  
>>>> >>>>>> to the  
>>>> >>>>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other  
>>>> >>>>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the  
>>>> >>>>>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"  
>>>> >>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch  
>>>> >>>>>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never  
>>>> >>>>>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing  
>>>> >>>>>> Zephram  
>>>> >>>>>> Cochrane as a black woman.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their  
>>>> >>>>>> egotistic  
>>>> >>>>>> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"  
>>>> >>>>>> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch  
>>>> >>>>>> something  
>>>> >>>>>> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was  
>>>> >>>>>> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making  
>>>> >>>>>> eps of Trek ...  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of  
>>>> >>>>>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only  
>>>> >>>>>> real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm  
>>>> >>>>>> dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to  
>>>> >>>>>> Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.

>>  
>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
>> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>  
>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>  
> I am proud to say that I have successfully avoided seeing any of #3  
> beyond the few frames of TV ads before I could skip ahead on the DVR. I  
> think I got away with only minor mental damage.

+1

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:43:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >> older  
>>>> >> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship  
>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't  
>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>  
>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>  
>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>> the TMP one way back when?  
>  
> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

> dangerous contraptions.

I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:52:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>>> >>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>> older

>>>> >>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)

>>>> >

>>>> > Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> > ship

>>>> > we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design

>>>> > won't

>>>> > be present on Discovery.

>>>>

>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.

>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

>>>

>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is

>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or

>>> the TMP one way back when?

>>

>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

>> dangerous contraptions.

>

> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
in the adjacent transporter spot.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:53:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <anim8rfsk-858DD3.17244026062017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk@cox.net says...

>  
> In article <ois6q5\$ttv\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 7:47 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 7:01 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > In article <ois270\$hrv\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:04 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> In article <oiruio\$53s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 2:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> >>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Another Reboot. That much is certain.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Just the opposite. They announced that Discovery is supposed to be

>>>> >>>>> doing what

>>>> >>>>> doing is problematic well beyond any cries of racism or other  
>>>> >>>>> intolerance. It was problematic when they did the same thing with

>>>> >>>>> prior to  
>>>> >>>>> Kirk as being more advanced than what even Picard had just  
>>>> >>>>> because our  
>>>> >>>>> tech has taken off in the present. It certainly \*should\* have  
>>>> >>>>> been a

>>>> >>>>> reboot.

>>>> >>>>>

someone

>>>> >>>>> needs to sit

>>>> >>>>> down with all the property in the franchise and work out a fully

>>>> >>>>> coherent continuity. One that they can stick to for all \*future\*

>>>> >>>>> production as well, of course. All this piecemeal shit has become a

>>>> >>>>> real anchor around the neck of the Trek universe.

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>> The "creative" types would hate that. They want to be able to put

>>>> >>>> their

>>>> >>>> own stamp on it without being "hampered" by being consistent with

>>>> >>>> what

>>>> >>>> others have done. Why do you think Abrams burned the whole thing

>>>> >>>> to the

>>>> >>>> ground and started over from scratch? Why do you think every other

>>>> >>>> Superman or Spiderman movie is a reboot, origin story? Because the

>>>> >>>> "creatives" want it to be \_their\_ vision that controls.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> That's partly it. You've also got the part where the "creatives"

>>>> >>> won't

>>>> >>> (some say can't) read the source material, and nowadays won't watch

>>>> >>> source material. Brannon Braga was apparently proud of having never

>>>> >>> seen an episode of real Trek, which is how he ended up writing Zephram

>>>> >>> Cochrane as a black woman.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >> I think the "won't read/view source material" is part of their

>>>> >> egotistic

>>>> >> "I can do it better! if you just don't bother me with the truth"

>>>> >> problem. So the two are sides of the same metaphorical coin.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Plus there's the whole "I'll sue you if you ever read or watch

>>>> >> something

>>>> >> of mine and then ever in your life make something I can claim was

>>>> >> unconsciously influenced by my work!" thing.

>>>> >

>>>> > Well, yeah, but refusing to watch an ep of Trek when you're making

>>>> > eps of Trek ...

>>>>

>>>> Alternatively, Simon Pegg is a huge TREK fan and he put all kinds of

>>>> stuff into the film to make TREK fans happy and they still complained.

>>>

>>> He didn't get rid of the Abrams stink....

>>

>> The third entry in the series was much better than the second. The only

>> real stink in it was a bunch of stupid motorcycle stuff. Of course, I'm

>> dreading the fourth film somewhat because I'm not looking forward to

>> Chekov getting run over by the ship and written off.  
>  
> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>  
> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.

I gave up on it after they destroyed yet another Enterprise. You'd think that having lost so many ships with that name, the Federation would take the hint.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:55:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>> older  
>>>> >>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship  
>>>> > we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't  
>>>> > be present on Discovery.  
>>>>  
>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>>  
>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>  
>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>  
>

> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

[https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the Director's Edition.

The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 02:57:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <1gvjcetu3aq2w\$.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, starfist@gmail.invalid says...

>

> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 16:23:18 -0400, Obveeus wrote:

>

>> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)  
>> rather than the phaser from the scrapped pilot stuff in The Cage episode  
>> isn't likely to offend many people beyond the few here who are just  
>> going to insist on being offended by anything/everything with the new  
>> series. The new show may suck royally and it may be entirely irrelevant  
>> since few people will be watching anyway, but people need to find better  
>> things to gripe about.

>

> Personally, I couldn't care less that the visual effects are  
> different. I am perfectly fine with that. It doesn't bother me at  
> all if the bridge looks more advanced or the Klingons look a little  
> different. Don't care.

>

> My complaint (probably too strong a word, it's just a show) is that  
> the people making the show have made a concerted effort to make big  
> social justice BS a huge issue for it, to the point of re-writing  
> canonical history of the Trek universe to do it, and to make this  
> totally unrealistic view of no straight white males in sight 10 years  
> before Kirk. That's a nonstarter for good fiction especially in an  
> established universe. They have an agenda to push. There were some



- > horrible agenda EPISODES of other Trek, like The Outcast, where they
- > basically tell us that Riker was attracted to someone with an
- > underdeveloped penis and you should be happy about that, but that was
- > one (awful) episode. These guys are going all in on in-your-face
- > snowflake-revolution-in-space, and screw your Trek timeline, we are
- > going to shove all of our SJW wet dreams into this show because it's
- > better than what was already there.

I don't know if you've noticed but Abrams et al are \_mocking\_ Trek. And apparently one of the things they're mocking is the social justice aspects.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:05:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <oirnp9\$dbh\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus@aol.com says...

- >
- > On 6/26/2017 3:13 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:
- >
- >> You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and
- >> the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of command.
- >> TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the military was
- >> really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes, they bend
- >> things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a TV show, but
- >> their starting point was a working military. Characters stay at their
- >> posts.
- >
- > This is simply not true. The show illogically (for any real military)
- > had the leader, Kirk, always beaming down into unknown conditions. Many
- > of the rest of the bridge crew illogically beamed down frequently as
- > well. Outside of Spock and Uhura, none of those people should/would
- > have ever had a reason to have been bopping down to new planets on a
- > whim in any realistic 'military' show.

He's the Captain. He gets to do stupid things if he wants to--nobody on the ship has the authority to stop him unless they want to go \_way\_ out on a limb and claim that he's disabled in some way.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:23:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <MPG.33bb92b98924412d98adc4@news.eternal-september.org>,



"J. Clarke" <j.clarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> I gave up on it after they destroyed yet another Enterprise. You'd think  
> that having lost so many ships with that name, the Federation would take  
> the hint.

I've always thought that by the TNG era, naming a Starfleet ship  
Enterprise would be like naming a cruise ship Titanic.

It's just not done.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:25:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oish21\$Ifc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>> older  
>>>> >>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >> ship  
>>>> >> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >> won't  
>>>> >> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> > The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>>  
>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>  
>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>  
>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>  
> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
> in the adjacent transporter spot.

I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:26:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>> older  
>>>> >>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >> ship  
>>>> >> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >> won't  
>>>> >> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> > The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>>  
>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>  
>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>>> dangerous contraptions.

>>  
>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>  
> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
> in the adjacent transporter spot.

I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the case? All this time I've just assumed that it was some generic person who was also destined to never serve on the Enterprise...

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:26:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oisfbl\$3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
>> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>  
>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>  
> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.

She might be too wrapped up to do it...

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:26:16 GMT

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>>> >>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>>> older

>>>> >>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which ship

>>>> >> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design won't

>>>> >> be present on Discovery.

>>>> >

>>>> > As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.

>>>> > The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

>>>>

>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is

>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or

>>>> the TMP one way back when?

>>>>

>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

>>> dangerous contraptions.

>>>

>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>

> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>

> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

> Director's Edition.

>

> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with my head.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:50:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oish21\$Ifc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>> older  
>>>> >>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >> ship  
>>>> >> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >> won't  
>>>> >> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> > The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>>  
>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>  
>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>  
>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>

- > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.
- > In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person
- > in the adjacent transporter spot.

ICE CREEEEEEAAAAMMMMMMMMM!!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:51:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-842319.20235626062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

- > In article <MPG.33bb92b98924412d98adc4@news.eternal-september.org>,  
> "J. Clarke" <j.clarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>> I gave up on it after they destroyed yet another Enterprise. You'd think  
>> that having lost so many ships with that name, the Federation would take  
>> the hint.  
>  
> I've always thought that by the TNG era, naming a Starfleet ship  
> Enterprise would be like naming a cruise ship Titanic.  
>  
> It's just not done.

Yeah, the B and C are sorta problematic, aren't they?

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:51:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

- > In article <oish21\$Ifc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>

>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>> ship  
>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>>> > the TMP one way back when?  
>>>>  
>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>>  
>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>  
>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>  
> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.

Retcon

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 03:52:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oisj1b\$q0a\$1@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>> ship  
>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
>>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
>>>> > the TMP one way back when?  
>>>>  
>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>  
>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>  
>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>  
> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

It ain't in the movie (they built the sets but never shot her scenes,  
although the actress is credited) but it made it to the novelization.  
>



>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>  
> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
> case? All this time I've just assumed that it was some generic person  
> who was also destined to never serve on the Enterprise...

See above

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 04:29:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this  
>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>> ship  
>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>

>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.  
 >>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
 >>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or  
 >>>> > the TMP one way back when?  
 >>>>  
 >>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
 >>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those  
 >>>> dangerous contraptions.  
 >>>>  
 >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
 >>  
 >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
 >>  
 >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
 >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
 >> Director's Edition.  
 >>  
 >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
 >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
 >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
 >  
 > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
 > my head.

LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the night before). Basically it goes like this:

Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting with Nogura

Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)

Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons unknown.

\*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>

(No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd

have been excellent)

Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The Cathy Mahone Story (1993).

I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her that's absolutely certainly her.

Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen grab.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 04:48:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 8:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <atropos-842319.20235626062017@news.giganews.com>,  
> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <MPG.33bb92b98924412d98adc4@news.eternal-september.org>,  
>> "J. Clarke" <j.clarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> I gave up on it after they destroyed yet another Enterprise. You'd think  
>>> that having lost so many ships with that name, the Federation would take  
>>> the hint.  
>>  
>> I've always thought that by the TNG era, naming a Starfleet ship  
>> Enterprise would be like naming a cruise ship Titanic.  
>>  
>> It's just not done.  
>  
> Yeah, the B and C are sorta problematic, aren't they?  
>  
Have you looked up the real world history of ships named 'Enterprise'?

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

---

On 6/26/2017 9:29 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>>> >>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>>>>> older

>>>> >>>>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> >>>>>> ship

>>>> >>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design

>>>> >>>>>> won't

>>>> >>>>>> be present on Discovery.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.

>>>> >>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is

>>>> >> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or

>>>> >> the TMP one way back when?

>>>> >

>>>> > STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>>>> > when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

>>>> > dangerous contraptions.

>>>>

>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>>

>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>

>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>> Director's Edition.

>>>  
>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>  
>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>> my head.  
>  
> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>  
> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
> with Nogura  
>  
> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>  
> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>  
Well that hardly sounds like someone talking to the "love of their life".

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 05:24:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oisor7\$7qu\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 9:29 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> In article <oisgh3\$9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>> well.  
>>>> >>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie  
>>>> >>> or  
>>>> >>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> >> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >> those  
>>>> >> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>>  
>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>>  
>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>>  
>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>> my head.  
>>>  
>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes

>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>  
>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>> with Nogura  
>>  
>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>  
>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>  
> Well that hardly sounds like someone talking to the "love of their life".

Did somebody refer to her that way?

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 10:37:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:

> Ubiquitous sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:28 PM:

>> jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:

>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its damage  
>>>> >>> in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I wonder if J.J.  
>>>> >>> is paying these idiots to provide a new target for the anger and  
>>>> >>> hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each time someone new  
>>>> >>> comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive" audience, the worse  
>>>> >>> the show gets.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry

>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?

>>>> >

>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off

>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever

>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a

>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)

>>>>

>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>  
>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>  
>> I thought it was merely their attempt to mark their own territory.  
>  
> They will accept that analogy as long as you acknowledge that their  
> method of urinating is both different and extremely clever and artistic  
> and creative.

Bwah!

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 10:40:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:31 PM:  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 12:22 PM:  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/24/2017 at 04:44 PM:  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
  
>>>> >>> Heh. No, Abrams did his damage in the discipline and dumbing-down  
>>>> >>> departments. This latest fustercluck seems committed to doing its  
>>>> >>> damage in the "diversity" and "passion" departments. Honestly, I  
>>>> >>> wonder if J.J. is paying these idiots to provide a new target for  
>>>> >>> the anger and hostility of Trek purists. All I know is that each  
>>>> >>> time someone new comes along to "improve" Trek for a more "inclusive"  
>>>> >>> audience, the worse the show gets.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> But don't you think this whole thing is staging, so that they can cry  
>>>> >> 'racist' to \*any\* complaint about Star Trek STD?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are the people behind this thing competent or clever enough to pull off



>>>> > something like that? Because they're clearly not competent or clever  
>>>> > enough to pull off a good Trek prequel. (I just saw a photo of a  
>>>> > transporter room, and these people are consistent, if nothing else.)  
>>>>  
>>>> I saw that that was out there and didn't even bother to look at it. How  
>>>> badly does \*that\* bode?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bear in mind that this is set in exactly the same year as THE CAGE, so  
>>>> we \*know\* what stuff should look like.  
>>>>  
>>> The entire mindset of people who do this sort of "reimagining" seems to  
>>> be something along the lines of: "We know that ours will be better  
>>> because we're making it all different!"  
>>  
>> Racist  
>  
> I'm trying to "reimagine" the concept of racism. How am I doing so far?

Other than "blame whitey"?

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 11:58:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> >>> ship  
>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>> won't  
>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >> well.  
>>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> > movie or  
>>>> > the TMP one way back when?  
>>>>  
>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> those  
>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>  
>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>  
>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>  
> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>  
> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
> case?

The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

> All this time I've just assumed that it was some generic person  
> who was also destined to never serve on the Enterprise...

The final cut of the film dropped the ball in that regard.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 12:03:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 11:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,

> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

>

>> In article <oish21\$Ifc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>>> >>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>>>>> older

>>>> >>>>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> >>>>>> ship

>>>> >>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design

>>>> >>>>>> won't

>>>> >>>>>> be present on Discovery.

>>>> >>>>>>

>>>> >>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.

>>>> >>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is

>>>> >> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or

>>>> >> the TMP one way back when?

>>>> >

>>>> > STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>>>> > when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

>>>> > dangerous contraptions.

>>>>

>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>  
>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>  
>> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
>  
> Retcon

She wasn't the love of his life, though. She was just a baby momma from a long time prior...a woman who with whom the relationship was willingly given up (mutual decision).

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 13:15:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
  
>>>> > I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> > Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> > this series.  
>>>>  
>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>  
>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>  
>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>  
> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of them not allowing female captains.

--  
Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 13:45:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: The Last Doctor

Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> > starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>

>>>> >> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>>>> >> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>>>> >> this series.

>>>> >

>>>> > Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>>

>>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part

>>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>

>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>

>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that

>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover

>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>

> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally

> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of

> them not allowing female captains.

>

They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to command the Defiant...

....and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains, surely the touchy-feely Federation that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch and Kirk was just humouring her.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 14:21:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <anim8rfsk-BA53EA.21290826062017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
> with Nogura  
>  
> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>  
> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)

Which is ridiculous on its face if she's a vice admiral. A vice admiral  
would have a helluva lot more responsibility than being a scheduler for  
another admiral.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 15:19:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <erf5s9FssumU1@mid.individual.net>, The Last Doctor  
<mike@xenocyte.com> wrote:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> > Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>> this series.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> > of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>>  
>>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>>  
>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>  
>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point  
>> of  
>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>  
>  
> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
> command the Defiant...  
>  
> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female  
> captains, surely the touchy-feely Federation that followed it  
> wouldn't go backwards in this regard.

Why not? Archer's Enterprise (and Hernandez's Columbia) were Earth ships under Earth authority. Kirk's Enterprise was a Federation ship. Maybe the Federation had a bunch of dimwitted member planets that forbade females being captains, and more progressive worlds had to abide by that until the rules were finally changed by the time of Enterprise-C. There are ways to make this work besides pretending it never happened.

> We just didn't happen to see one onscreen in TOS,

Because there weren't any.

> Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch and Kirk was just humouring  
> her.

That's mere handwaving, an attempt to account for a stupid plot point in a script written and produced by men in the 1960s. Further, Kirk not only had no reason to humor her, he was rather condescending (and even a little bitter) in that exchange.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 15:36:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-B01635.07215527062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

> In article <anim8rfsk-BA53EA.21290826062017@news.easynews.com>,  
> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:  
>  
>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>> with Nogura  
>>  
>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>  
>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>  
> Which is ridiculous on its face if she's a vice admiral. A vice admiral  
> would have a helluva lot more responsibility than being a scheduler for  
> another admiral.

Well, 'staff whore' has it's own responsibilities.

--  
Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 15:37:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oithbv\$f9r\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 11:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,  
>> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> In article <oish21\$Ifc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:



>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >>>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie  
>>>> >>>>>>> or  
>>>> >>>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> >>>>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>>>>>> those  
>>>> >>>>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>> >>>>>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>>> >>>>>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Retcon  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> She wasn't the love of his life, though. She was just a baby momma from  
>>>> >>>>>>> a long time prior...a woman who with whom the relationship was willingly  
>>>> >>>>>>> given up (mutual decision).

It wasn't mutual, she was just a bitch.

--

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 15:38:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oith2v\$f9r\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

>  
>  
> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>> ship  
>>>> >>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>> won't  
>>>> >>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>> well.  
>>>> >>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> >> movie or  
>>>> >> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> > when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid

>>>> > those  
>>>> > dangerous contraptions.  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>  
>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>  
>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>  
> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>  
>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>  
>> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
>> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
>> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
>> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
>> case?  
>  
> The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
> transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
> loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
> dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
> crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
> (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
> crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
> and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

Yeah, the cut as it stands just makes it look like Kirk is confusified  
by the shiny new corridors.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 15:50:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/26/2017 10:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
> In article <oisor7\$7qu\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 9:29 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> > In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> or  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>> >>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> >>>> >>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>>> >>>> those  
>>>> >>>> >>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>> >

>>>> > > [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>> >

>>>> > > Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> > > \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> > > Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>> >

>>>> > The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> > Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> > contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> my head.  
>>>  
>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>  
>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>> with Nogura  
>>>  
>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>  
>>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>  
>> Well that hardly sounds like someone talking to the "love of their life".  
>  
> Did somebody refer to her that way?  
>  
Yes.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 16:00:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 6:45 AM, The Last Doctor wrote:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> > Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>> this series.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >  
>>>> > Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> > of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>>  
>>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>  
>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>  
>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of  
>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>  
>  
> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
> command the Defiant...  
>  
There is a significant difference between being the Captain (commanding  
officer) of a ship and having the conn (standing a watch as the senior  
on-duty bridge officer or temporarily filling in for said).

> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
> and Kirk was just humouring her.  
>  
To quote Anim, "'Enterprise' was a holo-novel!" :)

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 16:11:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <270620171119107365%nope@noway.com>,  
A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

> In article <erf5s9FssumU1@mid.individual.net>, The Last Doctor

> <mike@xenocyte.com> wrote:  
>  
>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> > liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> >> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>>  
>>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>>  
>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about  
>>> finally  
>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the  
>>> point  
>>> of  
>>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>>  
>>  
>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
>> command the Defiant...  
>>  
>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female  
>> captains, surely the touchy-feely Federation that followed it  
>> wouldn't go backwards in this regard.  
>  
>  
> Why not? Archer's Enterprise (and Hernandez's Columbia) were  
constructs in a badly plotted and researched holonovel.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 16:16:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oitv84\$gq\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 6:45 AM, The Last Doctor wrote:  
>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> > liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> >> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>>  
>>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>>  
>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point  
>>> of  
>>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>>  
>>  
>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
>> command the Defiant...



>>  
> There is a significant difference between being the Captain (commanding  
> officer) of a ship and having the conn (standing a watch as the senior  
> on-duty bridge officer or temporarily filling in for said).  
>  
>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
>> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
>> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
>> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
>> and Kirk was just humouring her.  
>>  
> To quote Anim, "'Enterprise' was a holo-novel!" :)

a badly plotted and researched holonovel.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 17:39:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:  
> In article <oisfbl\$3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>  
>>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
>>> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>>  
>>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>  
>> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.  
>  
> She might be too wrapped up to do it...  
>

Would all that binding really stop her?

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 17:45:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 05:25 schreef BTR1701:

> In article <oish21\$lfcs\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when this

>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>>>> older

>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> >>> ship

>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design

>>>> >>> won't

>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as well.

>>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.

>>>> >

>>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is

>>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie or

>>>> > the TMP one way back when?

>>>>

>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film

>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid those

>>>> dangerous contraptions.

>>>

>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>  
>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>> in the adjacent transporter spot.

Only in the novel we really got to know who they were.

>  
> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
>

Never got that impression. Maybe /one/ of those. The greatest love of his life was his ship. The original.

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 17:48:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying  
>>>> >>> which ship  
>>>> >>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy  
>>>> >>> design won't  
>>>> >>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >> well.  
>>>> >> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> > that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> > movie or  
>>>> > the TMP one way back when?  
>>>>  
>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> those  
>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>  
>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>  
>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>  
>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>> Director's Edition.  
>>  
>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>  
> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
> my head.  
>

Nope. It's really like that.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 17:55:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 00:33 schreef Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz:

> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>

>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>

> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that

> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover

> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>

They did already had a female captain in Star Trek IV.

And Rachel Garrett in 'Yesterday's Enterprise'.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 17:58:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 10:39 AM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:

>> In article <oisfbl\$3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>

>>>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than

>>>> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'

>>>>

>>>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.

>>>

>>> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.

>>  
>> She might be too wrapped up to do it...

>>  
>  
> Would all that binding really stop her?

>  
I didn't watch the latest Mission Impossible movie, "MI: Mummy", but  
from the TV ads I got the impression she didn't spend much time bound up.

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 18:06:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 15:45 schreef The Last Doctor:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> > Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>>  
>>>> >>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>> this series.

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >  
>>>> > Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> > of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>>  
>>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>>  
>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>>  
>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of

>> them not allowing female captains.

>>

>

> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
> command the Defiant...

>

> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
> and Kirk was just humouring her.

>

Totally outside of official canon the web series Star Trek Continues had  
an episode about this, guest starring Clare Kramer. The reason,  
according to that story, was that the Tellarites were the problem within  
the UFP. Being male chauvinist pigs. ;-)

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 18:09:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 05:05 schreef J. Clarke:

> In article <oirnp9\$dbh\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus@aol.com says...

>>

>> On 6/26/2017 3:13 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>

>>> You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and  
>>> the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of command.  
>>> TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the military was  
>>> really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes, they bend  
>>> things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a TV show, but  
>>> their starting point was a working military. Characters stay at their  
>>> posts.

>>  
>> This is simply not true. The show illogically (for any real military)  
>> had the leader, Kirk, always beaming down into unknown conditions. Many  
>> of the rest of the bridge crew illogically beamed down frequently as  
>> well. Outside of Spock and Uhura, none of those people should/would  
>> have ever had a reason to have been bopping down to new planets on a  
>> whim in any realistic 'military' show.

>  
> He's the Captain. He gets to do stupid things if he wants to--nobody on the  
> ship has the authority to stop him unless they want to go \_way\_ out on a  
> limb and claim that he's disabled in some way.  
>

How would Kirk have handled the TNG mindset of captains not being on an  
away team aka landing party? He would not have been okay with it I think.

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 18:30:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <59529e91\$0\$783\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <[liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu)> wrote:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 15:45 schreef The Last Doctor:  
>> Ubiquitous <[weberm@polaris.net](mailto:weberm@polaris.net)> wrote:  
>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> > [liam@valentijn.nu](mailto:liam@valentijn.nu) wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part



>>>> >> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>>  
>>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>>  
>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point  
>>> of  
>>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>>>  
>>  
>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
>> command the Defiant...  
>>  
>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
>> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
>> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
>> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
>> and Kirk was just humouring her.  
>>  
>  
> Totally outside of official canon the web series Star Trek Continues had  
> an episode about this, guest starring Clare Kramer.

As Glory!!!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 19:19:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 09:15:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> > starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>  
>>>> >> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >> this series.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>>  
>>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>  
>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>  
>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>  
> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of  
> them not allowing female captains.

It was a fun bit of irony. And they made her an Admiral for it.

--  
Hammer

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 19:22:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 19:55:52 +0200, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 00:33 schreef Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz:  
>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>  
>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>  
>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>  
>  
> They did already had a female captain in Star Trek IV.  
> And Rachel Garrett in 'Yesterday's Enterprise'.

Yes, I took "first female captain" to refer to the televised drame itself having a primary cast female captain, not the canon timeline.

--

Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 19:51:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

- > Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)
- > The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters
- > or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about
- > SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's outfit
- > not being flaggy enough.

I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity perspective. It *would* be fair comment if a *single* representation of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would be *very* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do *not* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of the universe.

- > Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping
- > about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the ships no
- > longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were
- > supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting
- > randomly out of the back like was coda?

Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's outfits! :-) But seriously, you have to make a distinction between what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 19:58:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 10:52 PM:

> In article <oisj1b\$q0a\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>  
>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>  
>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>  
> It ain't in the movie (they built the sets but never shot her scenes,  
> although the actress is credited) but it made it to the novelization.

Ah, thanks. I was worried that I'd suffered some head trauma recently.  
Or caffeine withdrawal. Or both. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:03:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling  
> fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to  
> your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and  
> masturbated with the other.

I'm not so sure that was the message to the fans, or just to Paramount  
(or whoever it is that owns Trek these days). It *was* a dying  
franchise, by my measure due in large part to them cranking out crap  
after TNG went off the air. They *did* need a change of pace, and  
unfortunately they did it by chasing after the "action movie" audience.

My hope is always that a new TV series would be able to have the depth needed to really re-establish the franchise with the types of fans older Trek attracted, but Discovery seems to be along the same lines as the other newer Trek series, being terrible and thinking they can get away with it just because it's \*said\* to be set in the Trek universe.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:07:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:

> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>

>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>

>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>> Director's Edition.

>>>

>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>

>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>> my head.

>

> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
> night before). Basically it goes like this:

>

> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
> with Nogura

>

> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

>

> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>  
> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
> unknown.  
>  
>  
> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>  
> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
> have been excellent)  
>  
> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>  
> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>  
> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
> grab.

Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
to me. Thanks!

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:09:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>  
>  
> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>  
>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>

>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>

> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.

>>

>> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
>> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
>> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
>> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
>> case?

>

> The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
> transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
> loss of his love.

So the movie would have dealt with two of Kirk's conquests? Shatner must have loved that. :)

> Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
> dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
> crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
> (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
> crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
> and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort. Very disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at, including a rusty cast that was years removed from working together as actors. And it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a fan of Nicholas Meyer for his work as director and uncredited screenwriter on II. For my money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved Trek.

>> All this time I've just assumed that it was some generic person  
>> who was also destined to never serve on the Enterprise...

>

> The final cut of the film dropped the ball in that regard.

Interesting stuff.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre

"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:10:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>

>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>

>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>> Director's Edition.

>>>

>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>

>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>> my head.

>>

>

> Nope. It's really like that.

So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all. Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre

"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:28:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

- > I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to
- > Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.
- > You can't make this stuff up.

The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\* of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring in . . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:31:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

- > Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:
- >>
- >>
- >> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:
- >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>
- >>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:
- >>>> >
- >>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...
- >>>>
- >>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.
- >>>
- >>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.
- >>
- >> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.
- >
- > Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the
- > admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time
- > issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI

> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:32:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiudnk\$kev\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:

>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>>

>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>>

>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>>> Director's Edition.

>>>>

>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>

>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>>> my head.

>>

>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's

>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes

>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the

>> night before). Basically it goes like this:

>>

>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting

>> with Nogura

>>

>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

>>  
>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>  
>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>> unknown.  
>>  
>>  
>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>  
>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>> have been excellent)  
>>  
>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>  
>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>  
>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>> grab.  
>  
> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
> to me. Thanks!

:)

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Adam H. Kerman](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:33:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk <[anim8rfsk@cox.net](mailto:anim8rfsk@cox.net)> wrote:  
> In article <[oiudpt\\$kev\\$3@dont-email.me](mailto:oiudpt$kev$3@dont-email.me)>,  
> "Jim G." <[jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid](mailto:jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid)> wrote:  
>  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>>  
>>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>  
>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>  
> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

I love scale modeling. Do any big production budget movies do that  
any more?

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:40:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <anim8rfsk-D5F3B7.09110427062017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> In article <270620171119107365%nope@noway.com>,  
> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <erf5s9FssumU1@mid.individual.net>, The Last Doctor  
>> <mike@xenocyte.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> > On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> >> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not  
>>>> >>> part  
>>>> >>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> > write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> > women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> > takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>>  
>>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about  
>>>> finally  
>>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the  
>>>> point  
>>>> of  
>>>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known  
>>> to  
>>> command the Defiant...  
>>>  
>>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female  
>>> captains, surely the touchy-feely Federation that followed it  
>>> wouldn't go backwards in this regard.  
>>  
>>  
>> Why not? Archer's Enterprise (and Hernandez's Columbia) were  
>  
> constructs in a badly plotted and researched holonovel.

"Never give up! Never surrender!"

---

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:48:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
<droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.  
>> You can't make this stuff up.  
>  
> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!

My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
Month contests.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 20:52:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>  
>> They explained that.  
>  
> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

- > the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original
- > look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."

River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 21:46:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 12:51 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

- > For your reference, records indicate that
- > Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:
- >
- >> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)
- >> The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters
- >> or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about
- >> SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's outfit
- >> not being flaggy enough.
- >
- > I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity
- > perspective. It *would* be fair comment if a *single* representation
- > of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would
- > be *very* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a
- > blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do
- > *not* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of
- > the universe.
- >
- >> Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping
- >> about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the ships no
- >> longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were
- >> supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting
- >> randomly out of the back like was coda?
- >
- > Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's
- > outfits! :-) But seriously, you have to make a distinction between
- > what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an
- > established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to
- > do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not
- > made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.
- >
- The problem is they DID start a new timeline. And in the process said

"this is the only Trek now, we have destroyed the timeline of the prior serieses and movies."

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 21:48:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,

> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>

>>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >

>>>> > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>>

>>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>>>>

>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>>

>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the

>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time

>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI

>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

>

> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

>

What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 21:52:26 GMT

---



On 6/27/2017 1:03 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

- > For your reference, records indicate that
- > Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:
- >
- >> J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling
- >> fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to
- >> your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and
- >> masturbated with the other.
- >
- > I'm not so sure that was the message to the fans, or just to Paramount
- > (or whoever it is that owns Trek these days).

He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated backwards.

(Oops, wrong movie. ;) )

- > It *was* a dying
- > franchise, by my measure due in large part to them cranking out crap
- > after TNG went off the air. They *did* need a change of pace, and
- > unfortunately they did it by chasing after the "action movie" audience.
- > My hope is always that a new TV series would be able to have the depth
- > needed to really re-establish the franchise with the types of fans
- > older Trek attracted, but Discovery seems to be along the same lines as
- > the other newer Trek series, being terrible and thinking they can get
- > away with it just because it's *said* to be set in the Trek universe.
- >

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 21:53:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:

- > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:
- >> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,
- >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:
- >>
- >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:
- >>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>>  
>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>>  
>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>>  
>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>> my head.  
>>  
>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>  
>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>> with Nogura  
>>  
>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>  
>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>  
>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>> unknown.  
>>  
>>  
>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>  
>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>> have been excellent)  
>>  
>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>  
>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>

>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>> grab.  
>  
> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
> to me. Thanks!  
>  
Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 22:03:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>, Dimensional Traveler  
<dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>  
>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>>  
>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"  
>>

> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?

It might, but only if you're synesthetic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 22:11:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 14:53:27 -0700, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.

The Motion Picture wasn't novelized by some random author foreign to the Trek universe...

--  
Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 22:42:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 3:11 PM, Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz wrote:

> On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 14:53:27 -0700, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>

>> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.

>

> The Motion Picture wasn't novelized by some random author foreign to the Trek universe...

>

That's never made a difference.

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 22:56:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

In article <59529f7e\$0\$832\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>, liam@valentijn.nu

says...

>

> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:05 schreef J. Clarke:

>> In article <oirnp9\$dbh\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus@aol.com says...

>>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 3:13 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

>>>

>>>> You know, one of the differences in feel between TOS and both TNG and

>>>> the 2009 re-boot is in how they address discipline and chain of command.

>>>> TOS was written by people who had some idea of what the military was

>>>> really like, many of them having served themselves. Yes, they bend

>>>> things a bit for story purposes and the limits of filming a TV show, but

>>>> their starting point was a working military. Characters stay at their

>>>> posts.

>>>

>>> This is simply not true. The show illogically (for any real military)

>>> had the leader, Kirk, always beaming down into unknown conditions. Many

>>> of the rest of the bridge crew illogically beamed down frequently as

>>> well. Outside of Spock and Uhura, none of those people should/would

>>> have ever had a reason to have been bopping down to new planets on a

>>> whim in any realistic 'military' show.

>>

>> He's the Captain. He gets to do stupid things if he wants to--nobody on the

>> ship has the authority to stop him unless they want to go \_way\_ out on a

>> limb and claim that he's disabled in some way.

>>

>

> How would Kirk have handled the TNG mindset of captains not being on an

> away team aka landing party? He would not have been okay with it I think.

I suspect not.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:42:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiufem\$01k\$1@dont-email.me>,

"Adam H. Kerman" <ahk@chinet.com> wrote:

> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's  
>>>> >> life.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>  
>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>>  
>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"  
>  
> I love scale modeling. Do any big production budget movies do that  
> any more?

When they have to. SERENITY had to crash a real model of their Firefly class ship 'cause their CGI wasn't close to up to it.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:44:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <270620171648414080%nope@noway.com>,  
A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

> In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
> <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
>>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.  
>>> You can't make this stuff up.  
>>

>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
>> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
>> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!  
>  
>  
> My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
> Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
> morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
> want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
> wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
> Month contests.

That's a good point, at least post TOS. Once you replicate new uniforms instead of laundering them, all they have to do is send out a line of code ...

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:45:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiugif\$5t2\$5@dont-email.me>,  
Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>  
>>> They explained that.  
>>  
>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>

> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to

> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

But the Romulans got bumpy foreheads, even though nobody can tell them from the Vulcans ...

--

Join your old RAT friends at

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:45:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>> >

>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>>>>

>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>>>

>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the

>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time

>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI

>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

>>

>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

>>

> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?



hee hee

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:46:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:  
>>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >  
>>>> > [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> > \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> > Director's Edition.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> > Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> > contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> my head.  
>>>  
>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>  
>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>> with Nogura  
>>>  
>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

>>>  
>>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>  
>>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>> unknown.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>  
>>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>> have been excellent)  
>>>  
>>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>  
>>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>  
>>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>> grab.  
>>  
>> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>> to me. Thanks!  
>>  
> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.

Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 00:22:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 03:28 PM:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.

>> You can't make this stuff up.

>

> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!

If our military today was swarming with costume designers, we'd probably be seeing new Navy and Army looks every other week.

The Air Force would be switching things up every three to five days.

And the Marines would look at the costume designers and say, "Get the f%#\$ away from us."

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 00:22:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 03:31 PM:

> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>

>>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >

>>>> > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>>

>>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>>>>

>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>>

>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>  
> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

Fair enough. I knew that they used models (often recycled), but I also  
thought that there was some early computer work connected to some of the  
V-ger effects and nebula stuff.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 00:54:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 11:37 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oithbv\$f9r\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:

>

>> On 6/26/2017 11:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,

>>> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>> In article <oish21\$lfc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>

>>>> >>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when

>>>> >>>>>>>> this

>>>> >>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the

>>>> >>>>>>>> older

>>>> >>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie  
>>>> >>>> or  
>>>> >>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> >>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>> those  
>>>> >>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>> > In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>>> > in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>>>  
>>>> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>>  
>>> Retcon  
>>>  
>> She wasn't the love of his life, though. She was just a baby momma from  
>> a long time prior...a woman who with whom the relationship was willingly  
>> given up (mutual decision).  
>  
> It wasn't mutual, she was just a bitch.

Fair enough...but she certainly wasn't the love of his life. You do have to wonder why the writing was ever set up in those early films to shoehorn in a long term love interest for him...rather than just letting him screw his way across the galaxy like he did in the TV series.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 00:55:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 11:50 AM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:  
> On 6/26/2017 10:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> In article <oisor7\$7qu\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 9:29 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> when  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> of the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> which  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> design  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> it is  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> movie  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> or  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the  
>>>> >>>> film  
>>>> >>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>>> those  
>>>> >>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> > my head.  
>>>>  
>>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which  
>>>> makes  
>>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally  
>>>> the  
>>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>>  
>>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> with Nogura  
>>>>  
>>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>>  
>>>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>>  
>>> Well that hardly sounds like someone talking to the "love of their  
>>> life".  
>>  
>> Did somebody refer to her that way?  
>>  
> Yes.

They were together romantically in a long term ongoing relationship when  
she got FLY-ed.

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 00:56:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 1:39 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:  
>> In article <oisfbl\$h3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>  
>>>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better than  
>>>> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>>>  
>>>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>>  
>>> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.  
>>  
>> She might be too wrapped up to do it..  
>>  
>  
> Would all that binding really stop her?

She is also in ATOMIC BLONDE...coming out in a couple weeks.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:07:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiuslr\$1uc\$2@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
  
> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 03:31 PM:  
>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...



>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>  
>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>>  
>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"  
>  
> Fair enough. I knew that they used models (often recycled), but I also  
> thought that there was some early computer work connected to some of the  
> V-ger effects and nebula stuff.

Maybe in that awful wormhole sequence that was done by the guys they fired.

The Genesis Planet simulation in Star Trek The Wrath of Khan is widely considered the first CGI sequence in motion pictures.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:09:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>

>>

>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>>

>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>

>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>  
>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>  
> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

Did they even have CGI back then?

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:10:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiuug6\$5i0\$3@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 11:37 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oithbv\$f9r\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 11:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,  
>>>> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > In article <oish21\$lfc\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> > wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> [http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/](http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/)  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which

>>>> >>>>>> ship  
 >>>> >>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
 >>>> >>>>>> won't  
 >>>> >>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
 >>>> >>>>>> well.  
 >>>> >>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it  
 >>>> >>>>>> is  
 >>>> >>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J. movie  
 >>>> >>>>>> or  
 >>>> >>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
 >>>> >>>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
 >>>> >>>>>> those  
 >>>> >>>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's  
 >>>> >>>>>> life.  
 >>>> >>>>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the  
 >>>> >>>>>> person  
 >>>> >>>>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> Retcon  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> She wasn't the love of his life, though. She was just a baby momma from  
 >>>> >>>>>> a long time prior...a woman who with whom the relationship was willingly  
 >>>> >>>>>> given up (mutual decision).  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> It wasn't mutual, she was just a bitch.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> Fair enough...but she certainly wasn't the love of his life.

Just to clarify - we're talking Carol Marcus still? And, agreed.

You do  
 > have to wonder why the writing was ever set up in those early films to  
 > shoehorn in a long term love interest for him...rather than just letting  
 > him screw his way across the galaxy like he did in the TV series.

Yes, seems like it should have been the other way around.

The writer's guide for TOS defined the three great loves of Kirk's past. One presumably is Ruth from Shore Leave. It's possible Carol Marcus is that 'little blonde lab technician' that Gary Mitchell aimed at Kirk as a distraction so Mitchell would get better grades. Kirk: "I almost married her!!"

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:11:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>> >

>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>>>>

>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>>>

>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

>>

>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

>>

> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?

Synth music? Goldsmith's score used a massive symphony orchestra, and was the one thing about that film that was superlative.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:12:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiuui1\$5i0\$4@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

```
> On 6/27/2017 11:50 AM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:
>> On 6/26/2017 10:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:
>>> In article <oisor7$7qu$1@dont-email.me>,
>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> On 6/26/2017 9:29 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:
>>>> > In article <oisj1o$q0a$2@dont-email.me>,
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:
>>>> >
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:
>>>> >>> In article <oisgh3$k9c$2@dont-email.me>,
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:
>>>> >>>
>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:
>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>
>>>> >>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:
>>>> >>>>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>
>>>> >>>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:
>>>> >>>>>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> when
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> this
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> of the
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> older
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter- room/
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> which
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> ship
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy
```

>>>> >>>>>>> design  
>>>> >>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever  
>>>> >>>>>>> it is  
>>>> >>>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> >>>>>>> movie  
>>>> >>>>>>> or  
>>>> >>>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the  
>>>> >>>>>>> film  
>>>> >>>>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>>>>>> those  
>>>> >>>>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>>>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>>>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>>>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>>>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >>>>>>> my head.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> >>>>>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which  
>>>> >>>>>>> makes  
>>>> >>>>>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally  
>>>> >>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> >>>>>>> with Nogura  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>> >>>>>>>

>>>> > Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> > they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>> >  
>>>> Well that hardly sounds like someone talking to the "love of their  
>>>> life".  
>>>  
>>> Did somebody refer to her that way?  
>>>  
>> Yes.  
>  
>  
> They were together romantically in a long term ongoing relationship when  
> she got FLY-ed.

A standard one year marriage contract that was part of her duties as  
Nogura's staff whore. It was over before she got FLY-ed IIRC.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:15:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-C371FC.18113027062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

> In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>  
>>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's

>>>> >>> life.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>>  
>>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>>>  
>>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"  
>>>  
>> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?  
>  
> Synth music? Goldsmith's score used a massive symphony orchestra, and  
> was the one thing about that film that was superlative.

Ahem. Persis Khambatta, and her artificial nipples.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 01:17:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oitv84\$gq\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 6:45 AM, The Last Doctor wrote:  
>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> > liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> >> of that. It was the writers. They failed.



>>>> >  
>>>> > If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>>  
>>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>  
>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point  
>>> of  
>>> them not allowing female captains.  
>>>  
>>  
>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
>> command the Defiant...  
>>  
> There is a significant difference between being the Captain (commanding  
> officer) of a ship and having the conn (standing a watch as the senior  
> on-duty bridge officer or temporarily filling in for said).

Dax commanded the Defiant on missions. She *\*was\** the skipper for the duration of those missions.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:07:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 4:09 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
  
>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>  
> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
> overkill

Are you talking about the universe's largest lice infestation? (the bazillion glowing white 'dots')

> All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort. Very  
> disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at, including a  
> rusty cast that was years removed from working together as actors. And

> it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a fan of Nicholas  
> Meyer for his work as director and uncredited screenwriter on II. For my  
> money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved Trek.

I agree that WRATH OF KHAN was a much better film...and, for that  
matter, the best TREK film made.

---

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist  
critics)

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:08:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 4:48 PM, A Friend wrote:

> In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
> <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
>>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.  
>>> You can't make this stuff up.  
>>  
>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
>> in . . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
>> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!  
>  
>  
> My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
> Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
> morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
> want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
> wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
> Month contests.

Maybe the early uniforms turned out to have been made by American Airlines?

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:30:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 6:17 PM, BTR1701 wrote:

> In article <oitv84\$gq\$1@dont-email.me>,

> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>> On 6/27/2017 6:45 AM, The Last Doctor wrote:

>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>> > On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> >> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> >>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>>>> >>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>>>> >>>>> this series.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part

>>>> >>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>>> >

>>>> > The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

>>>> > write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that

>>>> > women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover

>>>> > takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>>>>

>>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally

>>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point

>>>> of

>>>> them not allowing female captains.

>>>>

>>>

>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the

>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the

>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs

>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to

>>> command the Defiant...

>>>

>> There is a significant difference between being the Captain (commanding

>> officer) of a ship and having the conn (standing a watch as the senior

>> on-duty bridge officer or temporarily filling in for said).

>

> Dax commanded the Defiant on missions. She \*was\* the skipper for the

> duration of those missions.

>

My comment was aimed more at some of the other examples (Uhura, Troi).

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:35:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 4:45 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:

>>>> >

>>>> >

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.

>>>> >

>>>> > For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.

>>>>

>>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the

>>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time

>>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI

>>>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.

>>>>

>>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"

>>>

>> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?

>

> hee hee

>

Oh, I guess that means the end of '2001' doesn't qualify as CGI either!

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation

instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:36:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,

> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:

>>>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>

>>>> >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>>> >> Director's Edition.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>>> >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>>> >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>> >

>>>> > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>>>> > my head.

>>>>

>>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's

>>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes

>>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the

>>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:

>>>>

>>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting

>>>> with Nogura

>>>>

>>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

>>>>

>>>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year

>>>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)

>>>>

>>>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> unknown.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>>  
>>>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>>> have been excellent)  
>>>>  
>>>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>>  
>>>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>>  
>>>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> grab.  
>>>  
>>> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>>> to me. Thanks!  
>>>  
>> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.  
>  
> Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>  
Hmmm, I still think Kirk calling someone he was married to, even  
temporarily, someone's whose seems way out of character.  
  
--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:37:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 5:22 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Doc O'Leary sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 03:28 PM:

>> For your reference, records indicate that

>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to

>>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.

>>> You can't make this stuff up.  
>>  
>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
>> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
>> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!  
>  
> If our military today was swarming with costume designers, we'd probably  
> be seeing new Navy and Army looks every other week.  
>  
> The Air Force would be switching things up every three to five days.  
>  
> And the Marines would look at the costume designers and say, "Get the  
> f%#\$ away from us."  
>  
Bah! If they have to actually \_say\_ it, they're not real Marines! :D

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:39:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 5:54 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>  
>  
> On 6/27/2017 11:37 AM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oithbv\$f9r\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 11:51 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <atropos-8CFE78.20252026062017@news.giganews.com>,  
>>>> BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > In article <oish21\$lf\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> > wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>

>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw  
>>>> >>>>>>>> when  
>>>> >>>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was  
>>>> >>>>>>>> of the  
>>>> >>>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying  
>>>> >>>>>>>> which  
>>>> >>>>>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy  
>>>> >>>>>>>> design  
>>>> >>>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>>>>>> well.  
>>>> >>>>>>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever  
>>>> >>>>>>>> it is  
>>>> >>>>>>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> >>>>>>>> movie  
>>>> >>>>>>>> or  
>>>> >>>>>>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the  
>>>> >>>>>>>> film  
>>>> >>>>>>>> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >>>>>>>> those  
>>>> >>>>>>>> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's  
>>>> >>>>>>>> life.  
>>>> >>>>>>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with  
>>>> >>>>>>>> the person  
>>>> >>>>>>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>>> >>>>>>>>



>>>> > I thought Carol Marcus was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>>  
>>>> Retcon  
>>>  
>>> She wasn't the love of his life, though. She was just a baby momma from  
>>> a long time prior...a woman who with whom the relationship was willingly  
>>> given up (mutual decision).  
>>  
>> It wasn't mutual, she was just a bitch.  
>  
> Fair enough...but she certainly wasn't the love of his life. You do  
> have to wonder why the writing was ever set up in those early films to  
> shoehorn in a long term love interest for him...rather than just letting  
> him screw his way across the galaxy like he did in the TV series.  
>  
It wasn't the '60s anymore. :)

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:42:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 5:56 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>  
>  
> On 6/27/2017 1:39 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:  
>>> In article <oisfbl\$h3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better  
>>>> > than  
>>>> > 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>>>  
>>>> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>>> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>>> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>>> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.  
>>>  
>>> She might be too wrapped up to do it...

>>>  
>>  
>> Would all that binding really stop her?  
>  
> She is also in ATOMIC BLONDE...coming out in a couple weeks.

Oh Oh! The promos for that look so \_coooooool\_! I'm sure the plot will be stupid as shit but that's not why I'm going to see it. :D

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 02:47:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:

>>>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>

>>>> >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>>> >> Director's Edition.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>>> >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>>> >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>> >

>>>> > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>>>> > my head.

>>>>

>>>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's

>>>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes

>>>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>>  
>>>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> with Nogura  
>>>>  
>>>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>>  
>>>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>>  
>>>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> unknown.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>>  
>>>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>>> have been excellent)  
>>>>  
>>>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>>  
>>>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>>  
>>>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> grab.  
>>>  
>>> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>>> to me. Thanks!  
>>>  
>> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.  
>  
> Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>  
You sure it wasn't by Freddy? :P

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

In article <oiv4dp\$h8v\$2@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 4:45 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiujl6\$7gb\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 1:31 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's  
>>>> >>>>> life.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>>> > admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>>> > issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>>>> > overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>>>>  
>>>> CGI? In TMP?? "Sorry, neither"  
>>>>  
>>> What? Synthesizer music doesn't count as CGI?  
>>  
>> hee hee  
>>  
> Oh, I guess that means the end of '2001' doesn't qualify as CGI either!

LOL!

A claim like that would be "Ian wrong"

--

Join your old RAT friends at

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 03:24:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiv44p\$h8v\$1@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 6:17 PM, BTR1701 wrote:

>> In article <oitv84\$gq\$1@dont-email.me>,

>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>

>>> On 6/27/2017 6:45 AM, The Last Doctor wrote:

>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> > starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>> >> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> >>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> >>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >>>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>>>> >>>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>>>> >>>>>> this series.

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not

>>>> >>>> part

>>>> >>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

>>>> >> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that

>>>> >> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover

>>>> >> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>>>> >

>>>> > But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about

>>>> > finally

>>>> > having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the

>>>> > point

>>>> > of

>>>> > them not allowing female captains.

>>>> >

>>>>

>>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the

>>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known  
>>>> to  
>>>> command the Defiant...  
>>>>  
>>> There is a significant difference between being the Captain (commanding  
>>> officer) of a ship and having the conn (standing a watch as the senior  
>>> on-duty bridge officer or temporarily filling in for said).  
>>  
>> Dax commanded the Defiant on missions. She \*was\* the skipper for the  
>> duration of those missions.  
>>  
> My comment was aimed more at some of the other examples (Uhura, Troi).

They let Troi fly the damn ship \*one time\* and she flew it into a planet  
- over and over and over again.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 03:25:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiv4gs\$h8v\$3@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> >>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >> my head.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> > credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>>>> > no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>>> > night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> > with Nogura  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> > they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> > she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> > unknown.  
>>>> >  
>>>> >  
>>>> > \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> > <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>>> > have been excellent)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>>> > (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> > Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>>> > that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> > grab.  
>>>>  
>>>> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>>>> to me. Thanks!  
>>>>  
>>> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.

>>  
>> Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>>  
> Hmmm, I still think Kirk calling someone he was married to, even  
> temporarily, someone's whose seems way out of character.

Not considering he'd just found out that that's exactly what she was.

--  
Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 03:34:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiv55p\$h8v\$7@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >> my head.  
>>>> >



>>>> > LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> > credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>>>> > no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>>> > night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> > with Nogura  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> > they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> > she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> > unknown.  
>>>> >  
>>>> >  
>>>> > \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> > <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>>> > have been excellent)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>>> > (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> > Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>>> > that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> > grab.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>>>> > to me. Thanks!  
>>>> >  
>>> > Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.  
>> >  
>> > Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>> >  
> > You sure it wasn't by Freddy? :P

He was busy writing the bad episode of Dukes of Hazzard that year.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 03:39:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 10:42 PM, Dimensional Traveler wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 5:56 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>

>>

>> On 6/27/2017 1:39 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:

>>>> In article <oisfbl\$h3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better  
>>>> >> than

>>>> >> 'worst of series, crime against humanity'

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.

>>>> >

>>>> > Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>>> > new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>>> > STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>>> > Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.

>>>>

>>>> She might be too wrapped up to do it...

>>>>

>>>

>>> Would all that binding really stop her?

>>

>> She is also in ATOMIC BLONDE...coming out in a couple weeks.

>

> Oh Oh! The promos for that look so \_coooooool\_! I'm sure the plot will  
> be stupid as shit but that's not why I'm going to see it. :D

+1

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [BTR1701](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 04:32:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oiv4r0\$h8v\$6@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 5:56 PM, Obveeus wrote:

>>

>>  
>> On 6/27/2017 1:39 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
  
>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:  
  
>>>> In article <oisfbl\$h3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better  
>>>> >> than 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>>> > new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>>> > STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>>> > Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.  
>>>>  
>>>> > She might be too wrapped up to do it...  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> >> Would all that binding really stop her?  
>>>  
>> >> She is also in ATOMIC BLONDE...coming out in a couple weeks.  
>  
> > Oh Oh! The promos for that look so \_coooooool\_! I'm sure the plot will  
> > be stupid as shit but that's not why I'm going to see it. :D

It's basically JOHN WICK with a chick.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 05:36:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <atropos-5A852E.21322627062017@news.giganews.com>,  
BTR1701 <atropos@mac.com> wrote:

> In article <oiv4r0\$h8v\$6@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/27/2017 5:56 PM, Obveeus wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 1:39 PM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
>

>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef BTR1701:  
>  
>>>> > In article <oisfbl\$3g\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> > wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 8:24 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>> You're honestly the first person I've heard rate BEYOND any better  
>>>> >>> than 'worst of series, crime against humanity'  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Even the people that actually watched it felt that way.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Nope. The second film (where Khan was featured) was the worst of the  
>>>> >> new trilogy. The third film, BEYOND, brought a good dose of humor that  
>>>> >> STAR TREK desperately needed to see again. Plus, they added Sofia  
>>>> >> Boutella...who I hope makes it back for film #4.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > She might be too wrapped up to do it...  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> > Would all that binding really stop her?  
>>>  
>>> > She is also in ATOMIC BLONDE...coming out in a couple weeks.  
>>  
>> > Oh Oh! The promos for that look so \_coooooool\_! I'm sure the plot will  
>> > be stupid as shit but that's not why I'm going to see it. :D  
>  
> > It's basically JOHN WICK with a chick.

No matter how many acid baths she takes, she'll never get rid of the Sean Penn stench.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 10:12:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <oiv2sm\$ek1\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 4:48 PM, A Friend wrote:

>> In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
 >> <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
 >>  
 >>> For your reference, records indicate that  
 >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
 >>>  
 >>>> I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
 >>>> Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.  
 >>>> You can't make this stuff up.  
 >>>  
 >>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
 >>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
 >>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
 >>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
 >>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
 >>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
 >>> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
 >>> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!  
 >>  
 >>  
 >> My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
 >> Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
 >> morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
 >> want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
 >> wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
 >> Month contests.  
 >  
 > Maybe the early uniforms turned out to have been made by American Airlines?

One of the first reviews of ENTERPRISE said that the uniforms looked like what they wear down at the Jiffy Lube.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
 Posted by [trotsky](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 11:04:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 8:09 PM, BTR1701 wrote:  
 > In article <oiudpt\$kev\$3@dont-email.me>,  
 > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
 >  
 >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
 >>>  
 >>>  
 >>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
 >  
 >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>>  
>>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>  
>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty CGI  
>> overkill (and pace-killing) stuff that bogged down the whole movie.  
>  
> Did they even have CGI back then?  
>

No.

---

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 12:18:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 6:12 AM, A Friend wrote:

> In article <oiv2sm\$ek1\$2@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/27/2017 4:48 PM, A Friend wrote:  
>>> In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
>>> <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > I read that this particular batch of idiots even sent someone to  
>>>> > Sweden or some such place to research fabric materials for the uniforms.  
>>>> > You can't make this stuff up.  
>>>>  
>>>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a \*lot\*  
>>>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
>>>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
>>>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
>>>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
>>>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring

>>>> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
>>>> \*that\* story; it'd be a fun watch!  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
>>> Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
>>> morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
>>> want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
>>> wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
>>> Month contests.  
>>  
>> Maybe the early uniforms turned out to have been made by American Airlines?  
>  
>  
> One of the first reviews of ENTERPRISE said that the uniforms looked  
> like what they wear down at the Jiffy Lube.

....but do they need to be replaced because they make the wearers itchy  
and hive-y and protest-y?

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jerry Brown](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 16:50:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 07:58:57 -0400, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> > On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>> ship  
>>>> >>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design

>>>> >>>> won't  
 >>>> >>>> be present on Discovery.  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
 >>>> >>> well.  
 >>>> >>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
 >>>> >> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
 >>>> >> movie or  
 >>>> >> the TMP one way back when?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
 >>>> > when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
 >>>> > those  
 >>>> > dangerous contraptions.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
 >>>  
 >>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
 >>  
 >> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
 >  
 > For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
 >  
 >>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
 >>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
 >>  
 >> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
 >> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
 >> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
 >> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
 >> case?  
 >  
 > The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
 > transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
 > loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
 > dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
 > crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
 > (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
 > crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
 > and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
 nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
 as extras on recent releases.

--



Jerry Brown

A cat may look at a king  
(but probably won't bother)

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 16:57:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsr3adinf1@jwbrown.co.uk>,  
Jerry Brown <jerry@jwbrown.co.uk.invalid> wrote:

> On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 07:58:57 -0400, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:52 PM:>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 10:43 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:25 PM:>  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 10:08 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 06:25 PM:>  
>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 4:29 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 02:35 PM:>  
>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:12 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Do you have a cite for that? Because everything that I saw when  
>>>> >>>>>>> this  
>>>> >>>>>>> came out made it clear that it was unknown if the image was of the  
>>>> >>>>>>> older  
>>>> >>>>>>> ship or the newer one.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> <http://ew.com/tv/2017/06/22/star-trek-discovery-transporter-room/>  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Thanks. My usual stops weren't committing in terms of saying which  
>>>> >>>>>>> ship  
>>>> >>>>>>> we were seeing. One can only hope that the crash test dummy design  
>>>> >>>>>>> won't  
>>>> >>>>>>> be present on Discovery.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>> >>>> As I recall, they used that model for the first STAR TREK film as  
>>>> >>>> >>>> well.  
>>>> >>>> >>>> The thing turned Kirk's girlfriend into THE FLY.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> >>>> Apparently I've done a really good job of blocking out whatever it is  
>>>> >>>> >>>> that you're referring to. Are you talking about the first J.J.  
>>>> >>>> >>>> movie or  
>>>> >>>> >>>> the TMP one way back when?  
>>>> >>>>

>>>> >> STAR TREK THE MOTION PICTURE...way back when, very early in the film  
>>>> >> when the transporter is frying people and Bones is trying to avoid  
>>>> >> those  
>>>> >> dangerous contraptions.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>>  
>>>> The woman who got melded in the transporter was the love of Kirk's life.  
>>>>  
>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>  
>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>  
>>>> In this case, she wasn't melded with a fly, but rather with the person  
>>>> in the adjacent transporter spot.  
>>>>  
>>> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
>>> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock  
>>> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
>>> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
>>> case?  
>>  
>> The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
>> transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
>> loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
>> dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
>> crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
>> (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
>> crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
>> and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?  
>  
> Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
> nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
> as extras on recent releases.

And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
his body.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:29:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 21:19 schreef Lance Corporal Hammer Schultz:

> On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 09:15:28 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>

>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> > Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in

>>>> >>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for

>>>> >>> this series.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >

>>>> > Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part

>>>> > of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>>

>>>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>>>

>>> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to

>>> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that

>>> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover

>>> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>>>

>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally

>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point of

>> them not allowing female captains.

>

> It was a fun bit of irony. And they made her an Admiral for it.

>

Hmmm.... Remember what Kirk advised Picard? :-)

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:29:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 20:30 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <59529e91\$0\$783\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>

>> Op 27-6-2017 om 15:45 schreef The Last Doctor:

>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>> > On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:

>>>> >> ljam@valentijn.nu wrote:

>>>> >>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:

>>>> >>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>>> this series.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not part  
>>>> >>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain

>>>> >

>>>> > The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> > write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> > women are forbidden to captain a sharship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> > takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.

>>>>

>>>> But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about finally  
>>>> having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the point  
>>>> of  
>>>> them not allowing female captains.

>>>>

>>>

>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known to  
>>> command the Defiant...

>>>

>>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
>>> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
>>> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
>>> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
>>> and Kirk was just humouring her.

>>>

>>

>> Totally outside of official canon the web series Star Trek Continues had  
>> an episode about this, guest starring Clare Kramer.  
>  
> As Glory!!!  
>

Now that would make one fine story! :-P

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:31:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 22:40 schreef A Friend:  
> In article <anim8rfsk-D5F3B7.09110427062017@news.easynews.com>,  
> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <270620171119107365%nope@noway.com>,  
>> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> In article <erf5s9FssumU1@mid.individual.net>, The Last Doctor  
>>> <mike@xenocyte.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> > starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> >> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> >>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not  
>>>> >>>>>> part  
>>>> >>>>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.

>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> >> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> >> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> >> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about  
>>>> > finally  
>>>> > having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the  
>>>> > point  
>>>> > of  
>>>> > them not allowing female captains.  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known  
>>>> to  
>>>> command the Defiant...  
>>>>  
>>>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>>>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female  
>>>> captains, surely the touchy-feely Federation that followed it  
>>>> wouldn't go backwards in this regard.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>> Why not? Archer's Enterprise (and Hernandez's Columbia) were  
>>>  
>> constructs in a badly plotted and researched holonovel.  
>  
>  
> "Never give up! Never surrender!"  
>

LOL

One of the best non-Trek Treks.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:34:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 01:45 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <oiugif\$5t2\$5@dont-email.me>,

> Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:

>

>> For your reference, records indicate that

>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>

>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing

>>>> > the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the

>>>> > original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>>

>>>> They explained that.

>>>

>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>>

>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Arenâ€™t all of us humanoids supposed to

>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

>

> But the Romulans got bumpy foreheads, even though nobody can tell them

> from the Vulcans ...

>

Never liked that new Romulan look.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:39:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:  
>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>>  
>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>>  
>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>>  
>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>  
>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>> my head.  
>>>  
>>  
>> Nope. It's really like that.  
>  
> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>

Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---



Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:46:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 04:07 schreef Obveeus:

>  
>  
> On 6/27/2017 4:09 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>  
>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>  
>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty  
>> CGI overkill  
>  
> Are you talking about the universe's largest lice infestation? (the  
> bazillion glowing white 'dots')  
>  
>> All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort.  
>> Very disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at,  
>> including a rusty cast that was years removed from working together as  
>> actors. And it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a  
>> fan of Nicholas Meyer for his work as director and uncredited  
>> screenwriter on II. For my money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved  
>> Trek.  
>  
> I agree that WRATH OF KHAN was a much better film...and, for that  
> matter, the best TREK film made.  
>

I'm partial to Star Trek III myself. :-)

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:51:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 27-6-2017 om 23:46 schreef Dimensional Traveler:

> On 6/27/2017 12:51 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>> For your reference, records indicate that

>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>

>>> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)

>>> The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters

>>> or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about

>>> SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's outfit

>>> not being flaggy enough.

>>

>> I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity

>> perspective. It *would* be fair comment if a *single* representation

>> of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would

>> be *very* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a

>> blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do

>> *not* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of

>> the universe.

>>

>>> Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping

>>> about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the ships no

>>> longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were

>>> supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting

>>> randomly out of the back like was coda?

>>

>> Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's

>> outfits! :-) But seriously, you have to make a distinction between

>> what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an

>> established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to

>> do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not

>> made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.

>>

> The problem is they DID start a new timeline. And in the process said

> "this is the only Trek now, we have destroyed the timeline of the prior

> serieses and movies."

>

That was basically what JJ wanted. He was not amused that the CBS half of the franchise refused to give up their goodies in favor of 'only Kelvin timeline stuff'.

And as far as I'm concerned Discovery is yet /another/ timeline.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:52:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953e9cf\$0\$721\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:  
>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> > In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >  
>>>> > https://youtu.be/Ro\_QpDJX-Sk  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> > \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> > Director's Edition.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> > Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> > contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> my head.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Nope. It's really like that.  
>>  
>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>  
>  
> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

Flag on Rayna, as she's just a sex doll, and her builder has plenty of  
spares!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:53:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953eb74\$0\$819\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 28-6-2017 om 04:07 schreef Obveeus:  
>>  
>>  
>> On 6/27/2017 4:09 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>  
>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>  
>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty  
>>> CGI overkill  
>>  
>> Are you talking about the universe's largest lice infestation? (the  
>> bazillion glowing white 'dots')  
>>  
>>> All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort.  
>>> Very disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at,  
>>> including a rusty cast that was years removed from working together as  
>>> actors. And it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a  
>>> fan of Nicholas Meyer for his work as director and uncredited  
>>> screenwriter on II. For my money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved  
>>> Trek.  
>>  
>> I agree that WRATH OF KHAN was a much better film...and, for that  
>> matter, the best TREK film made.  
>>  
>  
> I'm partial to Star Trek III myself. :-)

Only because they kill David, but not nearly slowly or horribly enough.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:53:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/27/2017 8:34 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oiv55p\$h8v\$7@dont-email.me>,  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>

>> On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> In article <oiujtl\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>

>>>> On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>

>>>> >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> >>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>>>> Director's Edition.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >>> my head.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> >> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which makes  
>>>> >> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally the  
>>>> >> night before). Basically it goes like this:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> >> with Nogura

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> >> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> >> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> >> unknown.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> >> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but she'd  
>>>> >> have been excellent)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion Picture  
>>>> >> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> >> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be her  
>>>> >> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> >> grab.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all new  
>>>> > to me. Thanks!  
>>>> >  
>>>> Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from nowhere.  
>>>  
>>> Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>>>  
>> You sure it wasn't by Freddy? :P  
>  
> He was busy writing the bad episode of Dukes of Hazzard that year.  
>  
You're going to need to narrow that down more....

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:54:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953e8b4\$0\$737\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 28-6-2017 om 01:45 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <oiugif\$5t2\$5@dont-email.me>,

>> Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > In article <oiriqi\$qk0\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> > wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> >> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> >> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > They explained that.  
>>>>  
>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>  
  
>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>  
>> But the Romulans got bumpy foreheads, even though nobody can tell them  
>> from the Vulcans ...  
>>  
>  
> Never liked that new Romulan look.

It was just stupid. How the Hell is Spock undercover on Romulus  
pretending to be a Romulan?

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:54:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953e79b\$0\$727\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 20:30 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <59529e91\$0\$783\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>

>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 15:45 schreef The Last Doctor:  
>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> > starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> >> On Mon, 26 Jun 2017 15:21:41 -0400, Ubiquitous wrote:  
>>>> >>> liam@valentijn.nu wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Op 26-6-2017 om 19:46 schreef Ubiquitous:  
>>>> >>>>> starfist@gmail.invalid wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>>>>> I wonder if the reason women are forbidden to command a starship in  
>>>> >>>>>> Krik's era has anything to do with the disaster that is brewing for  
>>>> >>>>>> this series.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Didn't we learn anything from Voyager?  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>> Voyager had issues orbiting issues. The gender of Janeway was not  
>>>> >>>>>> part  
>>>> >>>>>> of that. It was the writers. They failed.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>> If memory serves, they made a big deal about having a female captain  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The PR push was annoying, but they didn't have to upend anything to  
>>>> >> write the character. At least the timeline worked. Kirk says that  
>>>> >> women are forbidden to captain a starship 10 years after Discover  
>>>> >> takes place. Not a problem for Voyager.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > But that wasn't the point. the point is they made a big deal about  
>>>> > finally  
>>>> > having a female Captain and she was a miserable failure, proving the  
>>>> > point  
>>>> > of  
>>>> > them not allowing female captains.  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> They'd had female captains before though - Uhura even had the conn of the  
>>>> Enterprise in a TAS episode. The captain of the Saratoga in STIV, the  
>>>> captain of the Enterprise C - even Troi managed not to make a total pigs  
>>>> ear of it the one time she got command. Alongside Voyager, Dax was known  
>>>> to  
>>>> command the Defiant...  
>>>>  
>>>> ...and of course, Janice Lester's outburst was then retconned away in  
>>>> Enterprise. If Earth ships in Archer's time could have female captains,  
>>>> surely the touchy-feely Federation  
>>>> that followed it wouldn't go backwards in this regard. We just didn't  
>>>> happen to see one onscreen in TOS, Lester was 17 bananas short of a bunch  
>>>> and Kirk was just humouring her.  
>>>>  
>>>>



>>> Totally outside of official canon the web series Star Trek Continues had  
>>> an episode about this, guest starring Clare Kramer.  
>>  
>> As Glory!!!  
>>  
>  
> Now that would make one fine story! :-P

:D

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 17:56:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 10:51 AM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
> Op 27-6-2017 om 23:46 schreef Dimensional Traveler:  
>> On 6/27/2017 12:51 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)  
>>>> The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters  
>>>> or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about  
>>>> SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's  
>>>> outfit  
>>>> not being flaggy enough.  
>>>  
>>> I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity  
>>> perspective. It \*would\* be fair comment if a \*single\* representation  
>>> of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would  
>>> be \*very\* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a  
>>> blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do  
>>> \*not\* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of  
>>> the universe.  
>>>  
>>>> Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping  
>>>> about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the  
>>>> ships no  
>>>> longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were  
>>>> supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting  
>>>> randomly out of the back like was coda?  
>>>  
>>> Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's

>>> outfits! :-) But seriously, you have to make a distinction between  
>>> what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an  
>>> established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to  
>>> do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not  
>>> made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.  
>>>  
>> The problem is they DID start a new timeline. And in the process said  
>> "this is the only Trek now, we have destroyed the timeline of the prior  
>> serieses and movies."  
>>  
>  
> That was basically what JJ wanted. He was not amused that the CBS half  
> of the franchise refused to give up their goodies in favor of 'only  
> Kelvin timeline stuff'.  
>  
Which just shows how over-inflated Abrams' ego is.  
  
> And as far as I'm concerned Discovery is yet /another/ timeline.  
>  
I think that's official.

--  
Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:07:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 19:53 schreef anim8rfsk:  
> In article <5953eb74\$0\$819\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 28-6-2017 om 04:07 schreef Obveeus:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 4:09 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>>  
>>>>> > For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time  
>>>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty  
>>>>> CGI overkill  
>>>>  
>>>> Are you talking about the universe's largest lice infestation? (the

>>> bazillion glowing white 'dots')  
>>>  
>>>> All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort.  
>>>> Very disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at,  
>>>> including a rusty cast that was years removed from working together as  
>>>> actors. And it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a  
>>>> fan of Nicholas Meyer for his work as director and uncredited  
>>>> screenwriter on II. For my money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved  
>>>> Trek.  
>>>  
>>> I agree that WRATH OF KHAN was a much better film...and, for that  
>>> matter, the best TREK film made.  
>>>  
>>  
>> I'm partial to Star Trek III myself. :-)  
>  
> Only because they kill David, but not nearly slowly or horribly enough.  
>

Not only that, but because of the story and the nods to TOS continuity.  
A lot closer to the feel of the series.  
Bringing Spock back.  
Kirk beating the Klingons.  
The horror of losing the ship. BTW, they destroyed Enterprises several  
times after that, but the punch we got in Star Trek III... No other  
movie with the ship destroyed ever matched that one!

The words McCoy spoke to Kirk:  
<https://youtu.be/CzJRx3vaApA?t=49>

I know that in general the uneven numbered movies are seen as... not as  
good as the even numbered. I hold them in higher regard. :-)

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:10:06 GMT

Op 28-6-2017 om 19:52 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <5953e9cf\$0\$721\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>

>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:

>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>

>>>> >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>>> >> Director's Edition.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>>> >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>>> >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>> >

>>>> > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>>>> > my head.

>>>> >

>>>>

>>>> Nope. It's really like that.

>>>

>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the

>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In

>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.

>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)

>>>

>>

>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith

>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

>

> Flag on Rayna, as she's just a sex doll, and her builder has plenty of

> spares!

>

Yeah, but otoh hand Spock thought it was necessary that Kirk 'forgot'  
about that.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:11:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:14:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 19:56 schreef Dimensional Traveler:

> On 6/28/2017 10:51 AM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:

>> Op 27-6-2017 om 23:46 schreef Dimensional Traveler:

>>> On 6/27/2017 12:51 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

>>>> For your reference, records indicate that

>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)

>>>> > The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters

>>>> > or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about

>>>> > SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's  
>>>> > outfit

>>>> > not being flaggy enough.

>>>>

>>>> I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity

>>>> perspective. It *would* be fair comment if a *single* representation

>>>> of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would

>>>> be *very* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a

>>>> blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do

>>>> *not* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of

>>>> the universe.

>>>>

>>>> > Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping

>>>> > about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the

>>>> > ships no

>>>> > longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were

>>>> > supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting

>>>> > randomly out of the back like was coda?

>>>>  
>>>> Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's  
>>>> outfits! :-) But seriously, you have to make a distinction between  
>>>> what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an  
>>>> established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to  
>>>> do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not  
>>>> made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.  
>>>>  
>>> The problem is they DID start a new timeline. And in the process said  
>>> "this is the only Trek now, we have destroyed the timeline of the prior  
>>> serieses and movies."  
>>>  
>>  
>> That was basically what JJ wanted. He was not amused that the CBS half  
>> of the franchise refused to give up their goodies in favor of 'only  
>> Kelvin timeline stuff'.  
>>  
> Which just shows how over-inflated Abrams' ego is.  
>  
>> And as far as I'm concerned Discovery is yet /another/ timeline.  
>>  
> I think that's official.  
>

Than they really should call it that. Be honest about it.

--  
Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:15:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Dimensional Traveler <[dtravel@sonic.net](mailto:dtravel@sonic.net)> wrote:

>> J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling  
>> fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to  
>> your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and  
>> masturbated with the other.

>  
> I'm not so sure that was the message to the fans, or just to Paramount  
> (or whoever it is that owns Trek these days). It *\*was\** a dying  
> franchise, by my measure due in large part to them cranking out crap  
> after TNG went off the air. They *\*did\** need a change of pace, and  
> unfortunately they did it by chasing after the "action movie" audience.  
> My hope is always that a new TV series would be able to have the depth  
> needed to really re-establish the franchise with the types of fans  
> older Trek attracted, but Discovery seems to be along the same lines as  
> the other newer Trek series, being terrible and thinking they can get  
> away with it just because it's *\*said\** to be set in the Trek universe.

That reminds me of the punchline of a joke that includes "slapping `Trek` on  
it's title".

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:19:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>

>>> They explained that.

>>

>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>

> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to

> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces a  
holographic message when reassembled.

I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Lance Corporal Hammer](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 18:56:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:

> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
> his body.

You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge isn't normal?

--

Hammer

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:10:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj0q87\$uqb\$2@dont-email.me>,  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/27/2017 8:34 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>> In article <oiv55p\$h8v\$7@dont-email.me>,  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 4:46 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oiujtI\$7gb\$5@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > On 6/27/2017 1:07 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 11:29 PM:  
>>>> >>> In article <oisj1o\$q0a\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >>>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>



>>>> >>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing  
>>>> >>>>> with  
>>>> >>>>> my head.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>> LOL, no, seriously. It's all in the book. They cast Lori\*, she's  
>>>> >>> credited, they built the sets, AFAIK they never cast Nogura (which  
>>>> >>> makes  
>>>> >>> no sense as his scenes are supposed to have been decimated literally  
>>>> >>> the  
>>>> >>> night before). Basically it goes like this:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Kirk and Sonak on the escalator, Kirk says he's headed for a meeting  
>>>> >>> with Nogura  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Kirk meets Nogura, stands up to him, gets the Enterprise back (cut)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Lori tries to waylay Kirk outside Nogura's office, brings up the year  
>>>> >>> they spent together, Kirk calls her Nogura's staff whore (cut)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Kirk beams to the space office complex. The next time we see Lori  
>>>> >>> she's in the transporter, beaming aboard the Enterprise for reasons  
>>>> >>> unknown.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> \*Susan O'Sullivan ... Woman (as Susan J. Sullivan)  
>>>> >>> <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0642817>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> (No, it's not the Susan Sullivan from Falcon Crest or Castle, but  
>>>> >>> she'd  
>>>> >>> have been excellent)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Susan O'Sullivan is an actress, known for Star Trek: The Motion  
>>>> >>> Picture  
>>>> >>> (1979), Our Man Flint: Dead on Target (1976) and Desperate Rescue: The  
>>>> >>> Cathy Mahone Story (1993).  
>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> I've never been able to find a good face photo that's supposed to be  
>>>> >>> her  
>>>> >>> that's absolutely certainly her.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Maybe I'll see if can't pull up COVER UP or something and do a screen  
>>>> >>> grab.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Interesting stuff. And, as someone who's read none of the books, all  
>>>> >> new  
>>>> >> to me. Thanks!  
>>>> >>  
>>>> > Star Trek novelizations have a history of authors adding shit from  
>>>> > nowhere.  
>>>>  
>>>> Well, um, this is from the script, and by Roddenberry.  
>>>>  
>>> You sure it wasn't by Freddy? :P  
>>  
>> He was busy writing the bad episode of Dukes of Hazzard that year.  
>>  
> You're going to need to narrow that down more....

Speaking of which, there was a Matlock this morning that credited both  
Anne Collins and Gerry Conway. Jesus wept.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:11:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953f104\$0\$703\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 28-6-2017 om 19:52 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <5953e9cf\$0\$721\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:  
>>>> > Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>

>>>> >>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >> my head.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Nope. It's really like that.  
>>>>  
>>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>  
>> Flag on Rayna, as she's just a sex doll, and her builder has plenty of  
>> spares!  
>>  
>  
> Yeah, but otoh hand Spock thought it was necessary that Kirk 'forgot'  
> about that.

Mind rape!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:11:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:12:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5953f218\$0\$703\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <ljam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 28-6-2017 om 19:56 schreef Dimensional Traveler:  
>> On 6/28/2017 10:51 AM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 23:46 schreef Dimensional Traveler:  
>>>> On 6/27/2017 12:51 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:  
>>>> > For your reference, records indicate that  
>>>> > Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Using a phaser that looks closer to STAR TREK (The Original Series)  
>>>> >> The complaints about the Klingon looks or the look of the transporters  
>>>> >> or the look of the phasers is right on par with the complaints about  
>>>> >> SUPERMAN's outfit being the wrong shade of blue or WONDER WOMAN's  
>>>> >> outfit  
>>>> >> not being flaggy enough.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I would disagree a bit with that, and even then only from a continuity  
>>>> > perspective. It *would* be fair comment if a *single* representation  
>>>> > of S or WW had their costume change without explanation. And it would  
>>>> > be *very* wrong to suddenly replace the person themselves with a  
>>>> > blonde (or give them head ridges :-). Unless it's a reboot, you do  
>>>> > *not* get to exercise your "creativity" in those sorts of aspects of  
>>>> > the universe.  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Were you guys sitting around the water cooler back in the 80s griping  
>>>> >> about how much the new BUCK ROGERS TV series sucked because the  
>>>> >> ships no  
>>>> >> longer swung back and forth on pieces of fishing line like they were  
>>>> >> supposed too? ...and they failed to have cigarette smoke wafting  
>>>> >> randomly out of the back like was coda?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well we're sure as hell not going to complain about Wilma Deering's  
>>>> > outfits! :-). But seriously, you have to make a distinction between  
>>>> > what is a surface difference and what is being changed in an  
>>>> > established story line for the wrong reasons. If they didn't want to  
>>>> > do "Prime" Trek, they should have created yet another timeline, or not  
>>>> > made it a Trek property at all. Simple as that.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The problem is they DID start a new timeline. And in the process said  
>>>> > "this is the only Trek now, we have destroyed the timeline of the prior  
>>>> > serieses and movies."  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> That was basically what JJ wanted. He was not amused that the CBS half

>>> of the franchise refused to give up their goodies in favor of 'only  
>>> Kelvin timeline stuff'.  
>>>  
>> Which just shows how over-inflated Abrams' ego is.  
>>  
>>> And as far as I'm concerned Discovery is yet /another/ timeline.  
>>>  
>> I think that's official.  
>>  
>  
> Than they really should call it that. Be honest about it.

They're too busy getting it wrong.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:13:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,  
Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>  
>>>> > If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> > the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> > original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>>  
>>>> They explained that.  
>>>  
>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>  
>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>  
> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces a  
> holographic message when reassembled.

>  
> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!

Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?

You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion wouldn't work.

--  
Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:39:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> On 6/28/2017 10:51 AM, Wouter Valentijn wrote:  
>> And as far as I'm concerned Discovery is yet /another/ timeline.  
>>  
> I think that's official.

No, it was officially announced as being part of the Prime timeline.  
That's the heart of the problem, as far as I'm concerned. That's why I  
think the best solution at this point really is to sit down and retcon  
the \*entire\* Trek omniverse down to something that makes sense as an  
ongoing framework for telling good stories. Not just resolving these  
newly fabricated timelines, but the Mirror Universe and all the other  
references to fantastical events that we done in a throw-away fashion  
at the time, but became canon when Trek became a franchise. Until they  
sweat out those details, it's ultimately pointless to call anything else  
Trek.

--  
"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:43:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 11:15 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:

> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>> For your reference, records indicate that

>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>

>>> J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling

>>> fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to

>>> your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and

>>> masturbated with the other.

>>

>> I'm not so sure that was the message to the fans, or just to Paramount

>> (or whoever it is that owns Trek these days). It *was* a dying

>> franchise, by my measure due in large part to them cranking out crap

>> after TNG went off the air. They *did* need a change of pace, and

>> My hope is always that a new TV series would be able to have the depth

>> needed to really re-establish the franchise with the types of fans

>> older Trek attracted, but Discovery seems to be along the same lines as

>> the other newer Trek series, being terrible and thinking they can get

>> away with it just because it's *said* to be set in the Trek universe.

>

> That reminds me of the punchline of a joke that includes "slapping `Trek` on

> it's title".

>

That would seem to imply that Abrams *isn't* the punchline to that joke.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:46:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 11:19 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:

> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>

>>>> > If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing

>>>> > the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the

>>>> > original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>>

>>>> They explained that.

>>>

>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>  
>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>  
> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces a  
> holographic message when reassembled.  
>  
> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>  
Magic DNA from only about 4 billion years ago IIRC.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:48:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,  
> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>

>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing

>>>> >> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the

>>>> >> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>> >

>>>> > They explained that.

>>>>

>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>>>>

>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to

>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

>>>

>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the



>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces a  
>> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>  
>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>  
> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?

I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
evolving independently rather than being seeded.

> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
> wouldn't work.

Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 19:52:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 12:11 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <5953f104\$0\$703\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 28-6-2017 om 19:52 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>> In article <5953e9cf\$0\$721\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:  
>>>> >> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >>>>> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >>>>> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with

>>>> >>> my head.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Nope. It's really like that.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> > alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> > any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> > Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>  
>>> Flag on Rayna, as she's just a sex doll, and her builder has plenty of  
>>> spares!  
>>>  
>>  
>> Yeah, but otoh hand Spock thought it was necessary that Kirk 'forgot'  
>> about that.  
>  
> Mind rape!  
>  
"Vulcan Roofie".

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 20:02:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

> He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying  
> him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated  
> backwards.

Why do you think they have any investment in the Trek universe greater  
than that of making a profit? The pitch was to make a successful Trek  
movie, not simply to do as he pleased. There was just enough overlap  
to suck the soul out of the franchise, to whatever extent the soul of  
Trek still exists post-TNG.

Likewise, I doubt Paramount really cares that much about the anachronistic token diversity that is being pushed in Discovery. Someone was simply able to sell them on the notion that they'll get a larger audience (and thus larger profits) if they hype that angle. And, in the short term, that will probably be true. But short term planning is *\*not\** a wise thing to do when you have a brand that you want to build a lasting value.

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Trek Fashion (Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics)

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 20:49:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: Doc O'Leary

For your reference, records indicate that  
A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

> In article <oiuf5l\$5t2\$4@dont-email.me>, Doc O'Leary  
> <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>  
>> The issue I would take with that is that, despite there being a *\*lot\**  
>> of wardrobe changes over the years (and even just in TOS if you look  
>> at how Shatner's vanity had him in at least half a dozen different  
>> shirts), I have never heard of any reasonable in-universe explanation  
>> why Star Fleet keeps deciding to re-tailor their standard uniforms so  
>> often. If there were ever a topic in the Star Trek universe to bring  
>> in . . . stereotypical token "diversity", that would be it. Tell  
>> *\*that\** story; it'd be a fun watch!  
>  
>  
> My own handwaving about that revolves around some psychologist at  
> Starfleet believing that changing the outfits as often as they did kept  
> morale up on long voyages. Since Trek people can produce whatever they  
> want in any quantity, coming up with new uniforms every so often  
> wouldn't be much of a problem. Maybe they even had Uniform of the  
> Month contests.

Heh. That would be a hilarious show! Star Trek meets The Office meets Project Runway. I would definitely watch something like that.

And even if it *\*is\** easy in-universe to just have the replicator kick out

the new designs, it would be maddening from a human perspective to have to constantly adjust to new rank designations and other details. I mean, really, what's the protocol for using that side flap for the version that started with Khan? Just when you figure it all out, they decide to change it all again! Yet another military pork project. :-)

--

"Also . . . I can kill you with my brain."  
River Tam, Trash, Firefly

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 20:49:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj10m3\$15j\$2@dont-email.me>, dtravel@sonic.net wrote:

> On 6/28/2017 11:15 AM, Ubiquitous wrote:

>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>> For your reference, records indicate that

>>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>>> J J Abrams basically stood over the dying body of 'Star Trek' telling

>>>> fans "Hey, look at me, I'm so popular that I can do whatever I want to

>>>> your beloved show!" while he gave fans the finger with one hand and

>>>> masturbated with the other.

>>>

>>> I'm not so sure that was the message to the fans, or just to Paramount

>>> (or whoever it is that owns Trek these days). It *was* a dying

>>> franchise, by my measure due in large part to them cranking out crap

>>> after TNG went off the air. They *did* need a change of pace, and

>>> unfortunately they did it by chasing after the "action movie" audience.

>>> My hope is always that a new TV series would be able to have the depth

>>> needed to really re-establish the franchise with the types of fans

>>> older Trek attracted, but Discovery seems to be along the same lines as

>>> the other newer Trek series, being terrible and thinking they can get

>>> away with it just because it's *said* to be set in the Trek universe.

>>

>> That reminds me of the puchline of a joke that includes "slapping `Trek`

>> on it's title".

>>

> That would seem to imply that Abrams *isn't* the punchline to that joke.

Oh, this predates Abrams by a decade or two.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 21:03:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <1alxvejdr2b4z.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, Lance Corporal  
Hammer Schultz <starfist@gmail.invalid> wrote:

> On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>  
>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>> his body.  
>  
> You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge  
> isn't normal?

Only on Thanksgiving.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Ubiquitous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 21:13:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
  
>>>> >> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> >> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> >> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > They explained that.  
>>>>  
>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>  
>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>  
>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces

>> a holographic message when reassembled.

>>

>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!

>

> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?

Nope, it was all the humanoids (and a way to explain why all the aliens looked humanoid).

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Chase\\_\(Star\\_Trek:\\_The\\_Next\\_Generation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Chase_(Star_Trek:_The_Next_Generation))

> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
> wouldn't work.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 21:16:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj10v6\$7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
wrote:

> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>> In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,

>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>

>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> > On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> >>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing

>>>> >>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the

>>>> >>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> They explained that.

>>>> >

>>>> > Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that

>>>> > the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>>>> > look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>>>>

>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to

>>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

>>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

>>>>

>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces  
>>> a  
>>> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>  
>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>  
>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>  
> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
> evolving independently rather than being seeded.

Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.

>  
>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
>> wouldn't work.  
>  
> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.

Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.

"The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.

How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard knowing?

Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.

oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!

Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.

How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3 months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?

Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?

The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine my surprise.

Troi is annoying.

Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor had already been to?

If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet, why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?

How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?

Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer program to find the missing fragment?

Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once supported life?

How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?

How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are, which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.

God this is a lousy show.

Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 21:17:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj120I\$den\$3@dont-email.me>,  
Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying  
>> him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated  
>> backwards.  
>  
> Why do you think they have any investment in the Trek universe greater  
> than that of making a profit? The pitch was to make a successful Trek



- > movie, not simply to do as he pleased. There was just enough overlap
- > to suck the soul out of the franchise, to whatever extent the soul of
- > Trek still exists post-TNG.
- >
- > Likewise, I doubt Paramount really cares that much about the
- > anachronistic token diversity that is being pushed in Discovery.
- > Someone was simply able to sell them on the notion that they'll get a
- > larger audience (and thus larger profits) if they hype that angle. And,
- > in the short term, that will probably be true. But short term planning
- > is \*not\* a wise thing to do when you have a brand that you want to build
- > a lasting value.

Does Paramount have anything to do with STD? I thought they had the movies, and CBASS has the TV shows.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 21:25:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <280620171703295315%nope@noway.com>,  
A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

- > In article <1alxvejdr2b4z.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, Lance Corporal
- > Hammer Schultz <starfist@gmail.invalid> wrote:
- >
- >> On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:
- >>
- >>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,
- >>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying
- >>> his body.
- >>
- >> You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge
- >> isn't normal?
- >
- > Only on Thanksgiving.

He was synthetic meatloaf made to look like Scotty's nephew ...

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 22:25:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <anim8rfsk-F3CA04.14255328062017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> In article <280620171703295315%nope@noway.com>,  
> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <1alxvejdr2b4z.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, Lance Corporal  
>> Hammer Schultz <starfist@gmail.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>>>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>>>> his body.  
>>>  
>>> You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge  
>>> isn't normal?  
>>  
>> Only on Thanksgiving.  
>  
> He was synthetic meatloaf made to look like Scotty's nephew ...

Reminds me. Gene Roddenberry's only appearance on STAR TREK is in that episode, "Charlie X." He supplied the voice of the cook who calls Kirk on the bridge to say that all the synthie stuff has been replaced with real turkeys.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2017 23:59:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 1:02 PM, Doc O'Leary wrote:

> For your reference, records indicate that  
> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>  
>> He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying  
>> him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated  
>> backwards.  
>  
> Why do you think they have any investment in the Trek universe greater

> than that of making a profit? The pitch was to make a successful Trek  
> movie, not simply to do as he pleased. There was just enough overlap  
> to suck the soul out of the franchise, to whatever extent the soul of  
> Trek still exists post-TNG.  
>  
> Likewise, I doubt Paramount really cares that much about the  
> anachronistic token diversity that is being pushed in Discovery.  
> Someone was simply able to sell them on the notion that they'll get a  
> larger audience (and thus larger profits) if they hype that angle. And,  
> in the short term, that will probably be true. But short term planning  
> is *\*not\** a wise thing to do when you have a brand that you want to build  
> a lasting value.

>  
Let me expand a sentence in my original post. "He didn't dare aim any  
of that \_disrespect\_ at Paramount...". The fact that Paramount was just  
as willing to urinate on the fan base doesn't make what Abrams did any  
better, it just helps explain \_why\_ he was given so much money to do so  
with. And Paramount being merely indifferent means he or some other  
film maker could have tried to retain the spirit of the original.

But the publicity and Abrams comments about making Trek and the  
decisions that were made BY Abrams make it clear that he was the driving  
force behind the yellow rain.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 00:00:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 2:03 PM, A Friend wrote:

> In article <1alxvejdr2b4z.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, Lance Corporal  
> Hammer Schultz <starfist@gmail.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>  
>>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>>> his body.  
>>  
>> You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge  
>> isn't normal?  
>  
> Only on Thanksgiving.  
>

I am not coming to your house for the holidays.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 00:02:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 2:17 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <oj120I\$den\$3@dont-email.me>,  
> Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:  
>  
>> For your reference, records indicate that  
>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying  
>>> him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated  
>>> backwards.  
>>  
>> Why do you think they have any investment in the Trek universe greater  
>> than that of making a profit? The pitch was to make a successful Trek  
>> movie, not simply to do as he pleased. There was just enough overlap  
>> to suck the soul out of the franchise, to whatever extent the soul of  
>> Trek still exists post-TNG.  
>>  
>> Likewise, I doubt Paramount really cares that much about the  
>> anachronistic token diversity that is being pushed in Discovery.  
>> Someone was simply able to sell them on the notion that theyâ€™™ get a  
>> larger audience (and thus larger profits) if they hype that angle. And,  
>> in the short term, that will probably be true. But short term planning  
>> is \*not\* a wise thing to do when you have a brand that you want to build  
>> a lasting value.  
>  
> Does Paramount have anything to do with STD? I thought they had the  
> movies, and CBASS has the TV shows.  
>

This is all followup to my review of the first movie.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

---

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 00:02:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/28/2017 2:25 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

> In article <280620171703295315%nope@noway.com>,

> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

>

>> In article <1alxvejdr2b4z.dlg@starfist.thorsfinni>, Lance Corporal

>> Hammer Schultz <starfist@gmail.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> On Wed, 28 Jun 2017 09:57:18 -0700, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>

>>>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,

>>>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying

>>>> his body.

>>>

>>> You mean bringing a dead crew member up from engineering to the bridge

>>> isn't normal?

>>

>> Only on Thanksgiving.

>

> He was synthetic meatloaf made to look like Scotty's nephew ...

>

I'm not coming to your house for the holidays either.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Adam H. Kerman](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 00:31:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> Doc O'Leary <droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com> wrote:

>> Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

>>> He didn't dare aim any of that at Paramount, they were the ones paying

>>> him and would have canned his ass so fast the Earth would have rotated

>>> backwards.

>> Why do you think they have any investment in the Trek universe greater

>> than that of making a profit? The pitch was to make a successful Trek

>> movie, not simply to do as he pleased. There was just enough overlap

>> to suck the soul out of the franchise, to whatever extent the soul of

>> Trek still exists post-TNG.

>> Likewise, I doubt Paramount really cares that much about the  
>> anachronistic token diversity that is being pushed in Discovery.  
>> Someone was simply able to sell them on the notion that they'll get a  
>> larger audience (and thus larger profits) if they hype that angle. And,  
>> in the short term, that will probably be true. But short term planning  
>> is *\*not\** a wise thing to do when you have a brand that you want to build  
>> a lasting value.

> Does Paramount have anything to do with STD? I thought they had the  
> movies, and CBASS has the TV shows.

That's interesting. Paramount Television was re-instated in 2013.  
The old Paramount Television (ex-DesiLu) was merged with CBS Productions  
to become CBS Television Studios in 2006. All they've done that you've  
heard of was production partner on Minority Report television series.  
They have nothing to do with Star Trek.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 17:28:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 21:11 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <5953f104\$0\$703\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>

>> Op 28-6-2017 om 19:52 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> In article <5953e9cf\$0\$721\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>

>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> > Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:

>>>> >> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> >>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> >>>> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> >>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to

>>>> >>>>> *\*any\** line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the

>>>> >>>>> Director's Edition.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral

>>>> >>>>> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage

>>>> >>>>> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.

>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> >>> my head.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Nope. It's really like that.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> > alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> > any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> > Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>  
>>> Flag on Rayna, as she's just a sex doll, and her builder has plenty of  
>>> spares!  
>>>  
>>  
>> Yeah, but otoh hand Spock thought it was necessary that Kirk 'forgot'  
>> about that.  
>  
> Mind rape!  
>

Basically, yeah.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 17:36:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <oj10v6\$n7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>> In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,

>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>>> > Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for changing  
>>>> >>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within the  
>>>> >>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> They explained that.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> >> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> >> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>>>> > be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>>> > hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>>>  
>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of the  
>>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that produces  
>>>> a  
>>>> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>>  
>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>>  
>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>>  
>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
>  
> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
>  
>>  
>>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
>>> wouldn't work.  
>>  
>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
>  
> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>  
> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>  
> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard  
> knowing?



- >
- > Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.
- >
- > oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!
- >
- > Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.
- >
- > How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3
- > months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?

Optimism?

- >
- > Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?
- >
- > The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine
- > my surprise.

And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)

- >
- > Troi is annoying.
- >
- > Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's
- > following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor
- > had already been to?
- >
- > If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet,
- > why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?

Deals with the UFP?

- >
- > How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?
- >
- > Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer
- > program to find the missing fragment?
- >
- > Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once
- > supported life?
- >
- > How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the
- > wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the
- > right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?
- >
- > How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

Bad luck?

>  
> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of  
> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and  
> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are,  
> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.  
>  
> God this is a lousy show.

Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.

The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 19:56:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 11:57 AM:

> In article <ndn7lctf8t1983hiecmpsr3adinf1@jwbrown.co.uk>,  
> Jerry Brown <jerry@jwbrown.co.uk.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 07:58:57 -0400, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>  
>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
>>>> one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock

>>>> showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
>>>> of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
>>>> case?

>>>

>>> The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
>>> transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
>>> loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
>>> dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
>>> crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
>>> (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
>>> crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
>>> and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

>>

>> Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
>> nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
>> as extras on recent releases.

>

> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
> his body.

EXACTLY! If you're gonna cut the family ties reference, then don't make  
Scotty look like an idiot. Well, frankly, he would have looked like an  
idiot either way, but it would have been somewhat understandable if we'd  
known about the family ties all along.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 19:56:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:

> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:

>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:

>>>> > In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...

>>>> >

>>>> > [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)

>>>> >

>>>> > Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> > \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> > Director's Edition.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> > Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> > contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>>  
>>>> Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> my head.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Nope. It's really like that.  
>>  
>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>  
> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 19:57:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:53 PM:  
> In article <5953eb74\$0\$819\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 28-6-2017 om 04:07 schreef Obveeus:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 6/27/2017 4:09 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Obveeus sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 06:58 AM:  
>>>>  
>>>> > For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>>  
>>>> Weird. If I had to guess, I'd guess that there was a problem with the  
>>>> admiral actor or the admiral actress or both. I mean, if it was a time

>>>> issue, it's not as if they couldn't have shaved a bit of the pretty  
>>>> CGI overkill  
>>>  
>>> Are you talking about the universe's largest lice infestation? (the  
>>> bazillion glowing white 'dots')  
>>>  
>>>> All I know is that I was very disappointed with that first effort.  
>>>> Very disappointed. Lots of things and people to point fingers at,  
>>>> including a rusty cast that was years removed from working together as  
>>>> actors. And it showed. In the end, it's why I've always been such a  
>>>> fan of Nicholas Meyer for his work as director and uncredited  
>>>> screenwriter on II. For my money, and despite II's own flaws, he saved  
>>>> Trek.  
>>>  
>>> I agree that WRATH OF KHAN was a much better film...and, for that  
>>> matter, the best TREK film made.  
>>>  
>>  
>> I'm partial to Star Trek III myself. :-)  
>  
> Only because they kill David, but not nearly slowly or horribly enough.  
  
:)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2017 20:01:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <59553a8b\$0\$767\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <oj10v6\$n7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>>> >> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>> changing  
>>>> >>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within  
>>>> >>>> the  
>>>> >>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> They explained that.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> >>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> >>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>>>> >> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>>> >> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> > Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of  
>>>> > the  
>>>> > humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
>>>> > produces  
>>>> > a  
>>>> > holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> > I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>>>> >>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
>>>> >>>> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
>>>> >>>> wouldn't work.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard  
>>>> >>>> knowing?  
>>>> >>>>

>> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>  
>> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!  
>>  
>> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>  
>> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?  
>  
> Optimism?  
>  
>>  
>> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>  
>> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>> my surprise.  
>  
> And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
>  
>>  
>> Troi is annoying.  
>>  
>> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>> had already been to?  
>>  
>> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet,  
>> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>  
> Deals with the UFP?  
>  
>>  
>> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>  
>> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer  
>> program to find the missing fragment?  
>>  
>> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once  
>> supported life?  
>>  
>> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the  
>> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the  
>> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?  
>>  
>> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?  
>  
> Bad luck?  
>

>>  
>> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of  
>> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and  
>> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
>> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are,  
>> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.  
>>  
>> God this is a lousy show.  
>  
> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.  
>  
> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across  
> the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.

Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
\*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 11:54:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/27/2017 at 12:48 PM:  
>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 05:26 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> > anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/26/2017 at 09:55 PM:  
>>>> >> In article <oisgh3\$k9c\$2@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> I'm still not getting the girlfriend/THE FLY reference...  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> [https://youtu.be/Ro\\_QpDJX-Sk](https://youtu.be/Ro_QpDJX-Sk)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Anybody who thinks Robert Wise was a good director should listen to  
>>>> >> \*any\* line read in this. I got them to drop 'oh my God' from the  
>>>> >> Director's Edition.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The woman in the transporter is Vicd Admiral Lori Ciana, Admiral  
>>>> >> Nogura's staff whore, that he had enter a standard one year marriage  
>>>> >> contract with Kirk to distract him from regaining the Enterprise.  
>>>> >



>>>> > Okay, now I'm thinking that you and Obveeus are both just messing with  
>>>> > my head.  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> Nope. It's really like that.  
>>>  
>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>  
>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>  
> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>

And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 11:57:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:

> In article <59553a8b\$0\$767\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>

>> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> In article <oj10v6\$N7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> > In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,

>>>> > Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>>> >>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>>>> changing  
>>>> >>>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within  
>>>> >>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>> They explained that.  
>>>> >>>>>  
>>>> >>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> >>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> >>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed to  
>>>> >>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>>> >>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of  
>>>> >> the  
>>>> >> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
>>>> >> produces  
>>>> >> a  
>>>> >> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>>>>  
>>>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>>>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
>>>>  
>>>> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
>>>> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> > You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their portion  
>>>>> > wouldn't work.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
>>>>>  
>>>> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>>>>  
>>>> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>>>>  
>>>> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard  
>>>> knowing?

>>>  
>>> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>>  
>>> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!  
>>>  
>>> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>>  
>>> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>>> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?  
>>  
>> Optimism?  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>>  
>>> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>>> my surprise.  
>>  
>> And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Troi is annoying.  
>>>  
>>> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>>> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>>> had already been to?  
>>>  
>>> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet,  
>>> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>>  
>> Deals with the UFP?  
>>  
>>>  
>>> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>  
>>> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer  
>>> program to find the missing fragment?  
>>>  
>>> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once  
>>> supported life?  
>>>  
>>> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the  
>>> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the  
>>> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?  
>>>  
>>> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?  
>>  
>> Bad luck?

>>  
>>>  
>>> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of  
>>> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and  
>>> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
>>> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are,  
>>> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.  
>>>  
>>> God this is a lousy show.  
>>  
>> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.  
>>  
>> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across  
>> the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.  
>  
> Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
> the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
> \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.  
>

One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 12:27:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <59563c98\$0\$774\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <59553a8b\$0\$767\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> In article <oj10v6\$7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >> In article <oj0ro2\$2jg\$4@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>>>>> changing  
>>>> >>>>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within  
>>>> >>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> They explained that.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality  
>>>> >>>>>>> that  
>>>> >>>>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original  
>>>> >>>>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed  
>>>> >>>>>>> to  
>>>> >>>>>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there  
>>>> >>>>>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of  
>>>> >>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
>>>> >>>>>>> produces  
>>>> >>>>>>> a  
>>>> >>>>>>> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>>>> > evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
>>>>  
>>>> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
>>>> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
>>>>  
>>>> >

>>>> >> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their  
>>>> >> portion  
>>>> >> wouldn't work.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
>>>>  
>>>> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>>>>  
>>>> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>>>>  
>>>> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard  
>>>> knowing?  
>>>>  
>>>> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>>>  
>>>> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!  
>>>>  
>>>> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>>>  
>>>> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>>>> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?  
>>>  
>>> Optimism?  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>>>  
>>>> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>>>> my surprise.  
>>>  
>>> And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Troi is annoying.  
>>>>  
>>>> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>>>> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>>>> had already been to?  
>>>>  
>>>> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet,  
>>>> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>>>  
>>> Deals with the UFP?  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>>  
>>>> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer

>>>> program to find the missing fragment?

>>>>

>>>> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once supported life?

>>>>

>>>> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?

>>>>

>>>> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

>>>

>>> Bad luck?

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are, which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.

>>>>

>>>> God this is a lousy show.

>>>

>>> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.

>>>

>>> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.

>>

>> Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.

>>

>

> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.

THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100 years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> > In article <oj10v6\$7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>

>>>> > wrote:

>>>> >> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> >>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>>> >>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for

>>>> >>>>>>>> changing

>>>> >>>>>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes within

>>>> >>>>>>>> the

>>>> >>>>>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> They explained that.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality

>>>> >>>>>>>> that

>>>> >>>>>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the original

>>>> >>>>>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids supposed

>>>> >>>>>>>> to

>>>> >>>>>>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that there

>>>> >>>>>>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of

>>>> >>>>>>>> the

>>>> >>>>>>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that

>>>> >>>>>>>> produces

>>>> >>>>>>>> a

>>>> >>>>>>>> holographic message when reassembled.

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?

>>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans

>>>> >>>>>>>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.

>>>> >>>>>>>>



>>>> > Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
 >>>> > makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their  
 >>>> >>> portion  
 >>>> >>> wouldn't work.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without Picard  
 >>>> > knowing?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The Avengers!  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
 >>>> > months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to infinity?  
 >>>>  
 >>>> Optimism?  
 >>>>  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
 >>>> > my surprise.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
 >>>>  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Troi is annoying.  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
 >>>> > following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
 >>>> > had already been to?  
 >>>> >  
 >>>> > If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a planet,  
 >>>> > why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
 >>>>  
 >>>> Deals with the UFP?  
 >>>>

>>>> >  
>>>> > How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer  
>>>> > program to find the missing fragment?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once  
>>>> > supported life?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the  
>>>> > wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the  
>>>> > right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?  
>>>>  
>>>> Bad luck?  
>>>>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of  
>>>> > worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and  
>>>> > who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
>>>> > related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are,  
>>>> > which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > God this is a lousy show.  
>>>>  
>>>> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.  
>>>>  
>>>> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across  
>>>> the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.  
>>>  
>>> Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
>>> the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
>>> \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.  
>>>  
>>  
>> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the  
>> Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some  
>> gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that  
>> Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.  
>  
> THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem  
> and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100  
> years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!

Say what?

One hundred years is pretty insignificant compared to the age of a planet.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 13:51:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 30-6-2017 om 15:40 schreef Ubiquitous:

> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> > Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

<snip>

>>>> >>

>>>> >> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer

>>>> >> program to find the missing fragment?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once

>>>> >> supported life?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the

>>>> >> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the

>>>> >> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

>>>> >

>>>> > Bad luck?

>>>> >

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of

>>>> >> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and

>>>> >> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are

>>>> >> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy' are,

>>>> >> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta quadrant.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> God this is a lousy show.

>>>> >

>>>> > Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.

>>>> >

>>>> > The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across

>>>> > the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.

>>>>

>>>> Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
>>>> the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
>>>> \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the  
>>> Federation'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some  
>>> gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that  
>>> Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.  
>>  
>> THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem  
>> and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100  
>> years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!  
>  
> Say what?  
> One hundred years is pretty insignificant compared to the age of a planet.  
>

Plus, there also could have been a time warp or something.

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 14:00:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj5k61\$fj3\$17@dont-email.me>,  
Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> > Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> >> In article <oj10v6\$n7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> >> wrote:  
>>>> >>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>  
>>>> >>>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>>>>> changing  
>>>> >>>>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes  
>>>> >>>>>>> within  
>>>> >>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> They explained that.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality  
>>>> >>>>>>> that  
>>>> >>>>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the  
>>>> >>>>>>> original  
>>>> >>>>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids  
>>>> >>>>>>> supposed  
>>>> >>>>>>> to  
>>>> >>>>>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that  
>>>> >>>>>>> there  
>>>> >>>>>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most  
>>>> >>>>>>> of  
>>>> >>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
>>>> >>>>>>> produces  
>>>> >>>>>>> a  
>>>> >>>>>>> holographic message when reassembled.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>>>> >>>>>>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
>>>> >>>>>>> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their  
>>>> >>>>>>> portion  
>>>> >>>>>>> wouldn't work.  
>>>> >>>>>>>

>>>> >>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without  
>>>> >> Picard  
>>>> >> knowing?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The  
>>>> >> Avengers!  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>>>> >> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to  
>>>> >> infinity?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Optimism?  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>>>> >> my surprise.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Troi is annoying.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>>>> >> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>>>> >> had already been to?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a  
>>>> >> planet,  
>>>> >> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Deals with the UFP?  
>>>> >  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer

>>>> >> program to find the missing fragment?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once

>>>> >> supported life?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the

>>>> >> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the

>>>> >> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?

>>>> >>

>>>> >> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

>>>> >

>>>> > Bad luck?

>>>> >

>>>> >>

>>>> >> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch

>>>> >> of

>>>> >> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included

>>>> >> and

>>>> >> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are

>>>> >> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy'

>>>> >> are,

>>>> >> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta

>>>> >> quadrant.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> God this is a lousy show.

>>>> >

>>>> > Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.

>>>> >

>>>> > The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across

>>>> > the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.

>>>>

>>>> Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever

>>>> the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is

>>>> \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.

>>>>

>>>

>>> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the

>>> Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some

>>> gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that

>>> Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.

>>

>> THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem

>> and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100

>> years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!

>

> Say what?

> One hundred years is pretty insignificant compared to the age of a planet.

But the Miri civilization was identical to 1960s Mayberry, and yet dated from a hundred years earlier. So it was there first.

Now maybe Don Knotts went back in time and messed stuff up, but the Miri world was the one with identical land masses, so ... it's either the original or an earlier copy of something else, but no way our Earth was first.

Same thing for the duplicate civilization in THE OMEGA GLORY. There was no mention of identical land masses, but if Tracey was right, the good guys lost a war the the Godless commies more than a thousand years before, so it's identical civilization is way older than the Miri world, much less Earth.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 14:35:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 30-6-2017 om 16:00 schreef anim8rfsk:  
> In article <oj5k61\$Fj3\$17@dont-email.me>,  
> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>  
>> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>> >> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> >>> In article <oj10v6\$N7c\$1@dont-email.me>, Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com>  
>>>> >>> wrote:  
>>>> >>>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> changing  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the changes  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> within  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>> the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>> original cast era (such as the Klingon's face/head)?  
>>>> >>>>>>>>>>>



>>>> >>>>>>>> They explained that.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> that  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> original  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> look was too simplistic and lame for a film.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> supposed  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> to  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of racist that  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> there  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> of  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> the  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> produces  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> a  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> holographic message when reassembled.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Wiki says humans, Kardashians, Klingons and Romulans are involved. It  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> makes sense for Kardashians to be non human.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> portion  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> wouldn't work.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> Picard  
 >>>> >>>>>>>> knowing?  
 >>>> >>>>>>>>

>>>> >>> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The  
>>>> >>> Avengers!  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>>>> >>> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to  
>>>> >>> infinity?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Optimism?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>>>> >>> my surprise.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> And ironically the old friend once WAS a doctor. :-)  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Troi is annoying.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>>>> >>> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>>>> >>> had already been to?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a  
>>>> >>> planet,  
>>>> >>> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Deals with the UFP?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer  
>>>> >>> program to find the missing fragment?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once  
>>>> >>> supported life?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the  
>>>> >>> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the  
>>>> >>> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?

>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Bad luck?  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch  
>>>> >>> of  
>>>> >>> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included  
>>>> >>> and  
>>>> >>> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
>>>> >>> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy'  
>>>> >>> are,  
>>>> >>> which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta  
>>>> >>> quadrant.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> God this is a lousy show.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across  
>>>> >> the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
>>>> > the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
>>>> > \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.  
>>>> >  
>>>>  
>>>> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the  
>>>> Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some  
>>>> gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that  
>>>> Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.  
>>>  
>>> THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem  
>>> and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100  
>>> years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!  
>>  
>> Say what?  
>> One hundred years is pretty insignificant compared to the age of a planet.  
>  
> But the Miri civilization was identical to 1960s Mayberry, and yet dated  
> from a hundred years earlier. So it was there first.  
>  
> Now maybe Don Knotts went back in time and messed stuff up, but the Miri  
> world was the one with identical land masses, so ... it's either the  
> original or an earlier copy of something else, but no way our Earth was  
> first.  
>  
> Same thing for the duplicate civilization in THE OMEGA GLORY. There was  
> no mention of identical land masses, but if Tracey was right, the good

> guys lost a war the the Godless commies more than a thousand years  
> before, so it's identical civilization is way older than the Miri world,  
> much less Earth.  
>

Some sort of parallel evolution.

Roughly following the same type of pattern.

IRL something like that actually happens / has happened in biology.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parallel\\_evolution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parallel_evolution)

Of course development in our beloved Trek Universe is even closer than that. :-)

--

Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jerry Brown](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 17:18:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, 29 Jun 2017 14:56:04 -0500, "Jim G."  
<[jimgysin@geemail.com](mailto:jimgysin@geemail.com).invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 11:57 AM:  
>> In article <[ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsrsr3adinfpf1@jwbrown.co.uk](mailto:ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsrsr3adinfpf1@jwbrown.co.uk)>,  
>> Jerry Brown <[jerry@jwbrown.co.uk](mailto:jerry@jwbrown.co.uk).invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> On Tue, 27 Jun 2017 07:58:57 -0400, Obveeus <[Obveeus@aol.com](mailto:Obveeus@aol.com)> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> On 6/26/2017 11:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Seriously? I never knew that, and I've seen the movie many times.  
>>>>  
>>>> For whatever reason, the plot point never made it into the film.  
>>>>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > I knew that the young Vulcan destined to never take Spock's place was  
>>>> > one of the victims (since Decker had to pull double-duty until Spock

>>>> > showed up), but when did they tell us that the other victim was the love  
>>>> > of Kirk's life? And why didn't he react more strongly if that was the  
>>>> > case?

>>>>

>>>> The extended scene of Kirk walking around the ship in a daze after the  
>>>> transporter accident was supposed to be all about him processing the  
>>>> loss of his love. Maybe the director decided that it still had that  
>>>> dramatic effect (showing that Kirk felt intense loss at the death of a  
>>>> crew member) without identifying the loss as something personal to Kirk  
>>>> (which could diminish the idea that he feels for every member of the  
>>>> crew or could make him look callous for recovering in just a few minutes  
>>>> and getting back to work after the loss of his significant other)?

>>>

>>> Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
>>> nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
>>> as extras on recent releases.

>>

>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>> his body.

>

> EXACTLY! If you're gonna cut the family ties reference, then don't make  
> Scotty look like an idiot. Well, frankly, he would have looked like an  
> idiot either way, but it would have been somewhat understandable if we'd  
> known about the family ties all along.

The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to  
sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
attack.

--

Jerry Brown

A cat may look at a king  
(but probably won't bother)

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:32:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:

> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:

>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:

>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>>>

>>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In

>>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>>  
>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>  
>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>  
> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.

And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:33:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:

> On Thu, 29 Jun 2017 14:56:04 -0500, "Jim G."  
> <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 11:57 AM:  
>>> In article <ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsrsr3adinfpf1@jwbrown.co.uk>,  
>>> Jerry Brown <jerry@jwbrown.co.uk.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
>>>> nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
>>>> as extras on recent releases.  
>>>  
>>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>>> his body.  
>>  
>> EXACTLY! If you're gonna cut the family ties reference, then don't make  
>> Scotty look like an idiot. Well, frankly, he would have looked like an  
>> idiot either way, but it would have been somewhat understandable if we'd  
>> known about the family ties all along.  
>  
> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to  
> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
> attack.

That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems unfortunate that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of explanation instead.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:36:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:

> Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:

>> On Thu, 29 Jun 2017 14:56:04 -0500, "Jim G."

>> <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>

>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 11:57 AM:

>>>> In article <ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsrsr3adinfpf1@jwbrown.co.uk>,

>>>> Jerry Brown <jerry@jwbrown.co.uk.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's

>>>> > nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available

>>>> > as extras on recent releases.

>>>>

>>>> And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,

>>>> and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying

>>>> his body.

>>>

>>> EXACTLY! If you're gonna cut the family ties reference, then don't make

>>> Scotty look like an idiot. Well, frankly, he would have looked like an

>>> idiot either way, but it would have been somewhat understandable if we'd

>>> known about the family ties all along.

>>

>> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to

>> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's

>> attack.

>

> That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems unfortunate

> that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on

> the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of

> explanation instead.

And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies, but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but

not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:43:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> > alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> > any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> > Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >  
>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>  
>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>>  
>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
>  
> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.

Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
Gary Mitchell planned out for her.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:49:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



On 6/30/2017 12:36 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:

>> Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:

>>> On Thu, 29 Jun 2017 14:56:04 -0500, "Jim G."

>>> <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 11:57 AM:

>>>> > In article <ndn7lctf8t1983hieecmpsr3adinf1@jwbrown.co.uk>,

>>>> > Jerry Brown <jerry@jwbrown.co.uk.invalid> wrote:

>>>> >

>>>> >> Similarly STWoK removed references to Ensign Preston being Scotty's  
>>>> >> nephew, possibly for the same reason. IIRC these scenes are available  
>>>> >> as extras on recent releases.

>>>> >

>>>> > And that was just stupid. They saved about 10 seconds of screen time,  
>>>> > and made you wonder why the Hell Scotty was wandering around carrying  
>>>> > his body.

>>>>

>>>> EXACTLY! If you're gonna cut the family ties reference, then don't make  
>>>> Scotty look like an idiot. Well, frankly, he would have looked like an  
>>>> idiot either way, but it would have been somewhat understandable if  
>>>> we'd

>>>> known about the family ties all along.

>>>

>>> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to  
>>> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
>>> attack.

>>

>> That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems unfortunate  
>> that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on  
>> the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of  
>> explanation instead.

>

> And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies,  
> but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but  
> not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.

>

I think the studios view it as "if you can pay enough attention to the  
story to find head-scratching stuff to complain about, the visuals  
weren't doing their job."

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>> anim8rfsk@cox.net wrote:

>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 22:01 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> > Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>>> >> Op 28-6-2017 om 23:16 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> >>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>> On 6/28/2017 3:13 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>>>> Ubiquitous <weberm@polaris.net> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>> droleary@2017usenet1.subsume.com wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>> On 6/26/2017 3:30 PM, anim8rfsk wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Obveeus <Obveeus@aol.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>>>>>> If you are going to rag on the show as being incompetent for  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> changing the look of 'known things', how do you resolve the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> changes within the original cast era (such as the Klingon's  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> face/head)?

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> They explained that.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Yep...with hand-wavium silliness that negated the simple reality that  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> the Trek film modified the look of the Klingons because the  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> original look was too simplistic and lame for a film.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> And yet the Vulcans got a pass. Aren't all of us humanoids  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> supposed to be closely related in Trek anyway? Seems kind of  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> racist that there hasn't been a lot more interbreeding . . .

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Yeah, there was an ep of TNG in which it was established that most of  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> the humanoids in this galaxy have something encoded in their DNA that  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> produces a holographic message when reassembled.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> I \_HATE\_ "magic DNA" eps!

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> Yeah, wasn't it humans, Vulcans, Klingons, and Romulans?

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>> I think it was just Vulcans, Romulans, and Klingons...with Humans  
>>>> >>>> evolving independently rather than being seeded.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>>>>>>> You'd think the Klingonese DNA would be so screwed up that their  
>>>> >>>>>>>>> portion wouldn't work.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>>> Well, it is now...ever since the bumpy head event.

>>>> >>>>>>>>>

>>>> >>> Oh, Hell, I'll pull it up on the Netflix. First time for TNG.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> "The Chase" - TNG always did have uninspired titles.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How does Will sneak this guy into the observation lounge without  
>>>> >>> Picard  
>>>> >>> knowing?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Best part of TNG - the TMP theme song.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> oh, God, no, guest star Tara King, the woman that destroyed The  
>>>> >>> Avengers!  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Troy is real. Not Troi, Troy.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How do you possibly know that finding an unknown treasure will take 3  
>>>> >>> months to less than a year? Wouldn't the time frame be zero to  
>>>> >>> infinity?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why is Picard talking to an Irish setter in a blue uniform?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> The incompetent ship's doctor can't save Picard's old friend. Imagine  
>>>> >>> my surprise.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Troi is annoying.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why would the Professor's diary say where to go after this, if he's  
>>>> >>> following a trail? Why are they going back to a planet the professor  
>>>> >>> had already been to?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> If the Klingons can just effortlessly destroy the biosphere of a  
>>>> >>> planet,  
>>>> >>> why haven't they killed everybody everywhere yet?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How can you not take a biosample from a planet with the transporter?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why does Picard assign the incompetent doctor to design a computer  
>>>> >>> program to find the missing fragment?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> Why does a lifeless planet having once had an ocean mean it once  
>>>> >>> supported life?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How did the Kardashians go to the wrong planet, figure out it was the  
>>>> >>> wrong planet, through some mysterious mechanism figure out what the  
>>>> >>> right planet is, and get there 30 seconds after the Enterprise?  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> How come the ancient alien is one of Odo's people?  
>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> Okay, the final answer is - there's a bunch of fragments from a bunch of  
>>>> >>> worlds, and it's totally unclear how many, much less who is included and  
>>>> >>> who is not. But apparently Kardashians, Romulans, and Earthers are  
>>>> >>> related, and presumably all humanoids in 'this part of the galaxy'  
>>>> >>> are, which doesn't explain all the humanoids over there in the Delta  
>>>> >>> quadrant.  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> God this is a lousy show.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Extremely bad science. That's not how it works.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The Preservers as an explanation was much cooler for human types across  
>>>> >> the galaxy. Parallel evolution would be slightly more plausible.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Yep. We already had the Preservers and Sargon's people. And whoever  
>>>> > the Hell built Miri's planet, which looks just like Earth, but is  
>>>> > \*older\* There was no reason for this stupid crap episode at all.  
>>>>  
>>>> One of my reference books (forgot which one, maybe 'Worlds of the  
>>>> Federation?'), speculated that Earth's solar system went through some  
>>>> gigantic cosmic replicator (or something like that), resulting in that  
>>>> Earth duplicate in 'Miri'.  
>>>>  
>>> THE SHAT got into it a little bit in his Trek books. The big problem  
>>> and inescapable conclusion is that given that the Miri world is like 100  
>>> years older than Earth, there's just no way that Earth is the original!  
>>  
>> Say what?  
>> One hundred years is pretty insignificant compared to the age of a planet.  
>  
> But the Miri civilization was identical to 1960s Mayberry, and yet dated  
> from a hundred years earlier. So it was there first.

Oh, you weren't talking about the age of the planet.

--

Dems & the media want Trump to be more like Obama, but then he'd  
have to audit liberals & wire tap reporters' phones.

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 19:59:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>

>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
 >>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
 >>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
 >>>> > Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
 >>>> >> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
 >>>> >> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
 >>>> >> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> > Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
 >>>> > Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
 >>>>  
 >>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
 >>>  
 >>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
 >>  
 >> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
 >> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
 >  
 > Getting preggers with a idjot son might have been part of the campaign  
 > Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
 >

Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?

--  
 Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
 Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 20:10:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <anim8rfsk-06B319.07004630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
 anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> Same thing for the duplicate civilization in THE OMEGA GLORY. There was  
 > no mention of identical land masses, but if Tracey was right, the good  
 > guys lost a war the the Godless commies more than a thousand years

> before, so it's identical civilization is way older than the Miri world,  
> much less Earth.

"Omega Glory" is the only Trek episode that was written top to toe by Gene Roddenberry, from his own idea, without any rewriting by anybody. And it shows.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 22:08:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5956ad8f\$0\$777\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> >> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> >>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> >>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after  
>>>> >>> all.  
>>>> >>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>>> >> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>>>>  
>>>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
>>>  
>>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>>  
>> Getting preggers with a idjot son might have been part of the campaign  
>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>>  
>  
> Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?

Yes. Yes, I am.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2017 22:29:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <anim8rfsk-AC8834.15081630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

```
> In article <5956ad8f$0$777$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>> In article <oj68ol$P1s$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>>>> > Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> >>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> >>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> >>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after  
>>>> >>>> all.  
>>>> >>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >>>>  
>>>> >>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS  
>>>> >>> Edith  
>>>> >>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>>>> >  
>>>> > And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
>>>>  
>>>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>>>>  
>>> Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
>>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>>>  
>>
```

>> Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?

>

> Yes. Yes, I am.

He must have been evil, since Mitchell had been Kirk's best friend since their Academy days, yet he is never mentioned (or apparently even thought of) ever again.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 00:08:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <300620171829141071%nope@noway.com>,  
A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:

> In article <anim8rfsk-AC8834.15081630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

>

>> In article <5956ad8f\$0\$777\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,

>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

>>

>>> Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:

>>>> In article <oj68ol\$p1s\$1@dont-email.me>,

>>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> > Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:

>>>> >> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:

>>>> >>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the

>>>> >>>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front.

>>>> >>>>> In

>>>> >>>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life

>>>> >>>>> after

>>>> >>>>> all.

>>>> >>>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)

>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS

>>>> >>>>> Edith

>>>> >>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)

>>>> >>

>>>> >> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.

>>>> >



>>>> > And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>>> > future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>>>>  
>>>> Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
>>>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?  
>>  
>> Yes. Yes, I am.  
>  
>  
> He must have been evil, since Mitchell had been Kirk's best friend  
> since their Academy days, yet he is never mentioned (or apparently even  
> thought of) ever again.

Plus he didn't even know what Kirk's middle name was. How do you forget something like 'Tiberius'?

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 00:22:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:43 PM:

> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>

>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:

>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:

>>>> > Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> >> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> >> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after all.  
>>>> >> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)

>>>> >>

>>>> > Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith

>>>> > Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.

>>>>

>>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)

>>>

>>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.

>>  
>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>  
> Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.

So Gary was poking holes in Kirk's Starfleet-issued condoms while  
keeping him well stocked with the latest in smooth jazz? What a bastage. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 00:23:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:49 PM:

> On 6/30/2017 12:36 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:  
>>> Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:  
>>>>  
>>>> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to  
>>>> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
>>>> attack.  
>>>  
>>> That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems unfortunate  
>>> that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on  
>>> the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of  
>>> explanation instead.  
>>  
>> And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies,  
>> but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but  
>> not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.  
>>  
> I think the studios view it as "if you can pay enough attention to the  
> story to find head-scratching stuff to complain about, the visuals  
> weren't doing their job."

I'm starting to think that you might have a cynical perspective on this  
sort of thing. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 00:24:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

A Friend sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 05:29 PM:

> In article <anim8rfsk-AC8834.15081630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <5956ad8f\$0\$777\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>>  
>>>> Getting pregggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
>>>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>>>>  
>>> Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?  
>>  
>> Yes. Yes, I am.  
>  
> He must have been evil, since Mitchell had been Kirk's best friend  
> since their Academy days, yet he is never mentioned (or apparently even  
> thought of) ever again.

Where Kirk is concerned, there doesn't seem to be a ton of longevity  
when it comes to things like "best friend" and "love of his life."

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita  
Bustillos, WYNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 00:28:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 6/30/2017 5:23 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:49 PM:  
>> On 6/30/2017 12:36 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>> Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:  
>>>> Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to

>>>> > sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
>>>> > attack.  
>>>>  
>>>> That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems  
>>>> unfortunate  
>>>> that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on  
>>>> the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of  
>>>> explanation instead.  
>>>  
>>> And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies,  
>>> but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but  
>>> not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.  
>>>  
>> I think the studios view it as "if you can pay enough attention to the  
>> story to find head-scratching stuff to complain about, the visuals  
>> weren't doing their job."  
>  
> I'm starting to think that you might have a cynical perspective on this  
> sort of thing. :)  
>  
You'd think that would keep me from being disappointed very often, yet  
still I am.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 01:15:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <oj6ppr\$dun\$1@dont-email.me>,  
"Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:43 PM:  
>> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> > Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> >> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> >>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front. In  
>>>> >>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life after  
>>>> >>> all.

>>>> >>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >>>  
>>>> >> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS Edith  
>>>> >> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>>>>  
>>>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
>>>  
>>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>>  
>> Getting preggers with a idjot son might have been part of the campaign  
>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>  
> So Gary was poking holes in Kirk's Starfleet-issued condoms while  
> keeping him well stocked with the latest in smooth jazz? What a bastage. :)

He could at least have fixed Kirk up with somebody that actually \*liked\* Kirk.

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Wouter Valentijn](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 13:58:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Op 1-7-2017 om 02:08 schreef anim8rfsk:  
> In article <300620171829141071%nope@noway.com>,  
> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:  
>  
>> In article <anim8rfsk-AC8834.15081630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
>> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>> In article <5956ad8f\$0\$777\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> > In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> > "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >  
>>>> >> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>>>> >>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> >>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:

>>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
 >>>> >>>>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front.  
 >>>> >>>>>> In  
 >>>> >>>>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life  
 >>>> >>>>>> after  
 >>>> >>>>>> all.  
 >>>> >>>>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS  
 >>>> >>>>>> Edith  
 >>>> >>>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
 >>>> >>>>>>  
 >>>> >>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
 >>>> >>>  
 >>>> >> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
 >>>> >> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> > Getting pregggers with a idjiot son might have been part of the campaign  
 >>>> > Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> Yes. Yes, I am.  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >> He must have been evil, since Mitchell had been Kirk's best friend  
 >>>> >> since their Academy days, yet he is never mentioned (or apparently even  
 >>>> >> thought of) ever again.  
 >>>> >>  
 >>>> > Plus he didn't even know what Kirk's middle name was. How do you forget  
 >>>> > something like 'Tiberius'?  
 >>>> >>>>  
 >>>> >>>>

Could be that he did know, but wanted to tease Kirk, who in the academy  
 was considered a 'walking stack of books' and very disciplined. Maybe  
 even 'robot' like in his eyes. Remember the 'R' that robots got in their  
 name in Asimov's robot novels?  
 Okay. Reaching now.

--  
 Wouter Valentijn [www.j3v.net](http://www.j3v.net)

"Be yourself no matter what they say"

Sting ("Englishman in New York")

liam@mail

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 16:15:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <5957aa8c\$0\$736\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:

> Op 1-7-2017 om 02:08 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>> In article <300620171829141071%nope@noway.com>,  
>> A Friend <nope@noway.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> In article <anim8rfsk-AC8834.15081630062017@news.easynews.com>,  
>>> anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> In article <5956ad8f\$0\$777\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
>>>> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> > Op 30-6-2017 om 21:43 schreef anim8rfsk:  
>>>> >> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>>> >> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 06:54 AM:  
>>>> >>>> Op 29-6-2017 om 21:56 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>>> Wouter Valentijn sent the following on 06/28/2017 at 12:39 PM:  
>>>> >>>>>> Op 27-6-2017 om 22:10 schreef Jim G.:  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> So I've learned. Frankly, it's probably a good thing since the  
>>>> >>>>>>> alternative would have been a bit much on the Kirk-as-Romeo front.  
>>>> >>>>>>> In  
>>>> >>>>>>> any case, I now know that Ruth wasn't the love of Kirk's life  
>>>> >>>>>>> after  
>>>> >>>>>>> all.  
>>>> >>>>>>> Unless the love of his life changed from year to year. :)  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> Or Areel Shaw, or Janet Wallace also from the past and during TOS  
>>>> >>>>>>> Edith  
>>>> >>>>>>> Keeler, Miramanee, Rayna Kapec.  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>>>>> The concept of "love of Kirk's life" was clearly a fluid thing. :)  
>>>> >>>>>>>  
>>>> >>>> And there were fluids involved. Specially with Miramanee.  
>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>>> >>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
>>>> >> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >  
>>>> > Are you saying Gary was evil /before/ he got his powers?  
>>>>  
>>>> Yes. Yes, I am.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> He must have been evil, since Mitchell had been Kirk's best friend  
>>> since their Academy days, yet he is never mentioned (or apparently even  
>>> thought of) ever again.  
>>  
>> Plus he didn't even know what Kirk's middle name was. How do you forget  
>> something like 'Tiberius'?  
>>  
>  
>  
> Could be that he did know, but wanted to tease Kirk, who in the academy  
> was considered a 'walking stack of books' and very disciplined. Maybe  
> even 'robot' like in his eyes. Remember the 'R' that robots got in their  
> name in Asimov's robot novels?  
> Okay. Reaching now.

hee hee

--

Join your old RAT friends at  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1688985234647266/>

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2017 19:19:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally posted by: A Friend

In article <anim8rfsk-CFC0E4.09150501072017@news.easynews.com>,  
anim8rfsk <anim8rfsk@cox.net> wrote:

> In article <5957aa8c\$0\$736\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl>,  
> Wouter Valentijn <liam@valentijn.nu> wrote:  
>  
>> Op 1-7-2017 om 02:08 schreef anim8rfsk:



>>> Plus he didn't even know what Kirk's middle name was. How do you forget  
>>> something like 'Tiberius'?  
>>>  
>> Could be that he did know, but wanted to tease Kirk, who in the academy  
>> was considered a 'walking stack of books' and very disciplined. Maybe  
>> even 'robot' like in his eyes. Remember the 'R' that robots got in their  
>> name in Asimov's robot novels?  
>> Okay. Reaching now.  
>  
> hee hee

Maybe it was something like Mitchell thinking, "I know there's an R in  
it somewhere."

I expect the R. was supposed to stand for Roddenberry.

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2017 19:26:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 07:28 PM:

> On 6/30/2017 5:23 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>> Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:49 PM:  
>>> On 6/30/2017 12:36 PM, Jim G. wrote:  
>>>> Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:  
>>>> > Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:  
>>>> >>  
>>>> >> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to  
>>>> >> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's  
>>>> >> attack.  
>>>> >  
>>>> > That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems  
>>>> > unfortunate  
>>>> > that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on  
>>>> > the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of  
>>>> > explanation instead.  
>>>>  
>>>> And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies,  
>>>> but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but  
>>>> not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.  
>>>>  
>>> I think the studios view it as "if you can pay enough attention to the  
>>> story to find head-scratching stuff to complain about, the visuals  
>>> weren't doing their job."  
>>  
>> I'm starting to think that you might have a cynical perspective on this

>> sort of thing. :)  
>>  
> You'd think that would keep me from being disappointed very often, yet  
> still I am.

That's the sort of thing that should make you really disappointed with yourself.

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics  
Posted by [Jim G.](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2017 19:27:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 08:15 PM:

> In article <oj6ppr\$dun\$1@dont-email.me>,  
> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>

>> anim8rfsk sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:43 PM:

>>> In article <oj68ol\$P1s\$1@dont-email.me>,  
>>> "Jim G." <jimgysin@geemail.com.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>>> And Dr. Marcus. Apparently birth control isn't much of a thing in the  
>>>> future. Either that, or James T.'s swimmers are particularly robust.

>>>

>>> Getting preggers with a idiot son might have been part of the campaign  
>>> Gary Mitchell planned out for her.

>>

>> So Gary was poking holes in Kirk's Starfleet-issued condoms while  
>> keeping him well stocked with the latest in smooth jazz? What a bastage. :)

>

> He could at least have fixed Kirk up with somebody that actually \*liked\*  
> Kirk.

Well, she must have liked him well enough on \*some\* level. :)

--

Jim G. | A fan of the good and the bad, but not the mediocre  
"It smells like bad beer and worse choices. I'll make it work." – Rosita Bustillos, WYNNONNA EARP

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2017 21:14:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 7/4/2017 12:26 PM, Jim G. wrote:

> Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 07:28 PM:

>> On 6/30/2017 5:23 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>> Dimensional Traveler sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:49 PM:

>>>> On 6/30/2017 12:36 PM, Jim G. wrote:

>>>> > Jim G. sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 02:33 PM:

>>>> >> Jerry Brown sent the following on 06/30/2017 at 12:18 PM:

>>>> >>>

>>>> >>> The novelisation claimed that Scotty was trying to get Preston to

>>>> >>> sickbay but the elevator screwed up due to damage during Khan's

>>>> >>> attack.

>>>> >>

>>>> >> That would have been a nice thing to see, too. It just seems

>>>> >> unfortunate

>>>> >> that, like the transporter business, a minute or two of time spent on

>>>> >> the pretty light shows couldn't have been used for this sort of

>>>> >> explanation instead.

>>>> >

>>>> > And yes, I'm sorta blurring my complaints about the first two movies,

>>>> > but that's because there's a common theme to it: visuals are nice, but

>>>> > not at the expense of head-scratching stuff that goes unexplained.

>>>> >

>>>> I think the studios view it as "if you can pay enough attention to the

>>>> story to find head-scratching stuff to complain about, the visuals

>>>> weren't doing their job."

>>>

>>> I'm starting to think that you might have a cynical perspective on this

>>> sort of thing. :)

>>>

>> You'd think that would keep me from being disappointed very often, yet

>> still I am.

>

> That's the sort of thing that should make you really disappointed with

> yourself.

>

I'm cynical enough to accept my failings as a god.

--

Inquiring minds want to know while minds with a self-preservation  
instinct are running screaming.

---

---

Subject: Re: Star Trek: Discovery star replies to show's racist critics

Posted by [Bast](#) on Fri, 20 Oct 2017 11:40:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---