



2018

## THE DOCTOR OF CHANGE: A IDEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF DOCTOR WHO

Noah Zepponi  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Zepponi, Noah. (2018). *THE DOCTOR OF CHANGE: A IDEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF DOCTOR WHO*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/2988](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/2988)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).



THE DOCTOR OF CHANGE:  
A IDEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF *DOCTOR WHO*

by

Noah B. Zepponi

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate School

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

College of the Pacific  
Communication

University of the Pacific  
Stockton, California

2018

THE DOCTOR OF CHANGE:  
A IDEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF *DOCTOR WHO*

by

Noah B. Zepponi

APPROVED BY:

Thesis Advisor: Marlin Bates, Ph.D.

Committee Member: Teresa Bergman, Ph.D.

Committee Member: Paul Turpin, Ph.D.

Department Chair: Paul Turpin, Ph.D.

Dean of Graduate School: Thomas Naehr, Ph.D.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Michael Zepponi.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is here that I would like to give thanks to the people which helped me along the way to completing my thesis. First and foremost, Dr. Marlin Bates, without whom I would never have made it to this point. His constant guidance and recommendations allowed me ultimately land at a place where my finished work is something I can be truly proud of. Second, Dr. Teresa Berman and Dr. Paul Turpin, each of which were readily available to assist me in any way I needed throughout my time in the program. Next, my entire family, but specifically my father, for always believing in and pushing me to achieve my very best. Last, but certainly not least, my friends. Laura and Daniel, without whom the Nerd Den would have never lived, and this thesis would have never been finished. Courtney, because even when I'm contumacious, was always available to listen and lend a helping hand. Chris, Megan, Dokko, AJ, Xander, you gave me a home away from home, wherein much of the ideas for my work percolated. And of course, Gabrielle, my pillar of support and bringer of late night thesis writing snacks. Thank you to each and every one of you.

The Doctor of Change:  
An Ideological Criticism of *Doctor Who*

Abstract

by Noah Zepponi

University of the Pacific

2017

This thesis has used the methodology of an ideological criticism on the long-running science-fiction television series, *Doctor Who*. Argued within, is that an ideological paradigm shift occurred during the fifty years of scripted storylines. To discern evidence supporting the shift, multiple episodes were viewed from each of the first eleven Doctors. During the viewing process all aspects presented within the show, such as dialogue, movements, tactics, and traits, were explored for ideological agency. Once found, the discourse was further analyzed to understand how these ideologies were enforced. From the findings, proof was examined in order to show by the end of the eleventh Doctor, *Doctor Who* had moved from portraying the viewpoints of individualism to collectivism.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER

1. Introduction.....	8
2. Context.....	10
Doctor Who.....	10
Show Cancellation/Continuation/Spin-offs.....	13
Description of Artifact.....	14
Summary.....	16
3. Literature Review.....	17
Ideological Rhetorical Criticism.....	17
Television & Science Fiction Rhetorical Analyses.....	24
Summary.....	29
4. Methodology.....	31
5. Analysis.....	33
Individualistic Ideology.....	34
The Changing Ideology.....	45
The Transitional Ideology.....	52
Collectivistic Ideology.....	61
Summary.....	71
6. Conclusion.....	73
REFERENCES.....	75

## Chapter 1: Introduction

The television show, *Doctor Who*, is one that has fascinated its viewers since its creation in 1963.<sup>1</sup> Originally, it was conceptualized as a show whose purpose was to be a “science fiction adventure series that also had some educational value for children.”<sup>2</sup> At the time of its first airing, *Doctor Who* or, as it would later become known, *Classic Doctor Who*, was planned to be broadcast for only one year. “Instead, the show lasted for twenty-six years, ending in 1989 after transmitting 159 television stories divided among 695 episodes and one television special.”<sup>3</sup> By studying multiple episodes from the combined seasons of *Classic Doctor Who*, as well as *Doctor Who*, the following research has found throughout its timeline, two distinctly different ideologies, or “patterns of beliefs that determines a group’s interpretations of some aspect(s) of the world.”<sup>4</sup> These two being individualism, which follows a self-first value system, and its counterpoint, collectivism, which operates from a group mentality. In addition to their presence throughout the show, each was found to, during a portion of the time frame, silence the other as an acceptable value system. Upon the original conception of *Doctor Who*, individualism takes the forefront. However, a paradigm shift takes place between 1963 and 2012, wherein collectivism’s stifled voice dispels the suppression, supplants the incumbent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cavan Scott, and Mark Wright, *Doctor Who: Who-ology*, (London: BBC Digital, 2013), 237. Kindle edition.

<sup>2</sup> Alan Kistler, *Doctor Who: A History*, (Guilford: Globe Pequot Press, 2013), 65.

<sup>3</sup> Kistler, 152.

<sup>4</sup> Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism Exploration & Practice*, (Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2004), chap. 8. 239-271.

As *Doctor Who* has expanded globally, this phenomenon is one which called for further study in order to identify the changing ideology. To do so, the following thesis employed an ideological criticism, entailing analysis of multiple *Classic Doctor Who* and *Doctor Who* episodes in order to extract moments associated with membership, activities, goals, values, norms, positions and group-relations.<sup>5</sup> Such instances were then categorized into similar groupings to discern what values were the most prevalent throughout the show, how they managed to maintain their status, and, how they changed over time.

Aside from being of interest to those in communication, the following research should also hold intrigue to scholars of sociology due to the artifact being truly uncommon in nature, in that it has spanned longer than any other scripted television show of its kind.<sup>6</sup> With *Doctor Who* producing episodes for over fifty years, this analysis is able to give insight to multiple eras, as well as provide evidence of how the values of an individual, specifically the titular character known as the Doctor, can be represented and changed over long periods time.

---

<sup>5</sup> Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism Exploration & Practice*, (Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2004), chap. 8. 239-271.

<sup>6</sup> "Dr. Who 'longest-running Sci-fi'" BBC News. 2006. Accessed November 15, 2015. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/5390372.stm>.

## Chapter 2: Context

### Doctor Who

The British Broadcasting Company (BBC) television show, *Doctor Who*, is one that, in the episodes studied, had been running for nearly fifty years to date. The origins of the show go back to March of 1962, when the BBC initiated a “survey of published science fiction to establish its relevance to television drama.”<sup>7</sup> Once the idea was conceived, actor William Hartnell was cast as the first Doctor and the show’s reign began. Beginning here, and moving through Matt Smith’s portrayal of the Eleventh Doctor, my research has found evidence supporting the claim that the prevalent value system presented through the show had been moved away from individualism. Instead, the rhetoric transitioned to being grounded in servicing community. However, in order to express the factors which led to this shift as well as how, at certain points, each suppressed the other, a foundational understanding of *Doctor Who* is required.

The show’s title character, known only as the Doctor, is not a creature of Earth, but rather a time-traveling alien from a fictional planet, Gallifrey.<sup>8</sup> His species, known as the Time Lords, were an ancient race which, within the span of the show, became exterminated during the conflict known as the “Time War.”<sup>9</sup> Fighting on the front lines of the war, the Doctor determined that the only way of ending it would be to take the lives of everyone involved. After completing the grisly task, the Doctor remained as the

---

<sup>7</sup> Cavan Scott, and Mark Wright, *Doctor Who: Who-ology*, (London: BBC Digital, 2013), 143. Kindle edition.

<sup>8</sup> The Doctor Who Site, "About Doctor Who." Accessed November 3, 2013. <http://www.thedoctorwhosite.co.uk>.

<sup>9</sup> Richards, 136.

only survivor of the Time War.<sup>10</sup> With much of what and who the Time Lords were lost, the Doctor was forced to carry on by as the race's lone survivor. One fact that is still unknown is the Doctor's real name. In fact, "there is no greater mystery in *Doctor Who* than the name of the Doctor."<sup>11</sup> His true identify is a secret which, throughout the show, has never been revealed. However, other secrets, such as his exact age, will occasionally be revealed, though his age in relation to other characters is fluid as the timeline of his life does not match the linear timeline of any other characters within the show. The reason being that he is travelling in time. As such, he could be any age at any given point in time that he jumps into. What can be deduced is that, depending on the episode, he is anywhere between 900 – 1,100 years old.<sup>12</sup>

As a Time Lord, the Doctor is genetically endowed with the ability to "regenerate," which allows Time Lords to avoid dying when their bodies are hurt beyond repair. The regeneration process, which can occur up to twelve times, creates a new body for the Time Lord's consciousness in which to reside. The "transformation alters the brain cells to some degree, giving each version of the Doctor his own traits, mannerisms, and preferences."<sup>13</sup> It is also important to note that a regenerated Time Lord remembers their past incarnations, though they are detached from them somewhat, often stating they were

---

<sup>10</sup> Richards, 141.

<sup>11</sup> Vogt, Tiffany, TV Addict, "Doctor Who Redux: The Mystery of 'The Name of The Doctor'." " Last modified May 18, 2013. Accessed November 3, 2013. [http://www.thetvaddict.com/2013/05/18/doctor-who-redux-the-mystery-of-'the-name-of-the-doctor'/?](http://www.thetvaddict.com/2013/05/18/doctor-who-redux-the-mystery-of-'the-name-of-the-doctor'/)

<sup>12</sup> Gary Russell, *Doctor Who: The Encyclopedia A Definitive Guide to Time and Space*, (Italy: BBC Books, 2007), 53.

<sup>13</sup> Kistler, 114.

“different men” in the past.<sup>14</sup> Though all regenerations to date give the appearance of The Doctor as a human, he has many biological functions that differ from that of humanity, including a binary respiratory system, the ability to identify human blood types by taste, and to communicate telepathically with his time machine, known as the TARDIS.<sup>15</sup>

The Doctor is not innately gifted with the ability to travel through time; instead, the Time Lords had organically grown a craft known as Time and Relative Dimension in Space (TARDIS).<sup>16</sup> The TARDIS, capable of traveling anywhere in time and space, “dematerial[izes] in one location and reappears in another, almost instantaneously.”<sup>17</sup> All TARDIS were originally equipped with a “chameleon circuit,” which would enable it to blend into its surroundings. However, The Doctor’s TARDIS became stuck in the shape of a 1950s police box during the *Classic Doctor Who* series.<sup>18</sup> Though the TARDIS may look like an ordinary blue police box, it is one of the most complex organisms that could be fathomed. As a living entity, the TARDIS contains the entire world of “time energy” within its walls, thus allowing it to be infinitely larger on the inside than the phone box shape it presents to the outside world.<sup>19</sup> Rather than being presented with his TARDIS,

---

<sup>14</sup> Kistler, 75; Kistler also notes that what has changed is who he is, not his point of view.

<sup>15</sup> Scott, 1103.

<sup>16</sup> Russell, 168.

<sup>17</sup> Russell, 168.

<sup>18</sup> Russell, 168.

<sup>19</sup> Russell, 169.

the Doctor actually acquired it by means of theft, as he was looking to escape the laws of the Time Lords.<sup>20</sup>

Along with the TARDIS, each incarnation of the Doctor generally has a set of people who travel with him through time and space. There are myriad reasons as to why he brings them on. The first of these instances occurs when the Doctor's ability to time travel is discovered by his granddaughter's teachers, and he is fearful they will tell the people of Earth about his TARDIS. He claimed no one can know of it because the information that time travel is possible would alter human history. As the show progresses, he eventually warms to them and, after the end of the Time War, he begins taking them on board to combat his own loneliness.<sup>21</sup>

### **Show Cancellation/Continuation/Spin-offs**

After declining numbers in viewers, as well as repetitive plot lines, the show was put on a "rest" in 1989.<sup>22</sup> After cancellation of the show, there was an attempt to revive interest in *Doctor Who* in 1996, when a television movie was produced by the Fox Network. However, this proved to do little more than further the same tired storyline, that led to the show's cancellation seven years prior.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, it was successful in that it showed that there was still interest in the franchise, "leading to new novels from BBC Books as well as original audio plays."<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Scott, 137.

<sup>21</sup> Sam Leith, "It's now time to take Doctor Who seriously." *The Telegraph*, March 24, 2007. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3638690/Its-now-time-to-take-Doctor-Who-seriously.html>

<sup>22</sup> "Cancelled!. *Doctor Who: A Brief History of a Time Lord*. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho/classic/news/briefhistory/cancelled.shtml>

<sup>23</sup> Kistler, 161.

<sup>24</sup> Kistler, 166.

In 2005, an ailing BBC network decided to re-launch a new *Doctor Who* series due to poor primetime Saturday night ratings.<sup>25</sup> The show was to be run by head of drama, Julie Gardner, and show runner, Russell T. Davies.<sup>26</sup> Once aired, it proved to be an immediate success, much of which was attributed to the fact that it “wasn’t a reboot of the original franchise, but a continuation.”<sup>27</sup> They kept the old fans from the *Classic Doctor Who* by following the same plot line, while also bringing in a new generation of Whovian culture.<sup>28</sup> “Since its return, *Doctor Who* has become a major institution in British television and a notable success in other countries, including America in particular.”<sup>29</sup>

After the show’s initial success in America, producers Russell T. Davies and Julie Gardner relocated to Los Angeles to develop a *Doctor Who* spinoff.<sup>30</sup> The show which would be later named *Torchwood*, along with *The Sarah Jane Adventures*, featured old companions of the Doctor outside of his timeline, became “hugely successful series” running for three and five years respectively.<sup>31</sup>

### **Description of Artifact**

---

<sup>25</sup> David, Derbyshire. "Ailing BBC pins revival on Doctor Who." *The Telegraph*, March 9, 2005. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1485252/Ailing-BBC-pins-revival-on-Doctor-Who.html>.

<sup>26</sup> Scott; Russell T. Davis became the head writer of the show from 2005-2009 before stepping down to Steven Moffat.

<sup>27</sup> Kistler, 166.

<sup>28</sup> Oxforddictionaries.com, n. “Whovian,” accessed November 3, 2015, <http://oxforddictionaries.com>

<sup>29</sup> Kistler, 172.

<sup>30</sup> Lynnette Porter, *The Doctor Who Franchise American Influence, Fan Culture and the Spinoffs*, (Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc., 2012), 2-3.

<sup>31</sup> Scott, 444.

For the following study, multiple episodes of *Doctor Who* and *Classic Doctor Who* were analyzed, with each episode of record being selected from a different point of the show's overarching storyline. Moreover, all eleven Doctors studied were given two separate episodes, from two individual storylines, apart from the eighth Doctor, who only appeared in one full-length movie. All episodes, which originally aired between 1963 and 2012, gave evidence as to their presented ideological agency. More specifically, to the context of my research, they exhibited values which categorized episodes into three distinct sections. The first two individualism, collectivism, "is defined by whether more emphasis is placed on the individual or on the group."<sup>32</sup> The third, a transitional phase, provides evidence of both the former and the latter, though neither is successful in suppressing the other.

Episodes which exhibited an individualistic viewpoint were those viewed within the reign of the first three Doctors. During which, elements of the individualistic ideology were not only represented more prevalently through goals of self-fulfillment and independence, but also valued and rewarded explicitly.<sup>33</sup> On the contrary, during the time studied of the tenth and eleventh Doctor, the opposite appears. Self-sacrifice for the good of the group, and individuals being submissive to the greater group become common themes.<sup>34</sup> It is then in between these two stages, a period where no discernable ideology exists, that the majority of the research lies. Here, both the values of

---

<sup>32</sup> Tuong-Van Vu, et al., "Do individualism and collectivism on three levels (country, individual, and situation) influence theory-of-mind efficiency? a cross-country study," *Plos ONE*, 12, no. 8(2017): 1-20.

<sup>33</sup> Marcia A Finklestein, "Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Integrative Framework," *An International Journal*, 40, no. 10 (2010): 1633-1643.

<sup>34</sup> Chen Xinguang, et al., "Constructs, Concept Mapping, and Psychometric Assessment of the Concise Scale of Individualism-Collectivism." *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal* 43, no. 4 (2015): 667.

individualism and collectivism are found yet, neither is able to suppress the voice or existence of the other.

### **Summary**

The *Doctor Who* franchise is a scripted television show which began in 1963 and has run for over fifty years. With an archive of discourse cataloging a single character over such a long-time period, the artifact under study is one which is both truly unique and necessary of study. From the selected excerpts of the discourse, the episodes under study fell into the categories of individualism, collectivism and a transitional period where both were present, but neither was successful in overthrowing the other. Furthermore, it has been discussed how as *Doctor Who* has expanded exponentially since premiering, resulting in successful spin-off series such as *Torchwood* and *The Sarah Jane Adventures*. Additionally examined were the causes which lead to the multiple year hiatus the franchise took, before eventually resurfacing as a movie and then full television re-launch.

### Chapter 3: Literature Review

The following two-part literature review contains a concise inspection of the necessary previous research required to support this study. First, provided is an overview of the construction of ideological criticism, and explanations of the prevalent ideologies presented within the artifact. The subsequent section contains works on television rhetoric as well as previous studies within the science fiction genre.

#### Ideological Rhetorical Criticism

The analysis is an ideological criticism of *Doctor Who* which, draws much of its framework from Sonja Foss, who as previously stated, defines the term ideology as “a pattern of beliefs that determines a group’s interpretations of some aspect(s) of the world.”<sup>35</sup> It was these “interpretations of some aspects of the world,” that as they were uncovered needed to be further understood. As a solution, Foss offers a four-step process for identifying the most strongly prevalent ideology in order to create a foundation for analysis in an ideological criticism: selecting an artifact, analyzing the artifact, formulating a research question, and writing the essay.<sup>36</sup> She describes the process for ideologically analyzing the artifact as looking for membership, activities, goals, values/norms, position and group-relations, and recourses.<sup>37</sup> What is meant to be found here are the ways in which the ideology is displayed within the artifact. There are many different ways that this can occur, for a rhetor will “choose to focus on some things rather

---

<sup>35</sup> Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism Exploration & Practice*, (Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2004), chap. 8. 239-271.

<sup>36</sup> Foss, 244.

<sup>37</sup> Foss, 244.

than others, and their choices in terms of content that can increase persuasiveness of the artifact's ideology."<sup>38</sup> Moreover, answering questions such as, "what is the preferred reading of the artifact?"<sup>39</sup> and "What does the artifact ask the audience to believe, understand feel or think about?" become paramount.<sup>40</sup>

Echoing Foss, Emel'yanenko describes ideology as a "world outlook man expresses as a personality and has a system of values which control his choice of physical and intellectual activities. Values and ideologies are formed in man since childhood under the influence of social conditions."<sup>41</sup> These social conditions, which can and, in the case of the Doctor, have been constructed over a lifetime, are explored herein. However, before proceeding into these processes, a deeper understanding as to what an ideology is, how it is created, and how it evolves is needed. To begin the thought, it must be noted that there can be, and are, multiple ideologies which exist in a culture.<sup>42</sup> Ideological hegemony, or ideological dominance by one group, "controls what participants see as natural or obvious by establishing the norm."<sup>43</sup> It then becomes the goal of an ideological rhetorical criticism to find the hegemonic ideology and establish how it is supported. According to Foss, "to maintain a position of dominance, a

---

<sup>38</sup> Foss, 246.

<sup>39</sup> Foss, 245.

<sup>40</sup> Foss, 245.

<sup>41</sup> Vladimir Dmitrievich Emel'yanenko, Aleksandr Nikolaevich Vetoshko, Sergey Grigorievich Malinnikov, Irina Vladimirovna Malashenko, and Lyubov Ivanovna Vetoshko, 2016. "Man's Values and Ideologies as a Basis of Gamification." *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education* 11, no. 18: 12576-12592.

<sup>42</sup> Lily Kong, "Ideological Hegemony and the Political Symbolism of Religious Buildings in Singapore," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11, no. 1 (1993): 23-26.

<sup>43</sup> Foss, 242.

hegemonic ideology must be renewed, reinforced, and defended continually through the use of rhetorical strategies and practices.”<sup>44</sup> The following analysis has used Foss’s definition to explore and find evidence of what is portrayed through *Doctor Who*.

The first step towards being able to achieve this goal as well as understand and interpret development within the artifact of study, comes from how an individual can come to accept themselves into an ideology they identify with. In *Self, Identity and Identity Formation*, there were two theories presented on how humans create a sense of identity.<sup>45</sup> The first, which also supports the claim of evolving ideology, states that “identity is not a set, concrete entity, on the contrary, it is very flexible and it can change according to its environment, context, and expectations from the counterpart, whether it may be the society, a group, or other identities just like itself.”<sup>46</sup> The second, social identity theory, claims identity can be formed through the need for the self to be accepted by various groups. After acceptance into a group is attained, an individual will act in accordance with the association.<sup>47</sup>

Ideology, according to Karl Marx, was viewed as more of a “false consciousness.”<sup>48</sup> The reason being that it is because an individual’s ideology is handed down by people in power, so it must be discerned who possesses the power.<sup>49</sup> The term

---

<sup>44</sup> Foss, 243.

<sup>45</sup> Hüseyin Cinoğlu, and Yusuf Arıkan, "Self, identity and identity formation: From the perspectives of three major theories," *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 9, no. 2 (2012): 1114-1131.

<sup>46</sup> Cinoğlu and Arıkan, 1116.

<sup>47</sup> Cinoğlu and Arıkan, 1123.

<sup>48</sup> Malcolm O Sillars, and Bruce E Gronbeck, *Communication Criticism*, (Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2001), chap. 12.

<sup>49</sup> Sillars and Gronbeck, 261.

power, as described by Sillars and Gronbeck, is referring to “the ability to influence the thoughts, decisions, and actions of other through relations that have been negotiated between individuals, as in marriages, friendships, [and] protection schemes.”<sup>50</sup> Jones and Jones brought these theoretical claims into a practical situation. They assert that those holding power within Britain had enforced nationalism as an ideology to its citizens.<sup>51</sup> “Practices such as military conscription, compulsory education, the erection of flags and monuments in prominent places, can all be viewed as part of the state’s effort to ‘educate’ its citizens, through aesthetics and rituals, regarding their role as members of the wider political and cultural community of the nation”<sup>52</sup> It is through finding rhetorical devices such as these, that my research was able to uncover how hegemony, was and was not maintained.

Understanding how ideological hegemony can be lost is seen through the research of John Schoenfelder. He claims that despite the fact that there may be an overarching ideology impressed by those in power, there will always be those who will fill other roles within an organization, which challenge the hegemony.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, it is attested that those who challenge the enforced ideology are not always aware that they are doing so. He states, “in different times and places, the contestants challenging politics in ‘heterarchies of power’ range from informal groups barely cognizant of their existence as

---

<sup>50</sup> Sillars and Gronbeck, 263.

<sup>51</sup> Martin Jones, and Rhys Jones, “Nation states, ideological power and globalisation: can geographers catch the boat?,” *Geoforum* 35, (2004): 409-424.

<sup>52</sup> Jones and Jones, 418.

<sup>53</sup> John W. Schoenfelder, “New Dramas for the Theatre State: The Shifting Roles In Ideological Power Sources In Balinese Politics,” *World Archeology* 36, (2004): 403-409.

collective entities to the formalized, self-aware congregations.”<sup>54</sup> Foss, from the other side, but in agreement states that “Although, as individuals, we may adhere to ideologies different from one that is hegemonic, we cannot help but participate in the hegemonic ideology as we participate in our culture through activities.”<sup>55</sup>

The current artifact has additionally been looked at through the views presented within *Communication Criticism* on structuration studies.<sup>56</sup> It is expressed that culturally grounded structures are shown in three ways, “1) to guide our interpretations or understandings of what is going on in human interactions, 2) to suggest what should (morally) be done in some situations, and 3) to point how some purpose can be achieved practically.”<sup>57</sup> As actions and dialogues from the research conducted fall into ideological groupings, understanding of the reasoning behind decisions made became prevalent. In that same vein, the findings of my research have revealed an evolving ideology within the artifact.

**Individualism & collectivism.** Through study of the artifact, two main ideologies which have been found are that of individualism and collectivism. To properly see the ideological shift within the artifacts and how then can be found as hegemonic, these two must not only be fully understood, but also be aware of the ways in which they are different. Definitions of these different value systems can be seen within “Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Integrative

---

<sup>54</sup> Schoenfelder, 410.

<sup>55</sup> Foss, 243.

<sup>56</sup> Sillars and Gronbeck, 271.

<sup>57</sup> Sillars and Gronbeck, 271.

Framework.”<sup>58</sup> Individualism and collectivism, according to Finklestein, are two ideologies which lie on opposite poles of a continuum, in that a collectivist will define themselves as part of a group and adhere to the personality of that faction, whereas those of an individualistic mindset will focus on self-fulfillment and independence.<sup>59</sup> Through the following attributes, scales, and explanations of the two ideologies, this research has been able to classify the information found within *Doctor Who*, discerning the changing agency.

Harry Triandis and Michele Gelfand make the assertion that there are a set of attributes that can be assigned to both collective and individualistic personalities, and from those it can be deduced which ideology an individual associates with.<sup>60</sup> First, in regards to individualism, David Ralston, et al., made the claim that “individualists appear to focus upon the self-promoting image management and self-serving ethical behaviors.”<sup>61</sup> Though there are many different scales and methods for discerning the differences between the two ideologies, Xinguang Chen, et al., argued that there is no clear correct model available, and due to the vacancy, created the Concise Scale of Individualism-Collectivism.<sup>62</sup> With the scale, individuals were measured against

---

<sup>58</sup> Marcia A Finklestein, "Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Integrative Framework," *An International Journal*, 40, no. 10 (2010): 1633-1643.

<sup>59</sup> Finklestein, 1637-1642.

<sup>60</sup> Harry Triandis, and Michele Gelfand, "A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism," *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, ed. Paul Lange, Arie Kruglanski, & Troy Higgins (New York: Sage Publications, 2011). 506-510.

<sup>61</sup> David Ralston, et al., “Societal-Level Versus Individual-Level Predictions of Ethical Behavior: a 48-Society Study of Collectivism and Individualism.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 122, no. 2 (2014): 301.

<sup>62</sup> Chen Xinguang, et al., "Constructs, Concept Mapping, and Psychometric Assessment of the Concise Scale of Individualism-Collectivism." *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal* 43, no. 4 (2015): 667.

statements that would be true of only one of the two modes of thinking. Based on the individual's chosen statements which best described them, they could be plotted along a continuum. Examples of individualist statements included were, "all individuals in the society are absolutely independent from each other...everyone must put his/her own interest first...it is essential to maintain one's personal characteristics in work and daily life."<sup>63</sup> Simply put, those who exhibit individualistic traits are those who think of themselves first, before others.

On the other side of the spectrum lies those of a collective nature. These individuals, when faced with the choice, will put the good of the group and what is best for the collective first. Based around the ideals of a group mentality, acceptance into and one's part within the group are not taken lightly. Ralston, et al. stated, "There is a clear distinction as to whether you are one of us or you are not. If you are one of us, you are treated in a very benevolent way and if you are not, malicious treatment is deemed acceptable behavior."<sup>64</sup> Those associated with a collectivist ideology have been found to answer affirmatively to statements such as, "individuals may not be able to survive if there is no group...to ensure group interests are met, self-interests must be sacrificed...Individuals should be unconditionally submissive to the group and nation."<sup>65</sup> An important note however, is that being submissive to the group and nation does not mean that there is a void of power within a collectivist culture, merely that the one in

---

<sup>63</sup> Xinguang, et al., 674.

<sup>64</sup> Ralston, et al., 301.

<sup>65</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

power must live by the aforementioned characteristics, as to best lead the group.<sup>66</sup> When considering ethical behaviors, Ralston, et al. argued that collectivists “are compartmentalizing three categories: (1) things you would do for in-group members (2) things you would be willing to do to out-group members; and (3) things you would do for yourself.”<sup>67</sup>

Kevin Jones and Chin-Yen Alice Liu, in their study of collectivism and individualism as it relates to influences on ethical decision-making note that there is a clear distinction between the two, in that the culture one is raised in will have a direct effect on how that individual will view a moral conundrum.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, they state, “it is clear that there is no single answer for how and why people make ethical choices, but with each inquiry, we gain additional understating of the influences.”<sup>69</sup> These influences are some of the factors that have been questioned within this study. Through research on these two ideological stances, Triandis and Gelfand stated six attributes for analysis of how individuals react to a given situation: self-definition, goals, emotions, values, leadership, and conflict/negations.<sup>70</sup>

### **Television & Science Fiction Rhetorical Analyses**

---

<sup>66</sup> Harry Triandis, and Michele Gelfand, "A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism," *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, ed. Paul Lange, Arie Kruglanski, & Troy Higgins (New York: Sage Publications, 2011). 506-510.

<sup>67</sup> Ralston, et al., 301.

<sup>68</sup> Kevin Jones, J., Liu, Chin-Yen Alice, “Ethical Decision Making: A Model Demonstrating Collectivism and Individualism Decision Influences.” *Academy of Business Research Journal* 3, no. (2015): 77-78.

<sup>69</sup> Jones, Liu & Chin-Yen, 80-81.

<sup>70</sup> Triandis & Gelfand, 506-510.

As the following study deals with the science fiction television show *Doctor Who*, an understanding of research conducted on similar artifacts is required before delving in. Although the following analysis does not deal directly with the ideological capabilities of television as a medium, it is noteworthy in regards to understanding the justification of the study, as well as provide a deeper understanding of ideological evolution. Beginning with the study of television as a whole, *The Television Text* explored the proposal that electronically distributed messages have a stronger influence on affecting ideology than person to person communication.<sup>71</sup> George Bagley argued that because of the mass communication capability of the television, viewing it is both an individual and a collective experience, with the ability to create a “mass experience.”<sup>72</sup>

Furthermore, Horace Newcomb and Paul Hirsch propose that societies can transmit and maintain their chosen ideology, or pattern of beliefs which shape worldviews, through conscious and subconscious appeals with communicational technology such as television.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, they argue that ideology, as influenced through television, is induced greatly through targeting people, which will relate to their message.<sup>74</sup>

Abduel Haid explored the notion of ideological development within the realm of television.<sup>75</sup> He further asserted that “television’s order of priorities, scale of values and

---

<sup>71</sup> George Bagley, "The Television Text: Spectatorship, Ideology, and the Organization of Consent," *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 18, no. 4 (2001): 436-451.

<sup>72</sup> Bagley, 448.

<sup>73</sup> Bagley, 562.

<sup>74</sup> Bagley, 571.

<sup>75</sup> Jamal Abdel Haid, "Ideology and Television in the Eastern Arab World," *Domes: Digest of the Middle East*, 21, no. 1 (2012): 39-48.

images are determined by the ideological and political substructures prevailing.”<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, the research expresses that by using television as a medium, those in charge of the represented message can have the ability to “mobilize the public,” referring to their relevant audience, as well as use it to implement their beliefs upon other groups.<sup>77</sup> It is here that Abdel Haid provides his framework to understand what kind of ideologies are being shown through television, how they are doing so, and in what ways ideologies are being challenged.<sup>78</sup> He depicts four steps that the Iraqi government used to “flaw the mirror” of the reality that the people saw through, and instead offered their own ideologies; these included distorting reality by glorifying with bright colors the “good” messages, mobilizing the masses, shielding the regime of Saddam Hussein, and “finally, demonizing the others, whomever they may be.”<sup>79</sup> Through Abdel Haid’s work, tactics such as the demonizing of opposing views, present ways that a piece of television discourse can silence challenging ideologies and give prominent voice to only the intended.

Regarding the artifact under study itself, John Tulloch, in *Producing National Imagery*, states *Doctor Who* symbolizes British nationalism<sup>80</sup> and that a nation is an “imagined community.”<sup>81</sup> Here, he is referring to a community that does not exist within

---

<sup>76</sup> Haid, 44.

<sup>77</sup> Haid, 44.

<sup>78</sup> Haid, 39.

<sup>79</sup> Haid, 39.

<sup>80</sup> John Tulloch, *Producing the National Imaginary Doctor Who, Text and Genre. A Necessary Fantasy? The Heroic Figure in Children's Popular Culture*. Edited by Dudley Jones & Tony Watkins. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

<sup>81</sup> Tulloch, 364.

the confines of a geographical location, rather a view of mind. The “imagined community” is one that can live within the mind of an individual, who can view themselves as something larger. A thought which looms large when analyzing a character that does not have a geographical “home.” An additional insight provided by Tulloch, in the discussion of science fiction discourse, he writes that producers “operate ‘invisibly’ (often non-consciously) to construct ‘ideal’ subjects in relation to the ‘real.’”<sup>82</sup> Here he is implying that creators of science fiction, specifically *Doctor Who*, whether they are aware of it or not, create an ideology from their own views, and implant that inside of their text, thus creating an ‘ideal’ subject out of the viewer. Moreover, he stated, “what many critical theorists are concerned about is the producers’ construction of ‘ideal subjects’ in science fiction and other popular genres per a technocratic and ‘managerial’ ideology of scientism.”<sup>83</sup> It was then through these claims that the work of the following analysis was able to search for key indicators of ideology, left by show’s writers. Once apparent, they were able to be used as a foundational backing for the following analysis.

**Science Fiction.** We next turn the focus to the science fiction genre, in order to understand the realm in which *Doctor Who* exists. Darko Suvin argues that we label it as unique and estranged genre which differs greatly from Fantasy.<sup>84</sup> He contends that a distinguishing factor is a fictional “novum” or new thing, which exists by means of plausible science, rather than magic.<sup>85</sup> Raymond Williams asserts that when studying

---

<sup>82</sup> Tulloch, 371.

<sup>83</sup> Tulloch, 370.

<sup>84</sup> Darko Suvin, “Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre.” New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 1979.

<sup>85</sup> Suvin, 63

science fiction is it important to take into consideration that most is really anti-science fiction.<sup>86</sup> He states, instead it is “an unbearable personal tension, or a particular sterility in social thinking, at once use and make a villain of a large part of man's organized attempt to know and to control. Humanism is discarded in the very affirmation of the familiar contemporary myths of humane concern.”<sup>87</sup> It is then with these definitions of the genre that the following research is able build off of. Arthur Evans, along the same lines, makes the claim that regardless of where one falls on the defining of science fiction, it is a genre needing further study. The reasoning, he asserts, is that science fiction provides a unique approach to looking at the period when a discourse was created.<sup>88</sup> Although my research does not deal directly with the time periods at which each of the episodes were created, it becomes abundantly clear that it needs to be taken into consideration when looking for evidence of ideological agency.

An example of which that has proven valuable for understanding time and place when looking for ideology was presented within Vettel-Becker's *Space and the Single Girl: Star Trek, Aesthetics, and 1960s Femininity*.<sup>89</sup> She asserts that although much of the original *Star Trek* has often been argued sexist towards female characters, we must consider context of the original air dates. Instances are then drawn that, although to a contemporary viewer the discourse may seem innately sexist, may not have been as

---

<sup>86</sup> Raymond Williams, "Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 15, no. 3 (1988): 356-360.

<sup>87</sup> Williams, 360.

<sup>88</sup> Arthur B. Evans, "The Origins of Science Fiction Criticism: From Kepler to Wells." *Science Fiction Studies*, 1999. 163.

<sup>89</sup> Patricia Vettel-Becker, "Space and the single girl: Star Trek, aesthetics, and 1960s femininity." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* no. 2. 2014. 143.

offensive in the 1960s.<sup>90</sup> Vettel-Becker's work has also provided an example of science fiction research which isolated instances within the discourse and dissected them for evidence which supports its findings.

A final piece which sheds light on developing a criticism in the science fiction genre was found through Atkinson and Calafell's work on the film series, *Star Wars*. They argue that antagonist, Darth Vader, was able to justify avoidance of responsibility.<sup>91</sup> A point that was ascertained by isolating the instances where the character under study was put in situations of "moral dilemmas."<sup>92</sup> Their methodology is similar to the following research, in that the ideologies of *Doctor Who* were found, through analyzing how characters react within the various documented situations. It is then through the work of Atkinson and Calafell, as well as the others in science fictions criticism presented, that my research based its methods for uncovering findings.

### **Summary**

The above has been a review of relevant literature, wherein articles and arguments relevant to the following analysis were explored. As will become apparent through the following analysis, the two main ideological viewpoints being explored within the following can be described as the self-serving value system of individualism and group focused version, collectivism. Each of these viewpoints lead towards the ways in which an individual's identity is made up, and in turn, the way that they perceive the world around them. Through these two ideologies, *Doctor Who*, is able to depict its 'desired

---

<sup>90</sup> Vettel-Becker, 151-168.

<sup>91</sup> Joshua Atkinson, and Bernadette Calafell, "Darth Vader Made Me Do It! Anakin Skywalker's Avoidance of Responsibility and the Gray Areas of Hegemonic Masculinity in the Star Wars Universe." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2, no. 1. 2009. 1-20.

<sup>92</sup> Atkinson and Calafell, 6.

way of being.’ However, in order to uncover what is meant to be intended understand was needed as to the avenues which can be taken in order to fully understand the complexities herein. Thus, the relevant literature above operates as a foundational backing and basis under which my analysis builds its argument of how *Doctor Who* rhetorically communicates and maintains its intended viewpoint.

## Chapter 4: Methodology

The model which has been used for the analysis was provided by Sonja Foss.<sup>93</sup> As previously stated, she claims that to find what ideologies exist within an artifact, questions of membership, activities, goals, values, norms, positions and group-relations, as well as recourses must be asked. Though she does conclude that not all these will have answers within each artifact under study, they are the starting points for an ideological analysis. In order to achieve that goal, my research took two steps: First, twenty randomly selected episodes and one movie from *Doctor Who* were selected. These episodes were chosen by taking a list of all possible episode numbers for each Doctor to random.org, and then drawing two random titles from each. The only exception being the Eighth Doctor, as he only appeared in a single full-length television movie. The second step consisted of viewing the episodes for occurrences of the afore mentioned ideological indicators.

After using these instances to identify the key values of an artifact, which were different depending on which Doctor was being studied and sometimes episode to episode, the question turned to how these ideologies maintain themselves within the artifact itself. The “nature of the ideology” was searched for by exploring the rhetorical devices that came into play within the piece, which according to Foss, would show what ideologies “dominate a culture.”<sup>94</sup> These devices, such as the character’s actions, dialogue and traits were found to develop and reinforce the ideology, which at the time, is

---

<sup>93</sup> Foss, 239-271.

<sup>94</sup> Foss, 245.

to be seen as the correct pattern of beliefs. An approach which was taken on each of the episodes under study.

As the goal of the following ideological criticism is to not only uncover the ideology presented favorably within the discourse, but also to discern the groups “whose interests are negated, unexpressed or not represented,” questions such as what is the hegemonic ideology presented within television show *Doctor Who*; How does it maintain itself; and how has it changed from the first Doctor through the Eleventh, became prevalent. It is then through exploring these questions that the following was able to discover agency and tactics employed through the discourse, and in turn, understand that a complete paradigm shift had taken place. With such, finding presented evidence which supported the claim that *Doctor Who* has transformed its discourse from advocating for individualism to be seen as the ideal way of living to now displaying collectivism as the correct worldview.

## Chapter 5: Analysis

What is intended to become apparent through the following analysis is twofold. First, between the first and eleventh incarnation of *Doctor Who*, the discourse has shifted completely in terms of what the prevalently and positively featured ideology is. Beginning with the first Doctor, evidence presented substantiates the claim that upon its origins, *Doctor Who* presents itself completely through the ideals and values associated with individualism. As the show progresses, the expressed way of seeing the world becomes far less dominant, making suppression of the collectivist voice challenging. A theme which continues until reinforcement of both are equally represented. Eventually, it is found that collectivism is able to supplant individualism completely, becoming the sole expressed ideology portrayed within the artifact. The second goal of the analysis is then to expand past expression of what happened in order to additionally provide the basis, evidence, explanation for how the actions and values associated with individualism and collectivism are represented and maintained over others throughout the discourse.

As the focal character, sole through line, and driver of the *Doctor Who* plotlines, a great deal can be found through the Doctor's successes and failures throughout the discourse. Thus, it can be inferred that the viewpoints presented by the Doctor, are rhetorically endowed with a unique ability to state and reinforce what way, or ways, of seeing the world should be thought of as "normal." As such, the following analysis has been divided into four sections displaying the Doctor's eleven incarnations chronologically in order to fully illustrate the ideological transformation presented as well as contributing factors which led hereto. The first section encompasses the period when an individualistic ideology is asserted most prevalently. The second section

dictates the show beginning enforce individualistic rules less. In turn, elevating collectivism from portrayal as a suppressed insurgent to mild positive representation. Explored in the third section is equal representation, or a hybrid ideology, in which exists a period where the principles of individualism and collectivism are evident, and neither is favored above the other. Finally, within the fourth section, collectivism is found to have successfully supplanted incumbent, individualism. With such, the thesis proves to be successful in dictating a complete transformation between the original conception of the Doctor in 1963 and 2017.

### **Individualistic Ideology**

Beginning with the first incarnation, it is shown that the Doctor, and by extension *Doctor Who*, exudes advocacy of individualistic viewpoint. To see how, we can look to the research of Triandis and Gelfand's which states that ideological agency can be found through the ways in which an individual reacts in given situations.<sup>95</sup> For example, in looking at the way the Doctor operates as a leader, we see in *The Rescue* that the Doctor looked up to not only by his companions, but also by an entire native civilization.<sup>96</sup> Once the Daleks have imprisoned the Doctor, he explains to his assailants that they will not be able to survive on the toxic planet without him and offers his ship as refuge if they agree to release him. A request which expresses a desire for salvation for himself rather than asking for everyone to be spared or the war to be stopped. By doing so, the Doctor is

---

<sup>95</sup> Harry Triandis, and Michele Gelfand, "A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism," *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, ed. Paul Lange, Arie Kruglanski, & Troy Higgins (New York: Sage Publications, 2011). 506-510.

<sup>96</sup> *The Rescue*, directed by Christopher Barry (1965; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009), DVD.

advocating that what should be thought of as “correct” is to disregard all others and their needs if it benefits the individual.

Furthermore, as the episode concludes, after he has saved the planet, the natives ask the Doctor to stay. He refuses them without a moment’s hesitation, reminding them, “you’ll have other wars to fight.”<sup>97</sup> Though the Doctor’s tone and dismissal of even the possibility that he would stay and help them grow as a society, he gives a strong indication that he has no interest in looking out for anyone but himself. The natives which serve as the collective voice in this situation, have issued the sentiment that with the Doctor joining their collective, they would be stronger and better able to succeed in their goals. However, by declining this option and immediately leaves the planet the Doctor, as the hero character, is effective in bolstering individualism as the natural response, and in turn, delegitimizing the competing belief pattern.

In viewing the Doctor’s self-definition, we can see through his dialogue that the Doctor speaks with an emphasis on singularity. Statements such as, “I’ve figured it out,” “my calculations are correct,” “I’m going to figure it out,” and, “I don’t have time,” show through his comments that he is only thinking about himself.<sup>98</sup> *The War Machines* demonstrates a prime example, as it revolves around the difference between the Doctor’s individualism and the rest of the world, which is shown to operate as a collective. First seen within a confrontation between the Doctor and a local boy, Ben, when they are faced with the question of going to save another character, and the Doctor states “my dear boy,

---

<sup>97</sup> *The Rescue*.

<sup>98</sup> *The Rescue*.

if we worry about just one person, we'll never get anything done.”<sup>99</sup> Though seeming like a collectivist viewpoint, in that one person's well-being must be sacrificed for the betterment of the group, the Doctor is making the comment in order to save himself, since he knows going to save the other character would put him in harm's way. A sentiment that is further enforced within the resolution of the episode. The Doctor needs to place electrified cables around one of the War Machines in order to deactivate it. Despite doing so, he confidently states to those around him that it must be done, as it is the only way to stop the machines. He then hesitantly begins to do it - in order to save himself - but Ben jumps out to save the Doctor, suggesting that he is capable of performing the task. With a full understanding that he would knowingly be putting a child in danger, the Doctor agrees with the boy's proposition, thus keeping himself from danger.

Once stopping the War Machine, Ben immediately runs off to save another character in the episode. Rather than returning the favor just allotted to him, the Doctor yells out after him, “foolish boy!”<sup>100</sup> These moments are noteworthy because through these actions and comments, the Doctor has effectively separated his way of thinking and acting from the rest of the world around him. Once again, we are shown through the discourse that the Doctor's actions are “right” based on the fact that he is able to do on his own what the group failed to do. Furthermore, the repercussions of individualism achieving hegemony, and thus establishing the norm, is shown through his effect on other characters, most notably his companion who had followed him through the episode

---

<sup>99</sup> *The War Machines Part 4*, directed by Michael Ferguson (1966; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009), DVD.

<sup>100</sup> *The War Machines Part 4*.

attempting to act as a team. Within the closing moments of the episode, we see the Doctor standing alone at his TARDIS, waiting for his companion to return so that they can leave. After a passerby informs him that she is not coming and has gone off to live her life as she sees fit, the Doctor scowls and he mumbles about her ungratefulness. These actions last for a short while until he claims that she should be able to make her own choices and then he smiles. By accepting that a person should be free to do so, *Doctor Who* is displaying its most pertinent relationship as one which is founded by individualistic principles. Moreover, the companion when presented with an opportunity to be independent, takes it, following the Doctor's example as to what should be done in a given situation.

*Doctor Who*, in these early stages, not only shows the Doctor to be an individualist, and reinforces its dominance over any other contending value systems by rewarding him for acting in accordance, but also by punishing anyone who counter opposes. An example can be seen when the second Doctor is pitted against the Cybermen for the first time.<sup>101</sup> Trapped in their tomb, the Doctor is able to isolate himself with his nemesis, leaving a second antagonist, Victoria, a clear chance to escape the tomb to safety. Rather than taking the exit, she moves to obtain a weapon and begins shooting at a lone Cyberman. The meaning behind the action is explained both to be an act of recompense for her actions against the greater collective, as well as a gesture which she hopes will allow the other humans to escape. Victoria looks back to the entrance of the room while the Cybermen have their backs turned to her. From the distance she would need to cover, it can be inferred that she would easily be able to escape and save herself.

---

<sup>101</sup> Howe and Walker, 132; The Cybermen are Android-Human sentient beings, which have been wiped of all emotion and only serve the purpose of turning the rest of humanity into them.

Instead, she trudges to free those she has helped capture, and in turn, much further from the assured escape. The moment her hands reach the imprisoned, the Cybermen notice her plan. An action which is met with immediate consequences, as she is killed. Here proof is found that within *Doctor Who*, as currently constructed, helping others results in destruction, while acting with a self-first mentality would have allowed continued safety.

There are moments presented which seemingly would be in direct conflict with the current overarching enforced ideals such as implications that the Doctor does care about his companions, and would put them on an equal ground as himself. However, dominance of individualism as the only endorsed pattern of ideas is repeatedly fortified. Such as, although the Doctor consistently keeps companions, they are closer to pets and not worthy of real sacrifice to protect. Meaning, if the situation called for it, he would have no issue letting everyone die to save himself. An example of which can be found within *The Mind Robber*.

The Doctor is presented with a situation where both of his two companions are captured by a Master Controller who can manipulate their actions. After pleading to release them, the Controller provides the solution: “If you agree to take my place, they could be released.”<sup>102</sup> The Doctor immediately responds, “You would really do that?”<sup>103</sup> Here he is momentarily giving the feeling he would consider sacrificing himself, thus leaving a door open for challenging world views, before his individualistic tendencies quickly takes over, responding to his own question before the Controller has a chance,

---

<sup>102</sup> *The Mind Robber Part 5*, directed by David Maloney (1968; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2005), DVD.

<sup>103</sup> *The Mind Robber Part 5*.

“No. My answer is still no.”<sup>104</sup> The moment is pivotal in expressing not only the relationship that the Doctor has with his companions at the current point in his life, but also how individualism is currently suppressing any other mode of thought. Through the actions of bringing companions with him, and seeking to help them when they are in duress, it could be argued that the Doctor is making an attempt to create a collective community. On the contrary, when presented with a scenario where true sacrifice would be required, the Doctor scoffs, giving sentiments that they are replaceable pieces of his agenda. An action which further discredits any opposing ideals.

When the Doctor asks, “You would really do that?” the question could be thought of as either being asked back to the Controller or to himself. Would the Doctor really be willing to sacrifice himself in order to save a companion’s life? The juncture of consideration, at best, can be taken as him momentarily deciding if he has grown close enough to these people to the point where portrayed ideology has been altered. The answer, for the current point in the timeline, is answered as quickly as it is asked, as the Doctor shoots down the proposition. Despite this fact, it cannot be ignored that the opportunity existed. Especially, taking into consideration, while the proposal was ultimately shot down, lack of immediacy in his response signified a distinct instance where individualism, while only for a moment, did not sustain complete dominance. Moreover, although the situation ends with the companions escaping, it is not by the Doctor’s sacrifice, rather through their own personal intellect.

When the third incarnation takes over, it is seen that individualism is still not at a point where it is being truly challenged. As the Doctor is dealing with the Master and a

---

<sup>104</sup> *The Mind Robber Part 5.*

dangerous situation, he allows a human to be killed. Once the issue is resolved, rather than tending to the fallen associate, the Doctor steps over his body and returns to the TARDIS leaving his companion, who did stop to look, chasing from behind yelling, “Doctor, wait for me!”<sup>105</sup> Visually what can be ascertained here is the Doctor walking away from a question or situation and completely tuning out as someone yells, “Wait,” behind him is one that is commonplace amongst scenes of the early years, and furthermore, is an instance which give clarity to how the collectivist ideology is being kept silenced.<sup>106</sup> Originating with the first Doctor in *The Rescue*, in the heart of Dalek fortress, the natives are calling out to the Doctor for instructions and he wanders off in his own world, not worried about anyone in his surroundings. It is not until his companion grabs his shoulder that he turns around, responding “Hmm? Oh, yes, yes, yes, come along.”<sup>107</sup> What is more interesting, is that within the episode *The Three Doctors*, when the third Doctor is forced to call upon former incarnations of himself. They are all offering up suggestions of how to defeat the villain, Omega, and rather than listen or converse with earlier versions of his own consciousness, He shushes them while walking away mumbling inaudible dialogue to himself.<sup>108</sup> Why the moment is noteworthy is that in that it Doctor shows that he is not only disinterested in help and opinions from

---

<sup>105</sup> *The Mind of Evil Part 6*, directed by Timothy Combe (1971; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2013), DVD.

<sup>106</sup> *The Mind of Evil Part 6*.

<sup>107</sup> *The Rescue*, directed by Christopher Barry (1965; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009), DVD.

<sup>108</sup> *The Three Doctors Part 4*, directed by Lennie Mayne (1973. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012.) DVD. Within the episode the Doctor crosses his own timeline in order to join forces with the previous two incarnations of himself in order to defeat an ancient Time Lord, Omega.

everyone around him, but he takes his individual identity so far, that despite the fact that he can speak to another version of himself, he rejects help and solutions from earlier selves.

In addition to showing individualism as the prevalent enforced way of thinking within the first six studied episodes of *Doctor Who*, the analysis herein also seeks to express a deeper understanding of how it maintains itself within that state. It has been expressed that the Doctor, as the most closely followed character within *Doctor Who*, has the ability to shed light on the way that the world is intended to be seen. And while much, in terms of ideological agency, can be discerned from the afore mentioned situations, further insight can be found as to how hegemony of that world view is supported through what is shown to be villainous. In order to create conflict amongst the protagonist and antagonist, there must be differentiating viewpoints. Through the first three Doctors studied, conflict was found to be created and maintained through villains possessing opposing world views. Hence, as it is important to understand the value system that *Doctor Who* portrays as correct, it is of equal importance to understand how reoccurring enemies such as the Daleks and Cybermen values are constructed in order to discern what is presented as incorrect. It is then found that through the strategy of labeling antagonists with opposing value systems and then punishing them accordingly that *Doctor Who* is able to suppress the voices of any insurgent modes of thought.

An example can be found during the first appearance of the Daleks, as they are shown to act as a complete collective. According to Xinguang Chen, three statements which would be true of a collectivist are: “1) All individuals in a society are closely related to each other. 2) Individuals may not be able to survive if there is no group or

country 3) To ensure group interests self-interests must be sacrificed.”<sup>109</sup> When Skaro is found to be filled with toxic air, the Daleks resort to taking over the whole planet to maintain the resources to operate the small robotic pods they each live in. Through them, we see a society of aliens, which not only are given similar genetic code, but also are placed in identical casing and given the same voice, which are represented as clones of the same droid. A thought further explored with another *Doctor Who* mainstay villain is, the Cybermen. They, much like the Daleks, are identical in the way that they look and speak, but they also are explained to have had their genetics manipulated so that, within their steel casing, they are exactly the same.

In regards to the second collectivist statement, rather than with the Doctor moving from time to time on his own, the Daleks and Cybermen cannot survive without their faction. It is explained that the Dalek society needs all its individuals to properly harvest resources for maintaining their pods. More evidence lies in the operation of the Cybermen, as they too are incapable of individually surviving. They seek to turn everyone into them, so that there is no difference amongst class, and they are free of sickness or death. There are multiple opportunities presented to the activated Cybermen in *The Tomb of the Cybermen* to escape the tomb and go off into the world. Instead, they remain underground building their colonies, until a time comes when they are strong enough as a community to take over the world. They, along with the Daleks, share a goal of destroying all other races other than themselves, with the distinction of the Daleks looking to kill and the Cybermen wanting to convert others into themselves to strengthen their own collective.

---

<sup>109</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

As to the final statement of a collective, the Cybermen, when challenged, send out multiple guards knowing that they will most likely be killed. An action that is of no consequence to them, nor those who go out under their own free will, as they are of the mindset that their self-interest and safety must be sacrificed for the protection and betterment of the group. The Daleks, on the other hand, have accepted the Doctor as one of their own, since he had previously suggested that he would be able to teach them how to sustain their pods. When the Daleks found themselves under attack by Skaro's native population, as well as exposed to the toxic elements of the surrounding environment, the dying creatures called out to the Doctor, "You will help us."<sup>110</sup> What is most noteworthy about here is that it is a statement. Rather than the Daleks expressing a plea for help, as they are essentially telling the Doctor to sacrifice his own well-being by staying in the harsh air, they make a command. By having no upward inflection in tone, or quivering of the voice which would signify a request, evidence is provided that within the Dalek reality, the sacrifice is not asked for, but expected.

Attributing collectivist ideals are not limited to the recurring villains within these episodes. The antagonist which frees the Cybermen from their sleeping state calls out to the Doctor, "You will see the union between their mass power and my absolute intelligence."<sup>111</sup> The key word within the dialogue is "union," as if in the mind of the speaker there is to be an amalgamation, which is not by his choosing, but instead because combining himself with the Cybermen would, in turn, ensure the safety and prosperity of the collective he hopes to build. It is here, through punishment of the antagonist, that

---

<sup>110</sup> *The Tomb of the Cybermen Part 4*, directed by Morris Barry (1967; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

<sup>111</sup> *The Tomb of the Cybermen Part 4*.

*Doctor Who* gives evidence of reinforcing the ideals of individualism. As he is killed, thought of acting in accordance with opposing ideals is successfully silenced.

The punishment and reward system of maintaining this hegemony is continued through the villain, Omega. He, similar to the Doctor, is one who has adopted an individualistic value system. As an omnipotent being in control of the universe, his power is unmatched. It is individualism that has allowed him to stay empowered for millennia as well as influencing the world around him. It is not until the Doctor arrives and Omega asks for help that he is punished by the universe around him. Once Omega asks for the Doctor to take his place and free him to go back to his people, he is expressing sentiment against the currently enforced way of thinking that allowed him to be brought to power. Soon after, he is dissipated into nothingness for blindly accepting the Doctor's help.

Although most antagonists are endowed with ideals opposing individualism and punished for it, an alternate rhetorical strategy utilized to maintain hegemony is rewarding conformity. In this scenario, villains are made to act in accordance with the presently dominant constructed world view, and then are given positive reinforcement. An example of which can be found when the Controller captures the Doctor and his companions, and expresses that those who are caught in the storybook world are "no longer human," as they are now part of a group.<sup>112</sup> The discourse here presents collectivist views to be, at least in the current point in the Doctor's timeline, "not human," and thus a further reinforcement of individualism. A thought that is continued when the Controller acts in accordance with are the values of individualism at the end of

---

<sup>112</sup> *The Mind Robber Part 5*, directed by David Maloney (1968; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2005), DVD.

the episode. He expresses to the Doctor that he has a desire to be freed from the environment of his enslavers' agenda in order to carry out his life as he sees fit.<sup>113</sup> A request that is promptly granted, as he is released, and shown to walk away happy.

### **The Changing Ideology**

Until here, *Doctor Who* has been clearly presented with an individualistic nature through examples from his first three regenerations, it is through his fourth, fifth, and sixth incarnations that we begin to see the individualism move from a state of completely suppressing other ideologies to one which is being challenged. The fourth Doctor, when confronted with the Sontarans, provides a first example of individualism failing in its hegemony, when a collectivist ideal is portrayed in a positive light, within the resolution of a conflict.<sup>114</sup> To defeat his enemy, the Doctor divulges a plan that has his companion go into the ship of the antagonist and place a bomb that will eventually kill the villain. The reason the plan is of particular significance is that the Doctor's schemed resolution needed multiple people to execute. Rather than the previous instance where the Doctor would solve the problem at hand, proving that he, as the individualist, is the only solution to the problem, enlists and must trust a companion to assist him in a situation where if not executed properly, the results would be disastrous. Yet, despite there being a strong sense of the same individualistic approach executed when the first Doctor chose to protect himself over a child when confronted with the War Machines, we see here his

---

<sup>113</sup> *The Mind Robber Part 5*.

<sup>114</sup> *The Sontaran Experiment Part 2*, directed by Rodney Bennett (1975; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2007), DVD; The Sontarans are a potatoe shaped cloned army of war strategists, who are bred to only think and care about war.

method takes it slightly differently.<sup>115</sup> The Doctor still sees that he is in the less dangerous situation, pitting himself against the Sontaran. A claim which is justified through the Doctor knowing that the opponent is used to being in a lighter atmosphere thus, the heavy air of the planet they are currently on, leaves him with little endurance. Knowing that a physical confrontation will cause the Sontaran to become weak if it exudes energy in a battle, the Doctor remains in line with his individualistic ideals, as he could easily escape should the battle get out of his control. On the other hand, a challenge to the dominating individualistic narrative is presented by the Doctor sending his companion into the lair of Sontaran. Though it may seem the less perilous situation was given to the companion, it is later described that the objective the Doctor gave him was to plant a bomb, containing an unknown number of variables, that could have easily led to his death. Aware that the Sontaran will need to recharge his energy in the ship after their quarrel, the Doctor has his companion set the aforementioned bomb there. A deed the Doctor not only could have never achieved on his own, but one which also displays a real necessity for help, providing resistance to the individualistic ideal that “one can do better by working alone, than in a group.”<sup>116</sup> After which, validation of this being the “correct” choice is granted through the plan coming to fruition and the antagonist defeated.

Despite minor transgressions, what becomes apparent is that, despite the challenge to the dominant established and singularly enforced way of being, there is a clear comfort with remaining in individualism and thus, collectivistic viewpoints are

---

<sup>115</sup> *The War Machines Part 4*. Within *The War Machines Part 4*; the Doctor sends a child into the line of fire against the villain rather than putting himself in harm’s way

<sup>116</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

dormant. A sentiment proven through not only how the boundaries of what is right or wrong are tested, but also by displaying the Doctor as uncomfortable when getting too far outside of the current enforced value system. Right after the bomb goes off killing the Sontaran, the Doctor goes to his other companion, Sarah, who had previously been captured and asks, “Sarah, feel better? No, don’t tell me. No time.”<sup>117</sup> The quick action of asking about the well-being of another is, much like in his previous incarnations, wiped away before the respondent has a chance to answer, implying the Doctor is asking merely out of social obligation, rather than authentic compassion for the companion. And although in itself the moment does show evolution in his way of thinking, the immediate recoiling reaffirms ideological leaning.

Moreover, reinforcement for individualism’s dominance is again found through the delegitimizing of the collectivist value system. By analyzing the antagonist Sontarans appearance, it is clear they not only resemble each other in armor, but are similar in features, too. A race, which was built to be the ultimate strategists of war, are shown to not only be incapable of survival on their own, as expressed through the death of the single Sontaran on the planet, but they also fall under the blanket statement, “Every one of us must consult others about how to act and behave.”<sup>118</sup> By the Sontaran checking in with the mother-ship during the same time that he is inspecting the planet four separate times within the twenty-two minute episode, it is shown that he has a defining need for approval before he can take any action. The constant need for communication with and approval from the larger entity on the correct way to behave in given situations will

---

<sup>117</sup> *The Sontaran Experiment Part 2.*

<sup>118</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

eventually be shown to be their final undoing. The Doctor is able to not only defeat the single Sontaran on the planet, but the entire fleet as well, as he dictates to them that he knows their strategy, and can therefore take down their whole army. It is his proclamation, which expresses to the society that as a group with collaboration, they will not be able to achieve their goals.

Despite these attempts to fortify itself, small declarations against individualism continue to show up. An example being the fourth incarnation, when the Doctor's companion is captured by the Movellans and has a bomb strapped to her. He must then choose between potentially putting himself in the line of an explosive to save her or letting her be destroyed and saving himself. Though it is not made clear if he will be able to get away regardless of his choice, he decides to jump in with his companion and attempts to help her. The action seems to go against everything that he believes in, disavowing both the ideals that an individualist should put their interests first, and that individuals are more important than the group. While the tactic of positive reinforcement for correct behavior of the Doctor has been previously discussed, here we find an instance of action being depicted as negative. As with the antagonists, the Doctor's choice is intended to be viewed as "incorrect," with confirmation being provided through the immediate punishment he is met with. The retribution in this case being that the bomb is shown to be fake, he is knocked unconscious and taken as a hostage proving not even he is above discipline. Though the Doctor's rhetorically mandated penance, it can be inferred that while individualism has been challenged as a singular way of thinking, it has not been overcome.

The selflessness theme of the Doctor continues when he is regenerated into a fifth incarnation. Here, he is found along with his two companions, accused of murder. Though he does not immediately think to protect his companions amid the accusation, he is clearly shocked when he learns that they will be sharing in whatever punishment he receives, thus showing that through the eyes of the police, he is viewed as a member of the group. When the news is given to him, he stands facing the police, takes a step back and, with wide eyes, stares at them in disbelief, because he is now faced with a decision to protect not only himself, but also to save those he brought into the situation. An instance which marks the first time the Doctor becomes consciously aware of the change in his values. By experiencing a sense of obligation to others, an inherently collectivist viewpoint, we can see that individualism is now challenged to a point opposite actions are met without consequence. In the case here, it can be illustrated through the obligation the Doctor feels, a sentiment which is demonstrated when he then takes the police with him to the TARDIS under the pretense that he can prove his innocence. However, after arriving at the TARDIS, rather than closing the door behind him and leaving his companions behind, he invites the police inside, and takes them all back to the original crime. A new bond that is taken one step further, when his companion is brought to the roof of a building by the true killer. The Doctor then puts himself in danger to save someone in his group. The action is rewarded by the villain eventually returning his companion safely to him proving to be the first example where a clear resolution and reward occurs as a result of acting with a group-first interest in mind. Moreover, it is the first occasion which sees the “correct” choice as being that of the collective. As such, it is then the first example wherein the hegemony, previously held by individualistic

viewpoints, has failed to uphold itself as the sole truth portrayed through *Doctor Who*. Hence, as a new voice has entered the discourse, the self-first attributes can no longer be seen or described as “the norm.” Further threat to, and evolution of, the positively communicated value system can be found in *The Caves of Andorzn*.

The Doctor is seen running by himself through a desert, dodging bullets to get to his companion, Peri. After risking his life for her, it is discovered that she is dying and the only way to save her life is for him to obtain an antidote, which is buried deep in a cave with toxic air. The Doctor, uncharacteristically and without hesitation, ventures into the cave in order to retrieve the medicine, a choice, which based on evidence of the enforced values of previous incarnations, should have had him punished. However, as the discourse now is found to be changing in regards to how one should act or feel in given situation, after falling to the ground grasping for air multiple times, the Doctor is successful in obtaining the item. As he comes out of the cave with Peri, the Doctor is informed that he now has the same poisoning that she does, and it will shortly be killed by it. He then shows a higher regard for Peri’s life than his own by giving her the entire supply of antidote. An action he executes despite being fully aware that the antidote is depleted, thus a gesture that will more than likely cost him his own life. Understanding that a Time Lord has twelve regenerations, it would normally not be seen as such a large sacrifice, however, the Doctor acknowledges that he does not know if he will be able to regenerate after absorbing so many toxins, stating “Is this death?... Feels different this time. Might regenerate, might not.”<sup>119</sup> With his dying breath, the Doctor turns to Peri

---

<sup>119</sup> *The Caves of Andorzn Part 4*, directed by Graeme Harper (1984; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

and states, "Sorry Peri, I'm not going to make it."<sup>120</sup> After the statement, he looks her in the eye, and a slight wrinkle of a smile on his lips, signifying he has accepted sacrificing himself, and he falls to the ground dead, presumably dead.

By sacrificing himself for someone else, *Doctor Who* exhibits the titular character acting in direct defiance with the values associated individualism.<sup>121</sup> It is through sacrificing himself that *Doctor Who* comes to two impasses. First, the currently portrayed way of viewing and acting towards the world does not agree with that of the Doctor. Second, that individualistic world view has failed to uphold itself, and can no longer be considered hegemonic. By creating a discourse that has routinely enforced its viewpoints by utilizing tactics of punishment, often death, of characters who do not conform to them, the Doctor's transgressions should not have been allowed. Yet, he is not killed and, instead, regenerates. While the argument could be made that he is punished through utilizing one of his finite lives, this should be seen as no more than reduced sentencing based on the previously discussed instances of defiance to the individualistic narrative. Furthermore, it is through lack of ability to villainize counterpoising ways of thinking that individualism has lost its dominant status.

As the collectivist voice continues to emerge as a valid mode of thought, the sixth Doctor is placed in a situation mirroring the previous one. Peri has again been captured and in need of the Doctor to act the part of savior. He follows the same guidelines that rewarded him by saving both of their lives in *The Caves of Andorzni*, returning to the

---

<sup>120</sup> *The Caves of Andorzani Part 4*.

<sup>121</sup> Harry Triandis, and Michele Gelfand, "A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism," *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, ed. Paul Lange, Arie Kruglanski, & Troy Higgins (New York: Sage Publications, 2011). 506-510.

prison to save his incarcerated companion. By doing so, we see the Doctor, once again, is attributed with a core collectivistic trait, “to ensure group interests are met, self-interests must be sacrificed.”<sup>122</sup> It is herein that proof is found signifying the core interest of the Doctor is no longer self-serving, but rather protecting the people he cares about.

Furthermore, these choices by the Doctor implement another challenge to individualism.

As before, retribution transpires through him being taken out of the rescue mission, teleported back to his home planet of Gallifrey, and placed before the Time Lord High Council to explain why he has acted in a fashion that they have not condoned. It is discovered that the individualist Time Lords allowed Peri to die in order make the point to the Doctor that he is not to interfere with the lives of others. After the statement, serving as a verbal depiction of why the punishment was carried out, the Doctor is shown the execution of his companion. The vivid display of the Doctor’s closest friend’s death utilizes the previous rhetorical tactic of villainizing opposing viewpoints but, in the current instance, the stratagem advocates agency of the collective. Hence, the death acts as a key in breaking individualism as the dominant worldview. Furthermore, a clear line is marked where collectivism not only impresses itself as the correct way of living but also, and possibly more important, depicts individualism as incorrect. As the Doctor cries out, “They took it upon themselves to act like second rate gods?!”<sup>123</sup> the Time Lords suddenly become shifted from fellow protagonists to antagonists, cementing an evolution in the equality of the portrayed values share of voice.

### **The Transitional Ideology**

---

<sup>122</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

<sup>123</sup> *Mindwarp*.

Now that the present *Doctor Who* ideology has been found to be no longer dominated by a singular voice, it is during his seventh, eighth, and ninth incarnations that my research has found the discourse to enter a transitional phase, where the values associated with both individualism and collectivism are present. Yet, it has also been discovered that, within this stage, while both viewpoints are expressed, neither is able to overpower the other. Through the periods discussed in the following section, it will be shown that the Doctor has disassociated himself from the Time Lord society, as well as individualism, entering a phase where the enforced way to think and act becomes confused and muddled. Illustration of which is found through the fact that as there are similar amounts of instances where both the individual and collective viewpoints are used in the given situations. It is then a result of which that gives a point where balance is found, allowing for openness to action and exploration into personal identity.

A feat that becomes immediately apparent through the way that the seventh Doctor carries himself within *Delta and the Bannerman*. Herein, not only is the Doctor attempting to help someone, specifically, an alien and her daughter, from unjust persecution, but he also he goes out of his way to do so. Unlike previous conundrums that saw him assists others, within the current one, the Doctor sees someone in need and reaches out to help. Through doing so, he is actively seeking out an opportunity to reenact the situation which saw his companion killed as well as showing defiance towards values associated with individualism. Later, another character in the Doctor's companionship describes a plan of how to defeat the Bannermen. Rather than scoffing at the idea, he takes it in and states, "I cannot condone this foolishness, but, then again, I

was never known for rationality.”<sup>124</sup> This statement holds two points. First, by not condoning the foolish behavior by others, we are shown that while the idea is not correct in the eyes of the Doctor, through his addition of “but, then again” he now allowing an openness to the ideas of the greater group. Second, by claiming he “was never known for rationality,” it is evidence that he is admitting to both himself and others that, in the past, he was not open to hearing these opinions from others. It is then through the acknowledgement of evolution of his personal identity from older incarnations and implying his irrationality that the current Doctor is able to flip the narrative. Now, rather than showing problem solving by a sole person as the best way to solve the problem, as presented within *The War Machines*, it is described as irrational.

The collectivist part of the spectrum is furthered in *Silver Nemesis*, wherein the companion of the Doctor expresses that she is scared. The reason being that the Doctor had informed her that they would be going into a warehouse that is known to be inhabited by Cybermen, most likely resulting in their death. Her fear is a thought that had not occurred to the Doctor. Earlier incarnations would have met her comment with a snide remark or, most commonly, ignored it all together and then carried on with his own agenda. In an action, which would have been labeled as uncharacteristic prior to the transitional ideology, the Doctor stops and turns to face her. He grabs her hands and, leaning over so that their eyes meet at the same level, he softly and genuinely says, "Oh, Ace. I'm sorry. Forgive me. Why don't you go back to the TARDIS? You'll be safe

---

<sup>124</sup> *Delta and the Bannerman Part 3*, directed by Chris Clough (1987; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009), DVD.

there, whatever happens."<sup>125</sup> The sentiment shows him honestly empathizing with the feelings of another and a sincere caring for them. These actions are also worthy of distinction, because by kneeling to meet Ace, he is going out of his way to meet her eye level, a motion which symbolically provides proof that, from his point of view, they are equals. The Doctor however, then continues into the building regardless of her choice to accompany him, showing that despite caring for another individual, he is still accepting of individualist ideals. These actions show not only a large movement from individualism towards openness to ideological development and ambivalence within *Doctor Who*, but also the inability for either side suppress the other.

The juxtaposition diluting any expression of a solid identity enforcement in either ideology, is a notion which is encouraged when he and Ace get inside the building. Cybermen are found to be nearing an attack and Ace begins to give her thoughts for a new plan. Contrary to his earlier acceptance of the opinions of others, he silences her with a wave of his hand and snidely expounding "you are interrupting me."<sup>126</sup> A response, which coupled with the movement away from her, shows that although they were demonstrated to be equals, in the moment when the Doctor forced to act without being afforded the time to consider his actions, he is inclined to follow individualistic tendencies.

The crux of wavering in terms of how to act based up one's value system is met during the eighth incarnation. After regenerating, the Doctor finds himself alone in a

---

<sup>125</sup> *The Silver Nemesis Part 3*, directed by Chris Clough (1987; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2010), DVD.

<sup>126</sup> *The Silver Nemesis Part 3*.

hospital and cries out to himself multiple times “Who am I!?”<sup>127</sup> As he searches for self-identity during the movie, assertion of the individualistic characteristics are shown. While Grace, the Doctor’s companion in the film, tries to help him, original personality traits and tactics were discovered, such as ignoring her questions, and walking away mumbling inaudible comments to himself. It is not until the antagonist, the Master, looks into the Eye of Harmony that the Doctor is able to remember all of his past lives, it is here that the balanced displayed way of seeing the world comes back.<sup>128</sup> After that moment, his demeanor and the tone of the movie is noticeably different, because he answers all of her questions and smiles. It is also after here that he not only stops walking away from her, but makes sure that she accompanies him wherever he goes so that he can protect her as well as receive her opinions. Due to the complete flip in attributed personality traits within the movie, we are able to see illustration of how much the presented worldviews have taken place within the discourse. It is then through the tactic of expressing individualism as the value system no longer being acted in accordance with, that it has begun to be seen as irrelevant. Moreover, by doing so, the collective voice is now placed in a position to overthrow the incumbent as the new overarching way of seeing the world.

Further proof lies in the fact that stopping the Master is only possible when the Doctor is able accept help from Grace. His behavior here begins showing a distinct choice to work towards a collectivist viewpoint. A sentiment which is confirmed when the movie concludes. The Doctor asks Grace to come with him, an offer she rejects, but

---

<sup>127</sup> *Doctor Who: The Movie*, directed by Geoffrey Sax (1996; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2011), DVD.

<sup>128</sup> Richards, 546-549; The Eye of Harmony is a piece of the TARDIS which shows, as well as connects all points in time. It is the center of a black hole created by the Time Lords, which powers all TARDIS activity.

counters with a proposition for him to stay there with her. Though he declines the offer, he states, “I’m tempted.”<sup>129</sup> A comment which is declares the Doctor is willing to join a group larger than himself.

What was found through the amalgamation of these middle incarnations is that as the new pattern of beliefs is unable supplant itself as the dominant viewpoint until the end of the Doctor’s ninth life. Therefore, before discussing the transition, it must first be asserted how, during these middle incarnations, the Doctor’s adversaries share in his swaying view of what system of values should be seen as the desired way to be. Simply put, it is here that we begin to. *Silver Nemesis* provides an example which compiles antagonistic traits of both individualistic and collectivistic within a single episode. The Doctor here is faced with both sides of the spectrum. First, the Cybermen, represent the pinnacle of collectivism. Second, Lady Le, who throughout the episode is shown to be solely be working towards achieving personal gain. Her individualistic alignment is culminated when she allows her companion to be killed in an attempt to gain control of the bow and arrow.<sup>130</sup> In the end, the collectivist Cybermen kill the individualist Lady Le. The Doctor, however, who at the current moment in the narrative is a collectivist-individualist transition, defeats the Cybermen, thus enforcing a necessary balance between these two ideologies.

Furthermore, as we see the Master presented in *Doctor Who: The Movie*, he is the embodiment of the complete antithesis of the Doctor.<sup>131</sup> As such, his strong individualist

---

<sup>129</sup> *Doctor Who: The Movie*.

<sup>130</sup> *Silver Nemesis*.

<sup>131</sup> *Doctor Who: The Movie*, directed by Geoffrey Sax (1996; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2011), DVD.

tendencies speak volumes towards the changing ideology presented within *Doctor Who*. As the Master's main objective in the narrative is to steal the remaining regenerations of the Doctor, it is seen that he cares little for his own race. Despite his individual goals, it is the way that he goes about achieving them that is noteworthy. In a mimicry of the Doctor's companions, the Master takes on his own, Lee. Rather than aiming for helpfulness, as is seen with the Doctor's companions, Lee follows the Master blindly while looking for a reward of riches and displaying his own desires for personal gain. It is, however, in both of their eyes, a partnership used only to achieve their individual goals. As is the case, the Master does not get defeated until his actions reveal his true values. Blinded by his need to defeat the Doctor, he kills Grace and Lee, proving that the collective means nothing to him. It is through the casting aside the lives of those who have followed him, thus labeling them as meaningless to him, that Masters' values are shown to be in alignment with that of the Doctor's early incarnations.

Like the Master, Van Statten in *Dalek* is shown to be one who identifies completely with individualistic goals. Even though he keeps a large group around him at all times for protection, he displays how little he cares about their well-being, and how much he values his own life over theirs, by the ways he treats them. When the Dalek escapes, he demands that the guards stop defending themselves, calling: "Tell them to stop shooting at it. They're dispensable!"<sup>132</sup> Moreover, his first appearance sees him wiping the mind of one of his workers because he did not laugh at one of his jokes. Van Statten then sends the mind-wiped worker away to live in poverty. Upon the storyline's conclusion, the individualistic tendency is punished by having the same scenario

---

<sup>132</sup> *Dalek*, directed by Joe Ahearne (2005; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

reenacted on Van Statten. A moment that stands out because it is the same response which would have been expected of the Doctor early in his life, but now with a collectivist worldview, these behaviors are expressed as those which are worthy of discipline and contempt.

Beginning with Van Statten, it is then through the discourse of the ninth Doctor, that the group-valuing ideology begins to execute rhetorical tactics which establish a new overarching dominant view of what should be perceived as the norm. Exploring the same devices as discussed in previous sections, we can see that the collectivist agenda attempts to demonize its counterpoints through exploiting what characteristics are associated with “evil.” A feat which can be understood best through exploring the parallel change in the Doctor’s relationship with his antagonists. As *Doctor Who* explores a new potential way of being, the show Doctor’s actions are justified as “correct” through his anointment as that of a protagonist. In *Dalek*, the Doctor is locked in a room with the genetically modified villain. It is then discovered that they are both thought to be the last of their kind. When learning of the demise of his kind, the Dalek states “I’m alone in the universe. So are you. We are the same.” The Doctor replies without thinking, “We’re not the same!” But then taking a moment to comprehend the words, which were spoken to him, his eyes get wide as he realizes, “No. Wait. Maybe we are.”<sup>133</sup> A response signifying the fact that he understands he is alone in the universe, yet his rage-filled outburst implies that he does not want to be. What is more is that the Dalek, who has, in the previous sections, been labeled within *Doctor Who* as a villain, begins to show tendencies of an individualist nature. As he escapes from the underground facility, the

---

<sup>133</sup> *Dalek*, directed by Joe Ahearne (2005; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

Doctor expresses that a single Dalek is not only capable of surviving on its own, but also of destroying all of earth by itself. A moment which is significant because the Dalek race's long time objective has been to exterminate the world of everything that is not a Dalek.

Rose points out the reversal of the displayed identities as she follows the Dalek to the top of the facility so it can feel the sunlight. They arrive right as the Doctor comes around the corner with a gun looking to kill the Dalek. Rose then jumps in front of it and scorns the Doctor, "It couldn't kill Van Statten, and it couldn't kill me. It's changing. What about you, Doctor? What are you changing into?"<sup>134</sup> A question that is not ultimately answered until *The Parting of the Ways* when the Doctor is again pitted against the Daleks, but unlike last time, he is handed a choice. Either kill everyone on Earth to achieve his goal of destroying the Daleks, or save the planet from extinction, despite knowing that doing so will have all humans turned into Dalek slaves. After ample time thinking about the possible outcomes, he chooses to save Earth, accepting his own death by Daleks, since there is no way he will be able to regenerate fast enough to not be killed forever.<sup>135</sup> Of equal importance, there was a chance earlier on for him to get in the TARDIS and leave. Though, when the Doctor had brought the idea up to Rose, she quickly shot the notion down replying, "Yeah, but you never would."<sup>136</sup> Agreeing with her, rather than running away and saving himself, he commits to stand up as part of a

---

<sup>134</sup> *Dalek*; Rose, the Doctor's companion at the time is speaking of how the Dalek chose of its own will no to kill Van Statten, a secondary villain that had been holding the Dalek captive.

<sup>135</sup> *The Parting of the Ways*, directed by Joe Ahearne (2005; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD; It is explained that if a Time Lord is in the process of regeneration is killed, it will end his existence forever regardless of remaining lives.

<sup>136</sup> *The Parting of the Ways*.

group and fight, thus displaying his willingness to sacrifice his personal goals for the betterment of the group. It is then within the moment, that the Doctor whether consciously or not, accepts his new ideology, and hereafter cements collectivism as the show's dominant value system.

### **Collectivist Doctors**

As the transitional period ends, the scenario that the tenth and eleventh Doctor live in is one which sees the show's demonstration of the ideal way of being no longer in flux, but to be fully advocating collectivism. Proof of it can first be seen as the tenth Doctor goes in to check on the little girl he sees on the other side of a fireplace. To do so, he must leave his companions, Rose and Mickey, behind as he goes to investigate, however, he does not abandon them. Instead, they are told to wait for his return and to not wonder off. Though previous Doctors would have used the moment to rid themselves of the group, the current one does not. Rather, he is sincere in his comments, truly meaning "Don't wander off."<sup>137</sup> The last part of his statement, proven and compounded by the extended wide-eyed look he gives each of them, shows his true caring for his companions, as he worries for their safety with a smaller group. Through these statement, *Doctor Who* is showing that value should be placed upon assuring the security of the collective is greater than insuring that of an individual. Further validation of the claim lies with him taking them on an expedition and fearlessly landing in a ship where the only known variable is that they had sent out a call for help. As the Doctor is bringing his companions into a potentially perilous situation, the action aligns itself with the same sentiment that the seventh Doctor had when walking into the warehouse known to be

---

<sup>137</sup> *The Girl in the Fireplace*, directed by Euros Lyn (2006; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

filled with Cybermen. But this time, as he tells them not to wander off, he provides them with a key to the TARDIS, representing that the Doctor has learned, accepted and adapted since Ace and her fear of the Cybermen. Additionally, when the Doctor returns to the ship and, upon finding them missing, immediately goes off searching for them, and then exuding jubilation upon finding them safe. Happiness is expressed through smiles, hugs and a scolding for wandering off, which reminds the audience of the actions of a protective parent.

At the climactic moment of the episode, Reinette calls out to the Doctor, “The clock on the mantle is broken!”<sup>138</sup> Her utterance not only serves as a plea for the Doctor to save her, but it simultaneously displays her absolute faith in him, as he had promised earlier that he would return to protect her when the clock breaks, because within the plot it is explained that by executing the action, she is signifying the villain is returning to kill her. He rewards her trust by breaking thorough the last remaining time portal to her world. By mirroring the same willingness to sacrifice his own well-being he displayed towards his companion, a distinction can be drawn that she has been accepted into his group. To find proof of knowledge of his sacrifice, just moments earlier, the Doctor explained to Rose that he would be stuck in Madame de Pompadour’s time frame, and could never return to the life he has always known. As he goes through the mirror and the glass breaks on the floor, effectively trapping him, the moment is shown in slow motion, almost to give the Doctor’s perspective and to highlight his sacrifice of everything he has ever known for the good of another. In turn, collectivism is

---

<sup>138</sup> *The Girl in the Fireplace*; The comment “The clock on the mantle is broken!” is explained to be a call for the Doctor, as he’d promised that when the clock breaks, signifying the villains had returned, that we would come back to save her.

rhetorically enforced as the correct mode of making decision through the following scenes which provide him safe passage back to his TARDIS and companions. Further conveyance of the new dominant ideology is demonstrated through going back to his other team requiring the Doctor to momentarily leave Madame de Pompadour behind. Despite his actions, the Doctor indicates that he is not intending to permanently leave her, as he is only doing so to get the TARDIS and bring her along with him. However, with collectivism now being demonstrated as the ideology presently holding power over outcomes within the discourse, leaving someone behind can not go unpunished. Upon returning, Reinette is found to have died waiting for the Doctor to come back for her. Through the lens of individualism, earlier incarnations would not have been affected the loss of a companion, as could be seen through the previous example depicting his willingness to sacrifice them to the Controller. However, as that set of values is no longer represented, the Doctor is shown to silently mourn.

Demonstration of his grievance takes place once Mickey and Rose learn of Madame de Pompadour's death look. They at each other, gesture towards the Doctor and nod together, signifying they will give him some time alone. Through the somber visual of the Doctor by himself with his TARDIS, the camera zooms out showing his head down looking at a monitor in contemplation.<sup>139</sup> Here, *Doctor Who* illustrates how singularity should be viewed as a punishment, not something to be aspired towards. Validation of this claim lies in the final sequence of the episode: The Doctor holding onto

---

<sup>139</sup> Scott; The first Doctor claimed that he only had people around him because they had discovered he was a Time Lord, and he did not want anyone else to find out. By keeping those people close to him, in his mind, he was limiting the number of people he would have to deal with.

the note Reinette had given him, bringing it to his heart, meanwhile looking around for Mickey and Rose, who had just left him.

A moment bringing full circle the sadness and substantiating claims of the Doctor's longing for a feeling of belonging is presented by Reinette earlier in the storyline. The Doctor had telepathically linked minds with her in an attempt to discover why the robots were after her. She instead starts reading his mind, calling him "A lonely boy. Lonely then, and lonelier now...My lonely Doctor...How do you deal with the loneliness?" As he pulls back in astonishment calling out to her, "How did you do that!?" She replies "A door, once opened, may be walked through in either direction."<sup>140</sup> A moment providing verbal evidence of two points. First, when she asks him, "How do you deal with the loneliness?" As he immediately pulls back bewildered, the Doctor seemingly subconsciously confirms that she has read his mind. Second, his acknowledgement that she has so and saw his true memories gave proof that her assertions were all truthful. Through both of these instances, collectivism is displaying itself as the sole way to achieve happiness and in turn, denying existence of any other perspective.

It is through this tactic of displaying contentment as being only obtainable through a group which begins to drive the actions of *Doctor Who*. There is no better example of this, nor blatant enforcement and depiction of the intended world view, within *Doctor Who* than in *The Doctor's Daughter*. After seeing his cloned daughter shot and killed by the General, who serves as the antagonist of the episode, the Doctor picks up the gun from the ground and rushes over to his child's executioner. With the Doctor pointing

---

<sup>140</sup> *The Girl in the Fireplace*.

the gun at him, he yells to the others, “I never would. When you start this new world. This world of humans and Hath, remember that. Make the foundation of this society a man that never would.”<sup>141</sup> Simply by “never would,” he is insinuating that it should be made in his image which, in turn, would create the collective society he longs to be part of. In other words, a world where everyone would follow his values thereby forming a collective. More specifically, it would create group that places a higher value on the harmony of its citizens than personal gain. Proof of the claim can be found through his pointing at his own chest when stating how the world should be, as well as through the tears and raw emotion he exuded when another person he accepts is taken from him. Moreover, by distinguishing his mode of thought as separate from the General, who killed his daughter for the personal gain of the sphere, the Doctor is able to canonize his own beliefs, thus censoring the viewpoints that would be presented by an individualist society.<sup>142</sup>

His exhibited rage herein stems from the collective society that he felt he was beginning to build with Jenny before she was killed, forcibly and cruelly ripped her away from him. A building process which was not one that he had taken lightly, as Jenny had to prove herself in order to be accepted. As the Doctor is the lone survivor of his race, he is shown, within the episode, to be hesitant about others referring to Jenny as a Time

---

<sup>141</sup> *The Doctor's Daughter*, directed by Alice Troughton (2008; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD; The episode shows that the reason both humans and Hath were there together on the new planet is that, rather than waring, they were supposed to build a new inhabited world together. When the Doctor states “this world of humans and Hath” he is referring to the way they were supposed to be, and how he wishes it to be when he leaves.

<sup>142</sup> *The Doctor's Daughter*; The episode revolves around two sides waring attaining an object known as “the sphere.” All that is known of this is that it will give the possessor untold prosperity. Upon the conclusion of the episode, it is discovered the sphere is a device which grows plants, making the atmosphere habitable.

Lord. The Doctor's rationale lies in the fact that, as a clone, he is reluctant to think of her as a true Time Lord, which he explains through telling her, "You're an echo. A Time Lord is so much more. A sum of knowledge, a code. A shared history. A shared suffering. Only it's gone now. Gone forever."<sup>143</sup> Not only is it here that we discover a description of his people as those who should be followed, but also directly expressing his people as conforming to the collective way of being.

Additional explanation for his harsh tone and attitude towards Jenny can be justified through the collectivist viewpoint that, "There is a clear distinction as to whether you are one of us or you are not. If you are one of us, you are treated in a very benevolent way and if you are not, malicious treatment is deemed acceptable behavior."<sup>144</sup> It is not until Donna makes the Doctor feel Jenny's chest, showing him she has two hearts, a characteristic distinctive to Time Lords, that he is able to accept her as one of his own. Once the moment occurs, his entire demeanor towards her shifts. He changes from someone who wants her ostracized to that of a teacher, spending the rest of the episode explaining to her the correct way to live. As the sole remaining Time Lord, the passing on the identity of the race is left completely to the Doctor. The "shared knowledge" he spoke of is his to manipulate in any way that he sees fit. As the one holding the power in the situation, he imposes his new identity upon what is to be the "code" and "shared history." As Jenny starts to listen and conform to his ideological teachings, the Doctor accepts her fully into his group. A thought that is validated when his companion, Donna, asks the Doctor whether or not Jenny will be traveling with them

---

<sup>143</sup> *The Doctor's Daughter*.

<sup>144</sup> Ralston, et al., 301.

in the TARDIS. He looks at Jenny, smiles, and pleasantly notes “Yeah, I suppose so.”<sup>145</sup> Through the Doctor’s acceptance of her, *Doctor Who* is found to be utilizing a tactic that seeks to imply happiness can only be found through a group by giving evidence to support that an individual may only obtain acceptance into a group through complying to the way they see the world. Thus, it is through the execution of this tactic that what should be seen as the norm is set as well as representation that it should not be challenged since doing so will result in loss thereof.

From here, finding companions who align with this collective serves as the main objective of the narrative. Beginning with the earlier incarnation, the Doctor, through his own admission, had impassively watched his companions leave him, usually on their accord. But, as collectivist ideals have now supplanted the previously individualistic within the discourse, rather than mindlessly replacing companions he looks to both find those who align with him, as well as add numbers to his compatriots. In *Eleventh Hour*, the newly regenerated Doctor helps a young Amelia Pond, who has an ominous crack in the wall of her bedroom. He only leaves her when he hears an alarm sounding from the TARDIS, which tells him it will self-implode if certain unexplained functionalities are not managed. Like with Reinette, he promises Amelia he will return for her, and also mirroring the previous infraction to the dominant collective worldview, he is punished. Due to a miscue with the TARDIS, he is much later than he anticipated, arriving fifteen years later. Before leaving, Amy calls to him, “People always say that [they will come back].”<sup>146</sup> Amy’s comment unknowingly echoes the failure he experienced with coming

---

<sup>145</sup> *The Doctor’s Daughter*.

<sup>146</sup> *Eleventh Hour*, directed by Adam Smith (2010; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2013), DVD.

back for Reinette. In an attempt to calm her, he states “Am I people? Do I even look like people?”<sup>147</sup> Through his comment, he is stating that he is not like the other people she has known. Her statement carries with it the implication that she has been abandoned and lied to before, matching the Doctor’s loneliness and craving to belong to something bigger than himself. Moreover, as she is inclined to immediately pursue traveling with the Doctor despite having just met him, it confirms her amiability to go anywhere to follow her group, as well as being someone who wishes to understand others in an attempt to further understand herself, thus labeling herself as the collectivist.

The claim of her ideological inclinations is validated when the Doctor asks a grown-up Amy Pond to come travel with him. She is skeptical of his intentions, until she deduces his reasoning and asks, “Because you’re lonely...that’s it?”<sup>148</sup> The Doctor nods at her, signaling an affirmative answer, though his passivity in vocalizing an answer, which is expressed through a head nod followed by quiet, “mmhmm,” stems from the fact that he is not telling the complete truth. Confirmation is found when she looks at him with her eyes squinted as if to ask if he is being truthful. A look that is immediately met with the Doctor looking away and changing the subject. However, the primary reason he quietly looks away is that that he is ashamed that he does not yet belong to a specific group. A claim which is justified when Amy asks the Doctor why he’s so sure she’ll accompany him. He replies, “because you’re the Scottish girl in the English village, and I know how that feels.”<sup>149</sup> His comment here holds two main points. First, it is a

---

<sup>147</sup> *Eleventh Hour*.

<sup>148</sup> *Eleventh Hour*.

<sup>149</sup> *Eleventh Hour*

proclamation of the Doctor feeling like an outsider, looking to be accepted. By taking in the “Scottish girl in the English village,” he is giving acceptance and a group to a person that has none. Furthermore, by showing the two of them as lonely it further strengthens the dominance of collectivism, through depicting the individualist behavior as something that they both want to rid themselves of. Second, with his statement of “and I know how that feels,” he is empathizing with her which, whether he knows it at the time or not, is an acknowledgement that there is a group to which he can belong.

It is the Doctor’s relationship with Amy that the future collective is built upon. Despite the fact that they had both married other people two seasons later, she, along with her husband, were still serving as the companions. The longevity of their relationship, coupled with the fact they have continued to add to their crew serves as validation towards the new collectivist way of being. Their final episode together, *The Angels Take Manhattan*, begins with the Doctor, Amy, and her husband Rory sitting on a sunny day at a park. The Doctor reads a book to Amy and they bicker, displaying a sibling-like closeness. The closeness of the group, however, is tested immediately when Rory is taken back in time by the Weeping Angels. Amy and the Doctor follow in the TARDIS despite the great personal risk involved. The inherent danger of the mission stems from the fact that the Angels have distorted the timeline, thus making landing the TARDIS at Rory’s location like “trying to land a plane in a snow storm.”<sup>150</sup>

Valuing the group over one’s self is further demonstrated as the overarching mode of thought when his wife, River, breaks her arm, and without a moment of hesitation, the Doctor heals it by sacrificing some of his regeneration life force, effectively shortening his

---

<sup>150</sup> *The Angels Take Manhattan*, directed by Nick Hurran (2012; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012), DVD.

own life purely for her to no longer be in momentary pain.<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, when given a book written about his life from the future, the Doctor sees a chapter entitled, “Amelia’s Last Farewell.”<sup>152</sup> He becomes violently angry, yelling at everyone around him and throwing papers.<sup>153</sup> The reason for his rage, as he explains, is due to the fact that once he read the title, that moment became an unbreakable fixed point in time. The indignation he exhibits upon learning he will lose his companion imitates the sequence which saw his daughter killed. Now knowing the current moment will be the last time he ever sees Amy, the Doctor frantically searches for a way to protect his collective group, no matter the cost to himself or anyone outside his faction. As the currently enforced set of values states “individuals may not be able to survive if there is no group,” through his attempts to protect his collective, his is in turn working to protect his own life as well.<sup>154</sup> Therefore, through the potential loss of the companion, *Doctor Who* has tied the suffering of others to suffering of the self.

Upon the roof of a hotel, the last farewell appears to be coming true, when the only means of escaping the Angels is for Rory to sacrifice his life by jumping off the building and killing himself. However, it is unknown whether or not Rory’s potential sacrifice will break the paradox the Angels have created or just outright kill Rory. Amy, not wanting to live in a world without her husband, decides to jump with him. As previously clarified, the Doctor aligned himself with Amy because of their identical

---

<sup>151</sup> *The Wedding of River Song*, directed by Jeremy Webb (2012; London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2011), DVD. Within this episode the Doctor marries River Song, who is the daughter of Amy Pond and Rory Williams.

<sup>152</sup> *The Angels Take Manhattan*.

<sup>153</sup> *The Angels Take Manhattan*.

<sup>154</sup> Chen, et al., 674.

ideology. Hence, it can be inferred that were he in the same situation, he would make the same choice, because neither of them believe they can survive without the other. When the theory proves to be correct, the paradox is broken. The circumstances immediately reoccur when Rory is again taken back in time, and Amy is faced with the decision of going with him or not. The rules of the universe illustrate that if she chooses to go back with him, there is no way that the Doctor will ever be able to get to her, making these her final moments with him. She again chooses to be with her husband, leaving the Doctor who falls to the ground in emotional turmoil, before being pulled to the TARDIS by River. In the closing moments, the Doctor asks his wife to stay with him as he travels because he does not know if he can go on alone.<sup>155</sup> She agrees, giving evidence that by extending the size of the collective, he is able to continue on with his life, and is saved by his values. It is here, through demonstrating life cannot go on if a person is by themselves, that individualism is shown, once again, to be completely stripped of its voice. Therefore, now firmly entrenched as the only possible perceived way to see and act within the world of *Doctor Who*, collectivism is positioned, through the discourse, as the sole represented voice.

### **Summary**

In summation, through the analysis of *Doctor Who*, my thesis has found and provided evidence indicating a complete shift in the system of values within the discourse. Upon the original conception of the show, the correct way of being was expressed as valuing one's self over that of the greater collective, a viewpoint which held true until the sixth Doctor. After which, episodes under discussed were discussed

---

<sup>155</sup> *The Angels Take Manhattan*.

wherein dominance of the empowered worldview was challenge. Here, collectivism began to receive representation until eventually it arrived at a point where its voice could no longer be held silent, thus breaking the hegemony of individualism. These findings then lead to a time of balance during which, the viewpoints as presented through collectivism and individualism were portrayed as equally good and bad. However, what resulted was a muddled ideological message, from both the protagonists as well as antagonist, allowing for neither to be concrete in terms of their identity. It was not until the ninth Doctor that the shift had completely occurred which saw collectivism as the correct way of being and strongly valued over individualism.

By taking episodes of *Doctor Who* and analyzing its content, whose production happen over a fifty-year span, many factors were found and explored, which, in turn, have been the causation for stimulating ideological development within discourse. It is then through understanding how the ideological shift took place, as well as the tactics utilized, that we are able to see the direct differences in how the world is perceived through the lens of each of the two worldviews. Meaning, when operating in agreeance with individualism, the society built upon self-first mentality, and obstacles are developed and solved based on the abilities of a single entity. During which, sacrifice of others was often the easiest solution. On the contrary, when collectivism was presented as the dominant worldview, while options and insights for achieving goals grew, so did the number of people which needed to be protected.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

The research and analysis herein has constructed an ideological criticism of *Doctor Who*. It was examined for which values held power over the others. After doing so, the analysis, gave evidence from the discourse supporting an ideological shift from individualism to collectivism within the show. The findings were built upon the foundation of twenty individual episodes and one full-length television movie of both *Classic Doctor Who* and *Doctor Who*. Each episode was not only explored for overarching worldviews, but also for rhetorical tactics which provided evidence as to how these value systems were or were not able to maintain themselves as dominant within the discourse. Through analysis of the episodes under study, a full transition in regards to the portrayed intended way of being was found.

By applying the methods of an ideological criticism as described by Sonja Foss, my thesis was able to label the evolution of a *Doctor Who* through four distinct periods. First, explored was proof of an individualism as the sole present mode of thinking at the show's inception. Over the course of the section, tactics of maintaining dominance over other potential worldviews were found, which would be utilized throughout the discourse, such as villainizing counterpoising views. During the second, individualism was no longer able to maintain itself as the singular value system, thus allowing conflicting views to be presented. Through this section, collectivism moved from insurgent to challenger and, in turn, threatened what had been previously perceived as the norm. Third, was the period where neither collectivism nor individualism outweighed the other in regards to positive and negative representation. Both were found equally successful and unsuccessful in their tactics to suppress the other, allowing for a true

balance of the two. However, in the final section, evidence was found and explored as to how collectivism had become the new hegemonic way of thinking, by successfully demonizing all aspects and attributes associated with its counterpart. It was through these steps that the thesis uncovered the findings, portrayed in the analysis, and established the changing picture of what was being conveyed as the correct way to see the world as presented through *Doctor Who*.

As an artifact which has produced over 800 individual episodes, the twenty-two presented within this analysis represent a small piece of the possible research. Thus, limitations existed within sample size. However, by unveiling the voice which was dominantly presented by the rhetoric, the research goal of ideological criticism was achieved. Last, through exploring the ideologies presented within *Doctor Who*, two separate ways of viewing the same universe were depicted. Both of which offered distinct answers as to what an individual should value and protect above all else, the greater group or the self.

## References

- Abdel Haid, Jamal. "Ideology and Television in the Eastern Arab World." *Domes: Digest of the Middle East*. no. 1 (2012): 39-48.
- Atkinson, Joshua, and Bernadette Calafell. 2009. "Darth Vader Made Me Do It! Anakin Skywalker's Avoidance of Responsibility and the Gray Areas of Hegemonic Masculinity in the Star Wars Universe." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2, no. 1: 1-20.
- Bagley, George. "The Television Text: Spectatorship, Ideology, and the Organization of Consent." *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. no. 4 (2001): 436-451.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal*. no. 4 (1988): 519-530.
- Campbell, Mark. *Doctor Who: The Complete Guide*. Philadelphia: Running Press, 2013.
- "Cancelled!." *Doctor Who: A Brief History of a Time Lord*.  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho/classic/news/briefhistory/cancelled.shtml>.
- Cinoğlu, Hüseyin, and Yusuf Arıkan. "Self, identity and identity formation: From the perspectives of three major theories." *International Journal of Human Sciences*. no. 2 (2012): 1114-1131.
- Dalek*. Directed by Joe Ahearne. 2005. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- Delta and the Bannerman Part 3*. Directed by Chris Clough. 1987. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009. DVD.
- Derbyshire, David. "Ailing BBC pins revival on Doctor Who." *The Telegraph*, March 9, 2005. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1485252/Ailing-BBC-pins-revival-on-Doctor-Who.html> (accessed November 4, 2013).
- Destiny of the Daleks Part 4*. Directed by Ken Grieve. 1979. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2008. DVD.
- DiPaolo, Marc Edward. "Political Satire and British-American Relations in Five Decades of Doctor Who." *The Journal of Popular Culture*. no. 5 (2010): 964-985.
- Doctor Who: The Movie*. Directed by Geoffrey Sax. 1996. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2011. DVD.
- Eleventh Hour*. Directed by Adam Smith. 2010. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2013. DVD.
- Emel'yanenko, Vladimir Dmitrievich, et al. "Man's Values and Ideologies as a Basis of Gamification." *International Journal Of Environmental & Science Education* 11, no. 18.
- Evans, Arthur B. 1999. "The Origins of Science Fiction Criticism: From Kepler to Wells." *Science Fiction Studies*, 1999. 163.
- Finklestein, Marcia A. "Individualism/Collectivism And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Integrative Framework." *An International Journal*. no. 10 (2010): 1633-1643.
- Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism Exploration & Practice*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2004.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., and Signorielli, N. "Living with Television: The Dynamics of the Cultivation Process." In *Perspectives on Media Effects*, 17-40. Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986.

- Glasner, Barney, and Anselm Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Golder, Dave. "Doctor Who Nabs Eight Million Viewers." *SFX*, April 4, 2010. <http://www.sfx.co.uk/2010/04/04/doctor-who-nabs-over-eight-million-viewers/> (accessed November 17, 2013).
- Hall, Stuart. *Encoding and Decoding in Television Discourse*. Birmingham: Centre for Cultural Studies, 2009.
- Hesteroni, A., and Lowenstein, H. "Cultivation and Counter Cultivation: Does Religiosity Shape the Relationship between Television Viewing and Estimates of Crime Prevalence and Assessment of Victimization Likelihood?" *Psychological Reports* 112, no. 1 (2013): 303-24.
- Howe, David J., and Stephen James Walker. *Doctor Who: The Television Companion*. London: BBC Worldwide, 1998.
- John, Plunkett. "Doctor Who achieves record US audience." *The Guardian*, December 23, 2009. <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2009/dec/23/doctor-who-bbc-america> (accessed November 4, 2013).
- Jones, Kevin J., Liu, Chin-Yen Alice. "Ethical Decision Making: A Model Demonstrating Collectivism and Individualism Decision Influences." *Academy of Business Research Journal* 3, no. (2015): 75-83.
- Jones, Martin, and Jones, Rhys. "Nation states, ideological power and globalisation: can geographers catch the boat?" *Geoforum* 35, (January 1, 2004): 409-424.
- Kistler, Alan. *Doctor Who: A History*. Guilford: Globe Pequot Press, 2013.
- Klein, Stanley B., and Shaun Nichols. "Memory and the Sense of Personal Identity." *Mind* 121, no. 483 (July 2012): 677-702.
- Kong, Lily. "Ideological Hegemony and the Political Symbolism of Religious Buildings in Singapore." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11, no. 1 (1993): 23-45.
- Leith, Sam. "It's now time to take Doctor Who seriously." *The Telegraph*, March 24, 2007. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3638690/Its-now-time-to-take-Doctor-Who-seriously.html> (accessed November 3, 2013).
- Locke, John. "Of Identity and Diversity" Chapter XXVII *an Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. 1-29.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. *The "Ideograph": A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology. The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism*. Edited by James R. Andrews. White Plains: Longman, 1990.
- Mindwarp*. Directed by Nicholas Mallet, Ron James and Chris Clough. 1986. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2008. DVD.
- Mitchell, Jr., Donald. 2014. "Advancing Grounded Theory: Using Theoretical Frameworks within Grounded Theory Studies." *Qualitative Report* 19, no. 36: 1-11.
- Morgan, Michael. "Television and the Erosion of Regional Diversity." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 30, no. 2 (1986): 123-39.
- Newcomb, Horace, and Paul Hirsch. "Television as a Culture Form." *Quarterly Review of Film Studies*. (1983): 531-573.
- Nozick, Robert. *Philosophical Explanations* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1981).

- Omwami, Edith Mukudi. "Theoretical and Ideological Framing: Relative Change Theory and Its Application to Humanitarianism in Education Development." *Online Submission* (January 1, 2012): ERIC, EBSCOhost (accessed October 5, 2015).
- Pajares, Frank, Abby Prestin, Jason Chen, and Robin Nabi. "Social Cognitive Theory and Media Effects." In *The SAGE Handbook of Media Processes and Effects*, 283-298. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2009.
- Porter, Lynnette. *The Doctor Who Franchise American Influence, Fan Culture and the Spinoffs*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company Inc., 2012.
- Ralston, David, et al. "Societal-Level Versus Individual-Level Predictions of Ethical Behavior: a 48-Society Study of Collectivism and Individualism." *Journal of Business Ethics* 122, no. 2 (2014): 283-306.
- Richards, Justin. *50 Years Doctor Who: The Essential Guide*. Diamond Comic Distributors, 2013. "Dr. Who 'longest-running Sci-fi'" BBC News. 2006. Accessed November 15, 2015. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/5390372.stm>.
- Russell, Gary. *Doctor Who: The Encyclopedia a Definitive Guide to Time and Space*. Italy: BBC Books, 2007.
- Schoenfelder, John W. "New Dramas For The Theatre State: The Shifting Roles In Ideological Power Sources In Balinese Politics." *World Archeology* 36, (2004): 403-409.
- Scott, Cavan, and Mark Wright. *Doctor Who: Who-ology*. London: BBC Digital, 2013. Kindle edition.
- Sillars, Malcolm O, and Bruce E Gronbeck. *Communication Criticism*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2001. (2012): 677-702.
- Suvin, Darko (1979) *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tichenor, P. J., Donohue G. A., and C. N. Olien C. N. "Mass media flow and differential growth in knowledge." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (1970): 159-170.
- The Angels Take Manhattan*. Directed by Nick Hurran. 2012. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Black Orchid Part 2*. Directed by Ron James. 1982. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2008. DVD.
- The Caves of Andorzeni Part 4*. Directed by Graeme Harper. 1984. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Doctor's Daughter*. Directed by Alice Troughton. 2008. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Girl in the Fireplace*. Directed by Euros Lyn. 2006. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Mind of Evil Part 6*. Directed by Timothy Combe. 1971. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2013. DVD.
- The Mind Robber Part 5*. Directed by David Maloney. 1968. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2005. DVD.
- The Parting of the Ways*. Directed by Joe Ahearne. 2005. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Rescue*. Directed by Christopher Barry. 1965. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009. DVD.

- The Silver Nemesis Part 3*. Directed by Chris Clough. 1987. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2010. DVD.
- The Sontaran Experiment Part 2*. Directed by Rodney Bennett. 1975. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2007. DVD.
- The Three Doctors Part 4*. Directed by Lennie Mayne. 1973. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Tomb of the Cybermen Part 4* Directed by Morris Barry. 1967. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2012. DVD.
- The Twin Dilemma Part 2*. Directed by Peter Moffatt. 1984. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2010. DVD.
- The War Machines Part 4*. Directed by Michael Ferguson. 1966. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2009. DVD.
- The Wedding of River Song*. Directed by Jeremy Webb. 2011. London, UK: BBC Home Entertainment, 2011. DVD.
- Triandis, Harry, and Michele Gelfand. *A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism. Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Edited by Paul Lange, Arie Kruglanski, & Troy Higgins. New York: Sage Publications, 2011.
- Tulloch, John. "Producing the National Imaginary Doctor Who, Text and Genre". In *A Necessary Fantasy? The Heroic Figure in Children's Popular Culture*, edited by Dudley Jones and Tony Watkins. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.
- Urquhart, Cathy, Lehmann, Hans, and Myers, Michael D. "Putting the 'Theory' Back into Grounded Theory: Guidelines for Grounded Theory Studies in Information Systems." *Information Systems Journal* 20, no. 4 (2010): 357-381.
- Vettel-Becker, Patricia. 2014. "Space and the single girl: Star Trek, aesthetics, and 1960s femininity." *Frontiers: A Journal Of Women's Studies* no. 2: 143.
- Vogt, Tiffany. TV Addict, "Doctor Who Redux: The Mystery of 'The Name of the Doctor'." Last modified May 18, 2013. Accessed November 3, 2013. [http://www.thetvaddict.com/2013/05/18/doctor-who-redux-the-mystery-of-'the-name-of-the-doctor'/?](http://www.thetvaddict.com/2013/05/18/doctor-who-redux-the-mystery-of-'the-name-of-the-doctor'/).
- Vu, Hong Tien, and Tien-Tsung Lee. "Soap Operas as a Matchmaker: A Cultivation Analysis of the Effects of South Korean TV Dramas on Vietnamese Women's Marital Intentions." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 90, no. 2 (2013): 308-30.
- Williams, Raymond. "Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 15, no. 3 (1988): 356-60.
- Vu, Tuong-Van, et al., "Do individualism and collectivism on three levels (country, individual, and situation) influence theory-of-mind efficiency? a cross-country study," *Plos ONE*, 12, no. 8(2017): 1-20.
- Xinguang, Chen, et al. "Constructs, Concept Mapping, and Psychometric Assessment of the Concise Scale of Individualism-Collectivism." *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal* 43, no. 4 (2015): 667-683.