



INTER-COMMUNICATION

TO: JERRY ISENBERG

DATE:

FROM:

SUBJECT: INFORMATION REQUESTED

ORIGINAL CAST. Feel strongly that all the original cast should appear in the movie, although the relative size and importance of their roles will be dictated by the direction of a motion picture story. I cannot emphasize too strongly that every character somehow plays a part in the STAR TREK fan mystique. It comes out of some unusual and ^{possibly} ~~probably~~ unique "chemistry of the whole" which has no exact parallel in television or film history. Whether or not it can be explained or whether it even seems logical, it exists! ~~I know it exists because~~ I have spent seven years observing it in groups ranging from a few hundred people to 30,000 at the larger conventions. Important, this "chemistry of the whole" is not a thing involving 100,000 or so hard core Trekkies, but rather ^{It includes} the broad STAR TREK audience of ^{several} million people, ^{Its range extends to sometimes} and includes (again "unexplainable") fierce loyalty ^{even} to some very, very secondary characters who appeared only a few times during the three seasons. Probably the best examples of these are Grace Lee Whitney who played YEOMAN RAND during the first year, also Mark Lenard who played Spock's father SAREK a few times, and ^{then still} ~~even~~ ^{exists fan interest for} includes Arlene Martel who appeared only one time playing Spock's betrothed T'PRING.

Kirk's

~~SHATNER'S DEATH.~~ It would be very risky to kill Shatner early

in the film, making it appear that ^{PARAMOUNT} the studio scorns him -- and

thus scorns the basic STAR TREK property and the fans too. Again,

in emphasizing Shatner's values I'm not talking about things that are easily explainable or will even seem sensible to ^{THOSE} motion picture people

who are ^{new to} inexperienced in the STAR TREK audience phenomenon. ^{AGAIN, THIS ATTITUDE DOES NOT} To even

^{APPEAR LIMITED ONLY TO HAND COME THINKERS. EVEN TO}

the broad STAR TREK audience Kirk is as much a feature of the U.S.S.

Enterprise as its bridge and transporter room. Without Captain Kirk,

or, at least, without a reasonable amount of Captain Kirk, it ^{MAY} will not

^{FULLY ACCEPTABLE AS} be the U.S.S. Enterprise and ^{AS} STAR TREK to a ^{VERY} sizeable group of ^{POTENTIAL} ticket

buyers. The hard to explain "chemistry of the whole" operates here too.

^{That any of us connected with} The first question ^{we show GET FROM EVERY KIND OF FAN} I have gotten for the last two years all over the

country, ^{not just from Trekkies but from cops, hotel clerks, airline}

ticket agents, etc., is "Will ^{All} the original cast be in the movie?"

All this is also involved in the "proprietary interest" the audience

feels in STAR TREK and also a "Paramount the enemy" attitude which

will be discussed further on in this.

AUDIENCE AGE RANGE. ^{demographics} The age and occupation range of the broad STAR TREK

audience is much wider than indicated in your first draft report. ~~It~~

Paramount doubts this, I would consider ^{might be helpful for} it sound business practice for ^{PA} ~~PARAMOUNT~~ ^{TO INVEST} them to spend a few dollars on a survey since the ^{AN AUDIENCE} true demographics

of this audience ^{IS A KEY CONSIDERATION} are a very basic consideration in not only making the

picture but also in promoting and exploiting it. There ^{STILL} exists at

Paramount ^{SOME} still a considerable residue of the old attitude that ^{the} it is

^{SHOW'S FAN MOVEMENT}

sort of a "teeny bopper" thing. That conception has been very hard to

change and I even wonder if it has actually been changed appreciably

^{LEGAL DECISIONS WERE MADE ON THIS MISCONCEPTION.}

in front office circles. The fact is that the last year or so has seen

Certainly, the publicity garnered from naming the Space Shuttle
craft after our Enterprise must have generated considerable respect
for Star Trek amongst the professional and college educated types
3. who read the newspaper accounts of the christening.

a tremendous explosion of STAR TREK interest ^{OUT} into occupation and
age groups which studios have never ^{before} associated with the word "fan."

Recently I took an airplane flight to Atlanta, the cabin filled with
Los Angeles Bar Association officers attending a national conference.
It seemed inconceivable that top flight, ^{PRAGMATIC} ~~hard nosed~~ attorneys could be
STAR TREK fans. The fact exists that I found myself a minor celebrity
when my name was seen on my attache case tag. I have had the same
experience in equally unlikely settings such as country club dinners,
political gatherings, and in television station newsrooms, ~~across the~~
~~country.~~ The point of all this is not that Roddenberry is a minor
celebrity -- the issue is demographics. At an appearance recently in
Portland, Oregon, out of an audience of eight or nine thousand people,
almost half of them were over 30 years of age. At least 20% of that
audience appeared to be in their 40's, 50's and up. Again, I am not
explaining; I am simply reporting.

THE VARIOUS AUDIENCES. Obviously, ^{there are} ~~we have~~ a potential audience of
people who have never seen STAR TREK or don't particularly care for it
and will buy tickets only if convinced it is an important and entertain-
ing motion picture. Starting from there, ^{there are three} ~~it seems to be the assumption~~

~~there are only two other audiences.~~ ¹⁵ The first, the hard core Trekkie
^{which might be estimated at a million.} ~~audience.~~ ^{now-Trekkie audience which has supported seven}
Second, the broader and larger STAR TREK fan audience. ~~However,~~
^{years of rather phenomenal re-runs and may number ten}
~~this is an oversimplification.~~ Probably the largest potential ticket

buying group of all is a third category -- the people who have heard
enough about the fan phenomenon, read about conventions, noticed the
NASA subshuttle name, seen the starship hanging in the Smithsonian
Institution, and so on, who are ^{thinking} ~~simply convinced or becoming convinced~~
"There must be something to this STAR TREK thing"! Referring back to

things like the Atlanta Bar Association flight, country clubs and such, these incidents ^{involve mainly those people} include some fans but by far the larger number ~~were people~~ who have somehow become convinced that there must be some sort of "wheels within wheels combination" ^{something about} in the STAR TREK thing which somehow makes interest and approval mandatory. I suppose the term in our industry is that ~~it~~ is "in". There ^{seems to be} is a general belief ~~or~~ consensus among this group that it is ~~something~~ ^{STAR TREK is entertainment} that people of intelligence or good will should see and approve of. It's somewhat ~~in~~ the same position as ^{like} "apple pie and motherhood" ^{was} in the 40's. Again, I cannot explain it and certainly do not intend to defend it -- at the ^{that attitude} moment, ~~it~~ simply exists, ^{also,} and I suspect that this consensus, like most such things, could change as ^{rapidly as it happened.} fast as dress length fashions.

ACTOR AGE AND WEIGHT. ^{All the actors are} They're in pretty good condition with the exception of Jimmy Doohan, ^{Doohan's} but I have no doubt that a talk with ^{his} agent or with Doohan himself will see some ^{quick} rapid changes there. Yes, they all look older. But almost every other actor is down somewhere near original weight which means that body and facial structures are close to the audience memory of the characters, and makeup can bring them quite easily within the ^{acceptable} range of "a couple of years older than the TV series."

If Doohan doesn't lose his weight, I think he should still be used, ^{Doohan, that could be} although I would never even hint as much to him ^{on a basis} that the starship's Scottish engineer simply imbibed too much Scotch ^{AN acceptable explanation} over the last couple of years since we saw him last. A part of his ^{original} characterization ^{just such} was a love for Scotch, ^{now} and the fact he is heavier ^{now} might even yield some interesting moments in the hands of good writing and direction.

5.

GUEST STARS. Agree with you that we need motion picture "names" ,
and ^{I'll} maybe go even a little further. I think we need ~~most of all a~~
~~name or~~ names which say quality, ^{Such as a name} a professional actor never before
associated with science fiction in any form. One such name would be
Sir Lawrence Olivier. Or, although I don't know what Rex Harrison
looks like now, ^{his very name} his very name on the marquee has to say that this is
not simply an expanded television episode. ^{IN ANY WAY OR FORM.}

^{PUBLICITY}
ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION. For whatever it is worth to you, I see
absolutely no way that ^a studio ^{publicity office} and personnel and facilities can properly
service a job of this size and ^{adequately handle all STAR TREK} with ~~all the~~ special elements. I'll
go further -- it would be ridiculous to have anything but ^{a highly experienced} an outside
agency. As far as simply saying "A STAR TREK movie has been made and
will be at your local theatre", anyone of us ~~can simply~~ involved in
the original STAR TREK series, can individually generate more column
inches and television air minutes ^{than} the best studio publicity office
operating in our town today. By the time our motion picture is out
and ready, nearly every person in the U.S. will know about it, ~~and thus~~
^{what} we will need is not more exposure but rather the kind of highly
creative and ^{planning that} experienced guidance which is available only from a
top ~~flight~~ independent agency.

STAR TREK BOOKS. I'm very worried about what STAR TREK books will be
published between now and the time the motion picture emerges. I have
read a number of ~~these manuscripts~~ ^{of upcoming books} and have found most of them ranging
from ^{second} ~~third~~ rate to awful. Referring to the attorneys on the Atlanta

6.

flight, ^{IF ANY ONE OF THEM SHOULD PURCHASE} I would hate for one of them to be browsing in a bookstore and out of curiosity buy the latest STAR TREK book Spock: Messiah, ^{WE} we will most certainly have lost at that moment a potential film ticket buyer. The purchaser of ^{that} a book like this will not blame Bantam or the author. ^{SUCH NON-TECHNICALS WILL} They'll simply see it as evidence that the whole STAR TREK thing is nonsense. ^{SOME HERE AT PARAMOUNT SEEM TO HOPE THAT} There are those, who hope somehow ^{SOMEHOW FIND} I'll have the time and energy and inspiration to read all these upcoming manuscripts and work some sort of miracle with them. I can't. ~~IF~~ ^{CANNOT} this were my job, my business, a reasonable part of my income, I could spend the hundreds of hours, necessary to ^{which would} ~~see~~ ^{GUARANTEE THAT} that we publish ~~representative~~ ^{STAR TREK} quality books. This is not a ploy for remuneration -- ^{unexpectedly} Even if Paramount somehow suddenly and miraculously decided to ^{compensate} pay me for this ^{such} work, ^{I would still be unable} I'd still have no time to take on the chore. Some other answer is going to have to be found.

OTHER MERCHANDISING. Agree with you completely that the entire merchandising ^{PROGRAM} picture should be halted or at least slowed down and studied. ~~Also~~ ^{kind} we need some sort of quality control here too. Toy rip-offs can hurt the movie greatly. ^{TOO!} Or even if not outright ripoffs, ^{also} there are far too many licenses being granted for items which run counter to the entire concept of what STAR TREK is. For example, toy packaging which shows Mr. Spock using his phaser to destroy an alien beast which apparently is being killed because ^{IT} he is different and ugly. Have the people who approve these deals ever taken the trouble to look at a STAR TREK episode? A principal part of the fan phenomenon and the million dollar grosses is based on the ideals of the show, i.e., that because something is different or appears to us ugly, it is not

7.

necessarily bad or evil. This is what hundreds (perhaps thousands) of classroom projects from grammar school through top universities ^{START TREK} consider and discuss when studying STAR TREK. ^{TO} The point is not whether or not I want Paramount, a business corporation, to agree with me that life and life forms everywhere are a sacred thing -- I'm simply saying that Paramount is showing ridiculous business judgement in offending million dollar ^{FANS AND MISMANAGEMENT} potentials by making careless and unsupervised twenty and forty thousand dollar ^{BOX OFFICE} deals. ^{merchandise}

CONVENTIONS AND FAN CLUBS.

^{ALMOST EVERYONE WHO AT PARAMOUNT NOW} Everyone seems to at last agree that the ^{SEEMS TO AGREE THAT} entrepreneurs and "ripoff artists" could quickly turn fan affection ^{OR EVEN INTO OUTRIGHT ANGER.} into anger or disinterest. Even worse, a few national news stories ^{ABOUT FAN} of "ripoffs" could quickly change the entire audience attitude toward the new motion picture. At best, ^{ON TOP OF JUDGMENT} some bad luck in these areas could quickly make it appear that the entire STAR TREK fan phenomenon has now begun to quickly fade away. Nothing dies quite as fast as something that was "in" last year. At the worst, ^{JUDGMENT} some bad luck and bad management could make it appear that the entire ^{STAR TREK} phenomenon has been something built up by an unscrupulous few to bilk the young and the foolish out of their few spare dollars. Do you doubt for a moment that a sharp reporter could not sell a nationally syndicated expose called "THE STAR TREK FRAUD!"

What is Paramount to do in order to protect itself? The one thing it cannot do is to "take over" the ^{OR ANY OTHER FAN ACTIVITIES} conventions. Or even worse than that, to use ^{STAR TREK} the conventions to make ^{PARAMOUNT} a few thousand dollars. The only possible approach is a fully positive one in which Paramount sanctions or authorizes "official" STAR TREK conventitons (and perhaps fan clubs, fanzines and other activities) on a basis which offers some quid pro quo

to the fans. In other words, ^{PARAMOUNT MUST PAY OUT SOME} ~~setting forth a reasonable set of~~ rules and regulations ^{FAN dollars being} ~~primarily~~ designed to protect ~~the fans and~~ ^{SPORT ON CONVENTIONS. TO THOSE CONVENTIONS SANCTIONED AS "OFFICIAL", PARAMOUNT SHOULD} ~~see they get a dollar's worth for a spent.~~ The ~~supply of~~ science fiction movie classics and STAR TREK episodes, ~~to approved or~~ ^{PARAMOUNT SHOULD ALSO COORDINATE} ~~official conventions.~~ Coordination of STAR TREK star appearances at ~~such~~ ^{should be} ~~conventions.~~ Paramount's prestige and other offices ^{TO CONVENTIONS, PARAMOUNT SHOULD} ~~used to supply~~ ~~encourage~~ NASA and air industry exhibits, ~~to encourage~~ top flight sci fi writers to appear on the typical convention discussion panels; ~~to~~ supply art work, costume and other studio exhibits at such conventions, and so on. ^{In other words, those} ~~Those~~ who put on the ^{STAR TREK} ~~conventions~~ must be convinced that it pays to have ^{it designated by Paramount as an} ~~an "approved" or "official" designation.~~

→ Under no circumstances, however, should legal action ever be used to stop or to close an "unofficial" convention. ^{The reason for} ~~this is explained below.~~

FAN ATTITUDE TOWARD PARAMOUNT. The fan phenomenon ~~cannot be understood~~ ^{and it} ~~certainly~~ cannot be effectively employed in publicizing the film, ^{until} ~~unless~~ the history of STAR TREK fandom is ~~understood.~~ Whether true or not, most STAR TREK fans, ^{and certainly} ~~almost~~ ^{all} hard core Trekkies, are convinced that Paramount is a soulless, tasteless, and probably corrupt entity. Desilu's association with the show, if remembered at all, is considered ~~by many~~ a case of the larger Paramount taking over and then proceeding to lower the quality of STAR TREK, ignoring its ^{FAN} ~~audience,~~ and its time slotting, and then ^{deciding that it was} ~~announcing it~~ a "failed series" ^{with} ~~and~~ ^{PARAMOUNT} ~~washing~~ its hands of the whole endeavor. Fanzines over the last seven years are filled with stories of how the sets were given away, destroyed, how reruns were considered unlikely, etc.

STAR TREK

The fans see themselves as the group who kept ~~it~~ on the air ^{IT} the third year with an outpouring of a million letters to NBC, who "kept faith" with the show even when cancelled, who kept the name alive in their ^{clubs and} fanzines, who ~~personally~~ lost money holding the ^{STAR TREK} yearly conventions of a few hundred or a thousand souls at most, who ^{TO} instituted mail campaigns against ^{AND} their local stations insisting on STAR TREK reruns, who picketed these stations ^{WHENEVER} when the reruns were stopped, ^{THESE FANS} they insist that ^{AND THINGS WHO} they made the STAR TREK phenomenon happen, ^{THAT ARE THE ONES WHO} they made the motion picture happen, and that all this has been done in spite of Paramount and often in the face of outright opposition from Paramount.

The important thing is not whether these facts are true, or partly true, or totally false. These beliefs and these feelings exist. It is on an emotional level, ^{IT DOES NOT ALWAYS INVOLVE ANGER TOWARD PARAMOUNT} not necessarily anger but certainly a kind of ^{BUT IT DOES ALWAYS INCLUDE A SORT OF} "we fought city hall and won" feeling. There is also a bit of "we beat city hall and made ^{CITY HALL (PARAMOUNT)} them millions of dollars...and got absolutely no thanks for it."

Do these feelings really matter? Isn't it true that if they love STAR TREK this much, they'll still come and see the movie whatever their attitudes toward Paramount? ^{BUY TICKETS TO SEE} They undoubtedly will ^{THE STAR TREK MOVIE} attend the film and even celebrate and help promote it if it is good. Then, is there anything to worry about? Yes, there are several important considerations.