<u>**Title**</u>

On the periphery: archive film, public history and memory in places and spaces on the borders of London.

Angela English

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Media and Cultural Studies)

Awarded by Birmingham City University ADM/School of Media

February 2020

i

Contents

Abstract

This thesis offers an exploration of how local archive film is used in public history engagement and practice to create affective experiences of cultural and personal memory in peripheral spaces and places around London. Moving image archives are in general under documented and appear to sit outside a traditional archival discourse and the thesis addresses this in order to explore and uncover neglected issues around film archives. The thesis examines the relationship of this film material to place and life on the periphery of London. The thesis also examines how the film archive sector in the UK has functioned both historically and currently to shape, enact and deliver strategies to facilitate or hinder public history practice with archive film. I examine how affective experiences are made possible by exploring institutional issues and consider the role of the film archivist in public history work with film archives, through a series of interviews with practitioners in the sector and through an exploration of my own career. Audience studies explore the possibilities of creative practice and radical intervention with archive film in terms of place and locality. As a result of the interviews and the audience studies a plethora of voices create a narrative mapping the sector. Much of the film material used for the research comes from the London Screen Study Collection which is an archive of 1400 moving image titles based at Birkbeck College, University of London and for this reason London and its peripheries is the case study for the thesis. Accessibility, value and the impact of film archives in a digital culture are all areas of interest. I argue for the value of archive film in the creation of affective experiences of cultural and personal memory by exploring institutional issues and considering the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with film archives.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my supervisor at Birmingham City University Paul Long, who has consistently provided me with thoughtful and rigorous feedback that has challenged me to keep writing and rewriting. His advice, guidance and introduction to new ideas over the years of this doctoral project have been invaluable and I am appreciative of all the time he has spent reading and commenting on my work. I also want to thank my second supervisors, James Mansell and Richard Hornsey at the University of Nottingham. Their enthusiasm for my project and their advice, support and guidance has been immeasurably helpful and valuable over the last three years. Thanks also to John Mercer for his guidance in the final stages of the project. I consider myself fortunate to have had such committed and knowledgeable supervisors. My time at Birmingham City University has been positive and enjoyable and thanks to everyone there who has supported my project and offered feedback and ideas.

I have been privileged to be a Midlands3 Cities/AHRC funded doctoral candidate. I have had many interesting opportunities offered to me and I am grateful to everyone at M3C particularly Paul Grainge and Susanna Ison for all the support I have received. Research festivals, writing retreats and seminars have enhanced my work as has being part of a lively and diverse research culture.

I have had much support from friends and family and I would like to thank my sister Jenny Davison, son Simon English and daughter in law Roz Horton for all the meals, hospitality and social occasions which were welcome breaks from work. Especial thanks go to Alec English, IT wizard, for his advice and help as well as time spent on his canal boat which is an oasis of peace and tranquillity.

My deepest appreciation and love goes to my husband, David Etheridge. Without his support and belief in me, this thesis would never have seen the light of day. In times of stress he has held the domestic fort, been a calming influence and always kept me laughing. I wish him love and luck on his own PhD journey. This thesis is dedicated to him.

Abbreviations

AHRC	Arts and Humanities Research Council
BCU	Birmingham City University
BDA	British Deaf Association
BFI	British Film Institute
BUFVC (Learning on Screen)	British Universities Film and Video Council
CADG	Community Archive Development Group
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DMU	De Montfort University, Leicester
EAFA	East Anglian Film Archive
EHG	Eastcote House Gardens
FIAF	International Federation of Film Archives
FIAT/IFTA:	Federation Internationale des Archives de Television/International Federation of Television Archives
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
ICO	Independent Cinema office, London
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
ITC	Incorporated Television Company
IWM	Imperial War Museum
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LSA	London's Screen Archives

LSSC	**London Screen Study Collection**
MACE	**Media Archive for Central England**
MLA	**Museums, Libraries and Archives**
NEFA	**North East Film Archive**
NFCA	**National Fairground and Circus Archive**
NWFA	**North West Film Archive**
RFA	**Regional Film Archive**
SASE	**Screen Archive South East**
SWFTA	**South West Film and Television Archive**
TPYF	**Their Past Your Future**
UKFC	**UK Film Council**
WFSA	**Wessex Film and Sound Archive**
YFA	**Yorkshire Film Archive**
UKFC	**UK Film Council**

Introduction

A group of fifty people gather on a chilly October day in an outer London suburb to spend their afternoon watching archive film about their locality. The event takes place at Eastcote House Gardens in the London Borough of Hillingdon which is the most westerly borough on the periphery of London. The venue is a converted stables set in the gardens and the audience is drawn from a cross section of what might be described as the public who have booked in advance to attend this free screening. The event, organised by myself and the Friends of Eastcote House Gardens is sold out. The programme, curated by myself in discussion with the Friends, is entitled 'Hillingdon Panorama: Formation of a Borough' and consists of six short local archive films from the London Screen Study Collection (LSSC) at Birkbeck College, University of London. These films date from 1932-1960 and can broadly be defined as being about place and locality, covering such topics as charter celebrations (the incorporation of new boroughs), the Coronation, the building of Heathrow Airport and local carnivals. My hope for the afternoon is that the audience will interact with the films and each other to make discoveries about their own histories and also their collective and personal memories of the four Urban District Councils from which Hillingdon was formed in 1965.

Flickering grainy images illuminate our pasts. Sometimes the images are in black and white, sometimes in colour, sometimes there is music, commentary, voice overs and sometimes silence, either intentional because the film is silent or accidental because any sound may be lost or not available. Archive footage, particularly non-fiction footage, can be called an incomplete object and a stubbornly resistant text as it may have no provenance, no genre and no narrative. This film material relies for its discovery and accessibility on what Russell (2004) describes as 'a complex interaction of individual and institutional behaviour with sheer luck' (p. 13). If this film material can be considered an embodiment of truth at ten or twenty-four frames per second, how can we find out about it, gain access to it, engage with it and assess its value? Preservation is an important issue in the film archive sector and the tension inherent between preservation and access informs much scholarly and professional debate. Some prevailing attitudes to archive film material can be encapsulated as 'keep

it all because it all matters but don't worry too much because AV is not as important as textual documentation' and 'keep everything but do nothing about it'. These attitudes are familiar to me and are part of the frustration felt by practitioners attempting to access material for their work and practice which often focus on screening local archive film for different audiences. Definitive answers to the questions above are hard to achieve as the messy, flimsy, random and fragmentary nature of archive film material makes it difficult to control.

While there is much scholarly literature on issues around archives, film archives are in general under documented. Moving images archives appear to sit outside a traditional archival discourse as noted by Shand (2014), Roberts (2010) and Christie (2015) and their use for public history practice remains under scrutinised. To address this and uncover neglected issues around film archives this thesis examines how the film archive sector in the UK has functioned both historically and currently to shape, enact and deliver strategies to facilitate or hinder public history practice with archive film. I ask the following questions: how has archive film been employed as a tool for public history engagement? ; what role might archive film play in exploration of collective and personal memory of life in peripheral spaces around London? ; what is the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history practice with film archives? The thesis thus examines the co-dependent relationship between the archive, the archivist and the audience as reflected in the research questions above. The uses of archive film, the role of the archivist/practitioner and audience engagement are inextricably linked and the thesis explores and analyses these connections throughout. I argue for the value of archive film in the creation of affective experiences of cultural and personal memory by exploring institutional issues and considering both the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with film archives and how audiences engage with this material. Accessibility, value and impact of film archives in a digital culture are important topics that inform the thesis.

Value is not self-evident and among the constraints and barriers affecting the research and its outcomes is the ongoing difficulty of proving the value of this material aside from instrumental metrics. A critical history of the sector underpins the research in terms of making visible issues of

access, value and locality that lie at the heart of how film archives are made to demonstrate their worth. No detailed exploration of the use of local archive film as a tool for public history engagement has been undertaken to date and therefore this project adds to current knowledge about the use of local archive film, collating information that will be of use to academics, institutions and organisations in the field. Practitioners often work in isolation and the thesis offers insights into common anxieties, fears, frustrations and barriers that may not have been apparent before, allowing an analysis of challenges about public history and memory as they relate to the archive and to archive film. The approach I have employed throughout the thesis is to pay heed to the voices of professionals and non-professionals emerging from the sector and to create a space for the expression of their hopes, fears and experiences. The second aspect of the research focused on audience engagement, creative intervention into practice with archive film and its use as a tool and what the perceived relationship of the audience to this material might be. Since we exist in a financial and political climate where the arts suffer generally from austerity and lack of funding/investment and where film archives in particular are subject to precarity and enforced mobility, I have given a voice to those who are struggling in a world that may not see that what they do is valuable.

The LSSC was a core resource for the project. The LSSC was officially launched at Birkbeck College, University of London in the new Centre for Film and Visual Media Research in April 2007. The Collection emerged from Birkbeck's London Project study of early cinema in the city and from a vision to create a similar resource for London as the *Forum des Images* in Paris. This collection of film material made in and about that city was created in 1988 as an audiovisual memory bank of the city and with this vision in mind, the LSSC was launched in April 2007 as an accessible reference library of viewing copies of moving image material made in or about London, with this remit expressed in the widest possible terms. My own career and personal investment in the film archive sector over two decades led the way in prompting, planning and carrying out this PhD project. My primary concern in this long career in arts and education had been practice with moving image archive material and

audiences. I worked at the British Film Institute (BFI) and the National Film Theatre creating and delivering education events and programmes from 2000-2003, as a lecturer in film and media at Birkbeck College from 2000-2016 and as Research and Development Officer for the LSSC from 2006-2015. So I began this project with an understanding of the challenges that exist in investigating aspects of a world that is often disregarded and can be perceived as invisible by academics, the public and institutions. These challenges emerged more clearly through investigations of academic literature and through the primary research. Doing all aspects of this research meant examining my role and assumptions in a community of professionals and in a variety of institutions and considering my position and identity in terms of interrogating expertise. My participation as an 'insider' was a position that I needed to interrogate as part of the process and method of research.

Since a substantial proportion of the archive film in the LSSC was from boroughs on the periphery of London I was able to access local material for working with audiences during the research. However, the idea of the periphery applies to both the material used and the potential audience for it. This overarching aspect of the research was informed in part by Miles & Ebrey's 2017 study of participation and cultural value on the urban periphery, in particular their analysis of how recent critiques have pointed to the ways in which the peri-urban domain has been neglected in cultural policy(p.58). Arts Council England's 2015 report *Rural Evidence and Data Review*[1] recognises funding imbalances in favour of urban areas.

 I have been inspired by Patricia Zimmerman's approach which makes this film material visible by placing it at the centre of discourse. Her work makes a plea that amateur and archive film's position in historical, technological, economic and cultural discourse must be clarified (Zimmerman, 1995). I have noted that the descriptive terms 'archive', 'local' 'amateur' and 'home movie' are used fairly interchangeably and Zimmerman asserts that 'to study amateur film means detouring from the analysis of textuality into the power relations of discursive contexts' (p.x). This means moving away from what Brunow defines as 'the trifecta of preservation, restoration and digitization' (p.40) to a

---

[1] https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/.../Rural_Evidence_Review_2019_0.pdf

more complex and messy terrain where, as Zimmerman suggests, the fragmentary nature of amateur film and home movies is 'an imaginary archive that is never completed, always fragmentary, vast, infinite' (Zimmerman 2008, p.18). Archive film is an active, constantly changing historiographic practice and this research into how this material plays a role in public history engagement illuminates that practice at a particular moment in time and place.

STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In Chapter 1 Literature Review I first locate my research at the intersection of a number of extant and emerging fields, having outlined key theoretical areas which are: the nature of the archive; public history; memory; locality and film; the cinematic city. I draw upon these frameworks to define what is meant by archive film and to explore the materiality of the film archive, particularly given Cook's (1997) notion of the 'post-custodial archive without walls' (p.47) as opposed to the archive as a literal and concrete space. Cook suggests a paradigm shift in the role of archives and changes in archival theory over time with the advent of new technology. Archives are no longer static collections of physical records but have become potential virtual spaces where archivists can facilitate global access through technology. Haldar (2019) suggests archives are a living (rather than a dead) space and form a circulatory mechanism concerned with public memory, raising questions of how to make archives a dynamic resource. The notion of the archive as 'dead' or alive' has particular resonance for this project since the core film resource is the LSSC a static 'unofficial' archive of London film that has languished in a locked cupboard for four years. I discuss this in detail in Chapter 5 The London Screen Study Collection: An Autoethnographical Case Study. Academic writing on archival theory and practice has relevance for the project, but what becomes apparent in the literature review is a lack of critical discourse and scholarly attention given specifically to amateur and local film. Shand (2014) suggests that there is a lack of clarity as to where the study of the amateur archive film might sit in critical discourse. Film theory, archive theory and practice, social

science and memory studies are all possible areas but Shand argues that theoretical frameworks developed are 'insufficient to cover amateur film production as a whole' (p. 38).

In Chapter 2 Methodology I outline a number of themes about value, archival practice, memory and place, locality and public history which enabled research design and planning. In the first aspect of the research I discover what is actually happening in the film archive world through interviews with archivists and practitioners and an examination of own experience in the sector. The interviews were what Gillham (2005) describes as 'unstructured'. The unstructured interview as narrative enquiry is a methodological approach particularly appropriate to my respondents who are very knowledgeable and experienced within the film archive sector. The second aspect of research focuses on audience engagement and reception, creative intervention into practice with archive film and its use as a tool, and what that engagement might mean in terms of public good and public value. Linking the two aspects of the research is an interrogation of the narrative practices of presenting this film- what opportunities and what limitations exist and how can observation and participation illuminate the ways by which we perceive value. An exploration of the perceived relationship of the audience to archive film includes their understanding of the material and their responses to issues raised by archivists and practitioners.

Two other areas which aided methodological planning were the work of Raphael Samuel (1994) and an engagement with autoethnography/ethnography. Samuel does not deal specifically with film archives, but he informs a general question about history, particularly his view that history 'wells up from the lower depths' (p.4) and his description of 'history from below' (p.20) which includes local history collections, county records offices and local libraries as important repositories of history (p.17). Samuel describes history as 'an ensemble of activities and practices and a social form of knowledge' (p. 8) which informed both the interviews and the audience studies. Autoethnography and ethnography have also informed all aspects of the research because of my own history and involvement in the sector. Ellis *et al* (2011) suggest that autoethnography 'is one of the approaches that acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity' (p.2). In the early stages of the research

accommodating subjectivity, particularly my own, was a challenge. I was aided by the case made by Ellis *et al* for autoethnographers not only to 'use their methodological tools and research literature to analyse experience but also to 'use personal experience to illustrate facets of cultural experience' (p.4).

Chapter 3 Institutions of the Film Archive explores how and why institutions across the sector have interacted over time and primarily examines the relationship between the centre as represented by the British Film Institute and the periphery as represented by regional screen agencies, regional film archives and 'unofficial' archives. This is not a detailed history of why and how certain institutions were set up or how they functioned over time. It is rather a critical history exploring how organisations across the sector have interacted to bring us to the current situation which is something of an institutional muddle particularly around funding, access and perceptions of value. One overarching purpose of this chapter is to examine the relationship between the centre and the periphery of the sector in a way not often undertaken previously. This analysis is informed by the work of Dupin (2006), Burrows (1995) and Miller (2008) who have examined the history and functioning of the BFI and Flinn (2007, 2009, 2011, 2013) who has written extensively on community archives. By the centre I mean here the BFI and the UK Film Council (UKFC) and by the periphery the regional screen agencies and regional film archives. The centre is focused mainly but not always on London where national arts institutions have traditionally been located. I explore how this hierarchical relationship affects funding and access and defines value in terms of archive film material. The lack of core funding for regional film archives often leaves these organisations unable to fully preserve and exploit their holdings and dependent on external funders and their demands. Here voices from the sector emerge as part of this chapter which contains historical perspectives on different institutions. I use my experience working with the London Screen Study Collection to explore the 'unofficial' archive and the difficulties of defining collections which exist in a space between the private and public spheres. In this chapter I also reflect on cultural heritage and value in

a time of austerity and cuts to the arts where a target setting culture and the effects of neoliberalism mean an ongoing struggle to prove the worth of archive film.

Chapters 4 and 5 entitled Voices from the Film Archive Sector are concerned in detail with professional voices emerging from the research. In considering how to investigate this world and what it might embody for those who work within it, I set out to collect stories from a group of dedicated archivists and practitioners who aided the creation of a set of narratives of their world. I collated these testimonies of archivists and practitioners through thirteen interviews that capture a cohort of voices from the film archive sector. These interviews are a shared conversation, arising not from a set of questions but from an agenda largely mapped out by respondents. My own voice and experience is added in Chapter 5 entitled The London Screen Study Collection: An Autoethnographical Case Study which allows a space for my narrative to be added to those captured by the interviews. In the case study I use Muncey's idea that the individual is worthy of research (2005, p. 69). Her four approaches to the representation of an individual's story- the snapshot, the metaphor, the journey and artefacts- inform the case study as I describe and reflect on my nine year journey with the London Screen Study Collection.

In Chapter 6 Voices from the Periphery I investigate what this world means for audiences who engage with archive film by choice or chance and what opportunities that world embodies for them. The audience studies undertaken in suburban spaces and four New Towns around London enabled an exploration of practice with audience engagement and participation as well as public history and memory. At the core of this part of the thesis is the notion of the periphery by which I mean here the real and metaphorical borders and hinterlands on the geographical edges of London where the audience studies took place. Theories around aspects of microhistory as defined by Szijarto (2002) were useful here. Szijarto defines microhistory as 'the intensive historical investigation of a small area' (p.209) and suggests it conveys personal experience. To this I would add that this is a way to give space and privilege to the voices of the audience so they can articulate the value of what they have seen and experienced. Szijarto also suggests that microhistory places lived experience at the

centre (p. 212) and this approach used during the audience studies proved relevant in interactions with local residents and volunteers to uncover history, memory and experiences. Miles and Ebrey 's discussion of the 'village in the city', meaning suburban and other spaces on the edge of cities, and how cultural participation on the urban periphery is often kept afloat through voluntary work (2017,p. 63) was useful in working with volunteers in both Hillingdon and the New Towns. The audience studies illuminated community investment in archives which document the history and experience of groups. This suggests a type of value and status for this material in creating a repository outside of 'official' archives and enabling an engagement emerging directly from the narratives of people's lived experiences.

Throughout the thesis I argue that questions about the value, accessibility and impact of film archives cannot be answered through a culture of target- setting, outputs, footfall and performance so I have sought for a different approach to consider the nature of the film archive sector. Taken together the chapters that follow move from an exploration of the current condition of the film archive sector to the opening up of a series of spaces where archivist, practitioner and audience voices can create a narrative interrogating the value and uses of this material for public history engagement.

Chapter 1 Literature Review

INTRODUCTION

My research on public history, archives, locality and memory is located at the intersection of a number of extant and emerging fields. In terms of my research questions about archive film, public history and place and also to further make plain the archivist/audience articulation, I have identified a number of key theoretical frameworks to provide contextualisation for the field of study. These frameworks are: the nature of the archive including archival history, debates around the role of the archivist and issues of power and control; moving image archives and their artefactual status; public history; memory and film; locality and film; the cinematic city including history and documentary. These discourses were the most directly relevant to my research on creative practice with local archive film. In the first section of the review I explore some general literature about archives and their changing role in society including debates around the nature of the archive and the role of the archivist. The sections on public history and memory inform the question how has archive film been employed as a tool for public history engagement? The sections on locality and film and the cinematic city inform the question what role might archive film play in exploration of collective and personal memory of life in peripheral spaces around London? I also engage with debates about London and its suburban and peripheral spaces, both historically and in terms of postmodernist thinking, since London and film about the city was a case study for the project.

The literature review identifies gaps which my research addresses. Much of the literature reviewed with some notable exceptions does not mention moving image archives specifically or in any detail, giving a passing mention at best. Moving image archives appear to sit mainly outside a traditional archival discourse and their use for public history practice remains an area for exploration. No critique of the use of archive film as a tool for public history engagement has been undertaken to date and this project will add to current knowledge about the use of local archive film, collating information that will be of use to organisations in the field. Of wider relevance to debate will be an

analysis of challenges about public history and memory as they relate to the archive and to archive film.

<u>THE NATURE OF THE ARCHIVE</u>

The writing of Arlette Farge (2013) explores the nature and philosophy of the archive. Farge's viewpoint on the archive from the historical perspective of 18th century France opens a wider discourse within which to consider archives in general and moving image archives in particular. Her work is based on fragile paper records and she articulates the archive as 'precious and damaged' (p.2) but as a witness to ordinary lives. She calls the archive 'the real' as opposed to a narrative or discourse on the real (p.2) and is clear that to her an archival manuscript is a living document (p.15). Farge also suggests that the archive preserves moments at random, chaotically (p.9), suggesting that 'the archival document is a tear in the fabric of time, an unplanned glimpse offered into an unexpected event' (p.6). One of her major concerns is the materiality of the archive and the need for emotional engagement on the part of the archivist to decipher what she calls the 'infinite and undecipherable' (p.5). Farge's writing has relevance for moving image archives which can be fragile physically and often not readily accessible because of provenance and format and issues around ephemerality and materiality. Farge suggests that working with the archive can be 'boring' because of the task of recopying archive texts (p.15) and this can be compared with the often difficult and laborious task of cataloguing fragmented archive footage by writing shot by shot accounts of what is seen on screen.

Osborne (1999) in his discussion on the 'ordinariness of the archive' (p. 51) suggests three aspects to the archive which he defines as: the principle of publicity whereby archival information is made available to some kind of public; the principle of singularity where the archive focuses upon questions of detail; the principle of mundanity whereby the focus of the archive is said to be the dimension of everyday life (p.51).The latter had particular connections with my research into local archive film where I dealt in the mundane, offering visual representations of everyday life to

audiences. Osborne suggests that the archive creates a 'third world beyond the physical world of objects and the world of subjective experience' (p.52) and that it can be seen as a centre of interpretation which relates to public memory. In terms of mundanity, Osborne suggests 'the mundane can be anywhere for example, in the deeds stored in a local library, in the minutes of early working men's associations, in files stored in the basement of a hospital' (p.59). He suggests that the archive is concerned with ongoing mundane facts and the ordinariness of the everyday and that 'the place of power may be not confined to the big world of sovereigns and politics but in the interstices of life itself where the ordinary and everyday are played out' (p. 61).

In the light of a proliferation of 'unofficial' archives where power and control may be questioned, an example of which is the London Screen Study Collection (LSSC), a core resource for my project, Derrida 's *Archive Fever* (1995) offers analysis of the role of the archive in the origins of law and the drive to preserve history. (p.17). Manoff (2004) suggests that Derrida has influenced much archival discourse outside of library and information science (p.11) and notes Derrida's use of Freudian psychoanalysis to offer a theory of the archive premised on two conflicting forces which she describes as 'a death drive and a conservation or archive drive' (p.11). Manoff argues that Derrida's work has contributed to scholarly recognition of the contingent nature of the archive-'the way it is shaped by social, political and technological forces' (p.11). However, Manoff (2004) references Steedman (2001) in a critique of Derrida's work.

Steedman argues that his work is less helpful in understanding a broad range of archival questions and issues. She suggests that Derrida fails to give a sense of what archival research really means (Steedman 2001 p. 1165) and that his notion of the archive is too broad (p. 1161). Steedman also argues that the English translation of the title of Derrida's work Mal *d'Archive* as *Archive Fever* is unfortunate, suggesting as it does illness and some kind of occupational disease. Steedman suggests that if 'one is going to talk about archive fever one should be thinking epidemiology not metaphor' (p. 1172). She is impatient with the archive as metaphor as she suggests that the archive is 'a very literal and concrete space where those involved with the historical disciplines engage with material

objects' (p.1164). My project dealt with the film archive as a literal space and issues of materiality and vulnerability were core to the work with audiences.

Manoff (2004) goes on to ask some important questions about the archive. These are: 'who builds the archive and for what purpose? How is it organized and made accessible? How is it preserved?'(p.19). She also asserts the important role that archives, libraries and museums have to play in the creation and preservation of national identity and in contribution to social stability (p.22). The importance of archival discourse is stressed by Manoff as she sees it providing a 'place to enter the debate about changes in knowledge-making practices' (p.21). Manoff is also concerned with a perspective that includes library and information and museum specialists, whose dealings with archives include the work of acquisition, cataloguing and preserving. She notes that this work 'has a political component, whether acknowledged or not' (p.22).

Issues of power and control in archives have been given particular attention by Cook (1997, 2013) and Carter (2006). Cook (2013) traces archival history looking at four key archival paradigms over time which he names as 'evidence, memory, community and identity' (p.95). Cook suggests that 'evidence' is pre-modern archiving where the 'custodian-archivist guards the judicial legacy' (p. 106). He explores the idea of the archive as guarding the 'Truth' in records through unaltered and unmediated and unbroken context' (p.106) and also argues that this concept dominated professional discourse until the 1930s and is still an important concern (p.107). Cook's second archival paradigm is what he calls 'memory' which in this context means modern archiving where 'the historian-archivist selects the archive' (p.107). This suggests the archivist as an 'active selector of the archive' (p.108). This need came about, Cook argues, because of a huge expansion in public records after two world wars and the anticipated use of archives for academic research (p.107). Cook mentions moving image material namely film, TV and animation for the first time as part of an archive that emphasises 'the cultural heritage and memory dimensions of archives as institutions' (p.109). He suggests that this paradigm flourished from the 1930s to the 1970s.

His third archival paradigm is 'identity: post-modern archiving' where the 'mediator-archivist shapes the societal archive' (p.109). He argues that from the 1970s onwards the archivist as professional expert emerged. The change in perspective here is that the idea of a 'Truth' protected in archives moved to an understanding that archives contain 'many truths, many voices, many perspectives, and many stories' (p.110). This led to a focus in appraisal shifting to documenting citizens as much as the state, margins as much as the centre, dissenting voices as much as mainstream voices and cultural expression as much as state policy (p.110). This third archival paradigm was, Cook argues, 'distinctively focused on archives as a societal resource' (p.112) which increasingly respected the pluralistic and ambiguous nature of the postmodern world (p. 112). Cook's fourth paradigm is 'community' which he defines as 'participatory archiving- the activist-archivist mentors collaborative evidence' (p.113).Here he discusses the role of the Internet in changing archival practice and explores the idea of archiving as a participatory process shared with many (p.114). Cook notes that community-based archiving involves a shift in archival principles from exclusive custodianship to shared ownership (p.115). He suggests that such paradigms can be destructive or enabling (p.116) and are 'open-ended, overlapping and constantly evolving' (p.117). Cook argues that each era interprets anew evidence and memory and thus redefines archival identity (p.118). It is this fourth paradigm that was of the most concern for my research.

Carter (writing in2006) discusses how issues of authority and power in archives lead to silences, 'gaps' and 'blanks' where marginalized groups' voices are lost (p. 217.) He argues that while it is generally accepted that archival silences are a negative (p.217) it may be that certain groups choose silence, thereby exempting themselves from the archives (p.217). Carter suggests that the powerful in society are typically aligned with the state and its apparatus and they have historically created the records that eventually enter the archives (p.217). Thus Carter suggests that dissenting views have not been given a voice and have been 'gagged, threatened and visibly silenced' (p.218). He references Meyerhoff (2004) who calls this silence 'simple and perfect' (Meyerhoff, p.209). While this may be undergoing alteration by the increasing influence of the Internet, archival silences still

may have a disastrous impact on marginalised groups. Carter references Schwartz and Cook (2002) who suggest 'without archives, memory falters, knowledge of accomplishment fades, pride in a shared past dissipates. Archives counter these losses' (Schwartz & Cook 2002 p. 18). Carter suggests that archival silences result in societal memory being compromised (p.220) as is the ability for the marginal to seek accountability (p.221). Identity and community are affected as, in the face of archival silence, it is difficult to form a sense of collective identity (p.221). Carter suggests various ways these 'silences' can be subverted. One is 'reading archives against the grain' (p.224) and 'illuminating the discontinuities, ruptures and gaps of the discourse' (p.224). Another way is to look at records created by the state about marginalized and oppressed groups in order to discover their history, which may be the only extant historical information (p.224)

Caswell *et al* (2016) note that recent work in archival studies reflects a growth in independently operated community-based archival organisations (p.61) and reference Flinn and Stevens (2009) who position community archives as parts of larger social and political movements which are grassroots alternatives to mainstream repositories (p.61). Caswell *et al* (2016) also note that community archives can range from entirely independent, permanent, non-profit organisations to informal, loosely defined, temporary configurations (p.62). They are concerned with the social impact of archives which they suggest 'manifests itself in issues surrounding the development of personal and community identity, the preservation of culture and broadening understandings of history' (p.63). Here they suggest that although archives have demonstrated their impact using external factors such as the amount of revenue generated, little research has assessed internal impact at the individual level (p.65). In my audience studies, I have sought to assess the impact of local archive film through public engagement, particularly by gathering individual feedback from audience members and by seeking to assess the value of archive film through means other than metrics.

Caswell *et al* propose a new term 'representational belonging' (p.57) to examine how community archives might empower people and have important epistemological, ontological and social impacts

on members of marginalised communities (p.57).This new concept can serve as a counterweight to symbolic annihilation (p.75) and helps to describe the affective responses people have to seeing their communities represented in archives with complexity and nuance (p.75). They comment on the role of the archivist, suggesting that mainstream archival repositories and professionally trained archivists could do well to engage with the community archives movement to counteract the effects of symbolic annihilation (p.76).

Cook (1997, 2013) and Shepherd (2009) explore how cultural, technological and philosophical trends in society have changed and challenged archival practice. Cook (2013) discusses the role of the archivist in his writing on key paradigms in archival history, particularly in his ideas of the 'historian-archivist' and the 'mediator-archivist' (p.109). The archivist has been transformed from passive curator to active appraiser to social mediator (p.116). Cook also outlines new challenges that have emerged from the archival discourse with the advent of new technology which affect the archivist's role, making the archivist a 'community facilitator' (p.116). These changes mean a move to what Cook describes as a 'post-custodial' archive without walls' (Cook 1997, p.3) existing on the Internet. In this the archive reflects broader society and societal values, partly due to increased access through technology. Cook (2013) also extends his earlier arguments with discussion of community archives and their role in identity provenance where the archivist's role as mediator in shaping the archival resource changes to the archivist working collaboratively as mentor, facilitator and coach in the community (p. 114). In a similar vein, Flinn (2011) suggests that 'unofficial' archives are a 'reproach and challenge to mainstream archives' (p.5) stressing the need for a participatory approach by archivists who must make changes in professional practices to work more collaboratively (p.15).

In terms of moving image archives, there is some emphasis in the literature on technical issues, examples being how to treat degraded archive film (Kokaram, 2004), digitisation (Fossati, 2011), cataloguing (Harrison, 1991) and restoration (Turci, 2006). This raises some questions around issues of mediation, artefactual status and accessibility through public engagement. 'Unofficial' moving

image archives (as represented by the core resource for my project, the LSSC) are characterized by film material that documents 'ordinary lives' and may have little status or legitimacy both in terms of their perceived value. Wisniewski (2007) suggests that the concept of the visual archive emerges from a desire for 'control and truth rooted in empiricist assumptions of the visible as evidence' (p. 11). Wisniewski suggests that archive film is by its very nature ephemeral and 'produced to serve temporary functions' (p.3). Yet preservation is an important issue in the film archive sector and the tension inherent between preservation and access informs much scholarly and professional debate.

PUBLIC HISTORY

I first explore some definitions and discourses around ideas of public history while noting that, as Ashton and Kean (2008) quote from *The Public Historian,* 'there is a considerable diversity of approaches to the definition and practice of public history' (p. 12). Ashton and Kean suggest that public history could be defined as 'the range of historiographical processes that could lead to the possible creation of shared meaning and different understandings of the past' (p.1). Ashton and Kean (2008) also note that public history has a long history (p.10) and they go on to discuss what materials are suitable for writing history, suggesting a 'diverse, non-traditional range of materials' (p.3) including letters, diaries, speeches, legends and songs' (p.3). Following on from this, they suggest that materials from personal, local and familial domains can be mined to develop new perspectives on the past (p.4). Ashton and Kean reference Kelley (1978) especially his definition of public history as 'the employment of historians and historical method outside of academia' (p.16). Jensen (in Ashton and Kean 2008) similarly references Carl Becker's address to the American Historical Association in 1931 (Everyman His Own Historian) in which he identified history with memory and suggested 'the only history that is truly worthwhile is the pragmatic kind' (p.235) and also that 'history is the memory of things said and done' (p.235). The work of Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) is also influential in thinking about public history. In their survey of American life, they demonstrated the ways in which people used the past to make sense of their lives and showed the

importance of valuing individuals' experience of the past. Jensen (in Ashton and Kean,2008) calls their work 'a landmark in the empirical study of popular and public history' (p.42) as it was the first major attempt to generate sociological insight in to the ways in which ordinary people understand and use history in their everyday lives' (p.42).

In his highly influential *Theatres of Memory* Samuel (1994) suggests that 'history is not the prerogative of the historian' (p.6) but an 'ensemble of activities and practices' (p.6). He posits the question 'who is and who is not a historian' (p.4) and suggests that history is 'a form of social knowledge, the work, in any given instance of a thousand different hands' (p. 13). In Samuel's view, 'knowledge filters downwards' (p.4) and his description of 'history from below' (p.20) includes local history collections, county records offices and local libraries as important repositories of history (p.17). He also suggests that ephemera now play an important role as 'unofficial sources of historical knowledge' (p.22) and that we live in an 'expanding historical culture' (p.25) where a wide variety of material and practices can be utilised as a starting point for doing history. Samuel calls the past a 'plaything of the present' (p.429) and notes the expansion since the 1970s of heritage interpretation, involvement in 'living history' (such as open air and industrial museums), historical re-enactment and the growth of interest in family history which he sees as demonstrating that 'history is an argument about the past' (p.430). What he calls 'records-based history (p.437) has always had to compete with rival narratives attempting to tell the story of the past in different ways.

Samuel's ideas inform other writers such as de Groot (2009) who calls public history 'non-academic or non-professional history' (p.1). De Groot also notes the 'blurring of the lines between professional historians and others who access the past.'(p.1). Jensen suggests that Samuel shares with Becker, Rosenzweig and Thelen a 'shared desire to lessen the authority of academic history and further a democratisation of the study and use of history' (p.46). Jensen also suggests that on surveying the available attempts to characterise popular and public history, it becomes apparent that various conceptual frameworks are being employed (p.53). To focus on two such frameworks, Becker and

Samuel are centred on the concept of memory while Rosenzweig and Thelen make the idea of the user of the past their focal point (p.53). While these frameworks may appear different, Jensen notes that there are important points of convergence especially in the assertion that public history is different from traditional history and that it represents the idea of democratization. Becker's concept of history as the 'memory of things said and done' accords with Rosenzweig, Thelen and Samuel's findings about public history (p.53). Jensen suggests that the focus here is not the question of how to study and write about the past, but rather to examine how people make use of available and relevant pasts in their everyday life (p. 53).

Glassberg (1996) also describes public history as different from conventional academic history (p.7) and Ashton and Kean (2008) suggest that public history means that 'people are active agents in creating histories' (p.1).Flinn (2007) calls public history a form of 'history from below' (p. 160) referencing Samuel (1994) and De Groot notes that 'unofficial history' is being preserved and made accessible by new technology (p.100), adding to the growth of interest in local and family history and community history and heritage. He also suggests that the creation of community archives through the Internet will lead to a 'new inventive relationship that overcomes the hierarchical relationship in traditional archives' (p. 91). This will 'give agency to participants and encourage cultural participation' (p.100).

With these discourses and definitions in mind I will move on to explore literature concerned with archives and their role in community and public history. I will also look at ways of doing history using archive film as explored in the work of specific writers (Zimmerman 1995; Ishizuka and Zimmerman 2008; Nicholson 2008).

Flinn (2007), Long (2015) and Cook (2013) note the democratization of culture and archives. These archives have as Long (2015) says been 'opened up or bypassed as ordinary people pursue a desire to find out more about personal and communal histories that have been largely ignored by official accounts' (p.5).This growth in interest in public history using archives and the emphasis on practice

to deepen and empower public connection with the past is discussed by Flinn (2007). He emphasizes the growth of community archives in public history practice suggesting that these archives are a way of addressing the exclusion of marginalised groups from history and heritage, what he calls 'gaps and absences' (p.151). Flinn also notes the difficulty of establishing a common understanding of terms employed in this area (p.152) and how problematic definitions of 'community' and community archive' prove to be. Definitions of what a 'community' might be are especially complex and fluid and may focus on locality, on ideas of shared beliefs or shared values (p.153). Terms and definitions commonly used for this type of work might include: local history group; oral history project; community history project; community memory project. Flinn's definition of community archives is 'the grassroots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, control and ownership is essential' (p.153). In his discussion of the collections of material that might form the content of community archives, he mentions audio-visual material and film (p.153) as part of the 'broadest and most inclusive definition possible' (p.153). Flinn goes on to suggest that photographs, film and oral material contribute to 'bringing to life individuals and communities that otherwise lie rather lifeless or without colour in the paper record' (p.153).

Flinn and others note two important reports highlighting the growth and increasing importance of community archives. The first of these is the Archives Task Force (2004) report 'Listening to the Past, Speaking to the Future'[1]. Newman (in Ashton and Kean, 2008) notes that this report identified 'access to all' as a key aim to 'increase community participation in UK archive activities with particular focus on engaging hard to reach communities' (p.261). Newman is concerned with photography and one photographic archive in particular, but he raises a useful point of relevance for moving image archives. He describes the 'crossover from private to public domain' (p. 269) which raises issues of intellectual property rights if private material is transferred to a public location such as a local authority archive (p.269). Private here may mean either owned by an individual or by a

---

[1] https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/archives-sector/case-studies-and-research-reports/

group or specific community. Using home movies and amateur film as archive material raises similar issues. Newman suggests that community archiving is a 'way of retaining control over communities' cultural property and identity' (p.269).

 The second report is noted by Flinn (2007). In 2006 the Community Archive Development Group (CADG) commissioned the first piece of research into the social impact of community archives. Their report was published in 2007 and estimated that there might be three thousand community archives in the UK involving one million people. (CADG report 2007)[2]. The report discerned a number of impacts with regard to community archives, mostly concerned with 'opportunities for social interaction and participation' (Flinn p.165). Flinn also notes that the CADG report found that community archive activity resulted in cultural capital gains by bringing together groups and supporting understanding and respect (p.165). This 're-balancing of history and heritage in favour of under-voiced communities' (p.165) has led to greater community cohesion and Flinn suggests that 'it is clear that community archives have an impact in diversifying and democratising heritage' (p.165).

Gilliland and Flinn (2013) in further discussion about community archives suggest that most community archives exist in part as a response to the perception that official heritage bodies are not interested in their stories (p.5) but also point out that for some marginalised groups this perception is 'informed by a well- established and frequently justified mistrust or hostility towards the mainstream heritage institutions' (p.5). They reference Boucher (2006) in a definition of community archives which they suggest are 'managed by a community organisation, that is, an organisation which is not for profit and non-governmental. Community archives will differ from those sponsored by the state' (p.8). They also reference Hopkins (2008) in suggesting that the existence of a community archive can be seen as a 'refutation of and challenge to the practices of the mainstream professional heritage sector' (p.11).

---

[2] Community Archives Development Group *The Impact of Community Archives* Retrieved from http://www.communityarchives.org.uk

As I have noted, moving image archives appear to sit outside a traditional archival discourse and are often mentioned only in passing in literature. Ashton and Kean (2008) discuss 'visual archives' mainly in terms of photography (p.260). In their detailed explorations of public history and heritage they suggest that 'there is a sophisticated awareness of the processes of constructing an interpretation of the past in film and TV historical products' (p. 32) but this discourse does not include amateur or local archive film or home movies. De Groot (2009) notes the use of archive footage from TV to create 'cheap recall shows' (p. 164). He also discusses historical film in great detail but this discussion focuses on mainstream cinema, heritage film and TV drama. In his discussion on the impact of the Internet on public history practice, de Groot does however note that access to actual archival materials provided by online databases and digitized archives is leading to increased public engagement and 'emancipation of the historical subject' (p.60). He mentions the visual aspect with a brief account of the Mitchell and Kenyon films (p.64) and discusses some television programmes which impinge on increased interest in 'the everyday historical' (p. 62).

The work of Zimmerman (1995) and Ishizuka and Zimmerman (2008) foregrounds amateur film as an important part of public history practice. Written from a U.S perspective and focusing primarily on home movies, their discourse opens up a space to position archive film more centrally in discussions about public history. Zimmerman (in Ishizuka & Zimmerman, 2008) argues that readers should turn their thinking about cinema inside out, to reverse popular culture assumptions about home movies' (p. 1) She suggests that home movies are a visual practice emerging out of dispersed, localized and often minoritised cultures (p.1) and focuses on how amateur film and home movies might produce history and histories (p.2). She goes on to ask crucial questions about archive film and home movies which include how can we begin to 'unravel their historiographic significance in counter distinction to other kind of film histories from above?'(p. 2) and how do these films function as a counterpoise to public history and how do they construct historical knowledge? (p.2). Zimmerman (writing in 2008) notes that in the last two decades a 'revisionist film history' (p.2) has grown up through 'precise archival work' (p.2). But the emphasis here has been on ready-made corporate archives.

Zimmerman suggests that a movement towards a different formation of 'film history from below' (p.2) would 'permit us to see the unseen to deconstruct and then reconstruct the human through the ephemeral' (p.2).

Zimmerman (2008) is also concerned with the fragmentary nature of amateur film and home movies and suggests that 'home movies constitute an imaginary archive that is never completed, always fragmentary, vast, infinite' (p.18). This imaginary archive is 'transnational in character '(p. 18) and links nations, communities, identities and families (p.18). Thus home movies and amateur film can be envisioned as a 'cinema of recovery' (p.22) locating records as incomplete, fragmentary articulations of difference in locale, ethnicity, sexual identity, gender, region and nation (p.22). Zimmerman also challenges the notion of archives as 'the depositories of old, dead cultural artifacts' (p.19) instead suggesting that archives are 'never inert, as they are always in the process of additions of new arenas and unknown objects' (p.19).She sees the archive as a 'retrieval machine' (p.19) and references Abraham (in Ishizuka & Zimmerman, 2008) who confronts the issue of producing an archive for amateur film in India when no public archive now collects it. Abraham calls these films 'fossils of cinema' (p. 168) and 'a patchwork history' (p.168) and suggests that home movies exist as fragments, slices of differentiated reality come to life, frequently without a beginning or an end (p.170). Thus Zimmerman and others suggest that home movies (and other types of amateur film) can function as 'empirical evidence of otherwise lost events' (p.22) and this 'provokes a re-examination of what constitutes audience' (p. 22).

MEMORY, ARCHIVES AND FILM

Issues of individual, collective, cultural and social memory working together to reconstruct the past have had great relevance for my project in work with individuals, groups and communities to uncover local histories using archive film material. I first explore definitions of memory from a number of sources, particularly in terms of different concepts of what might constitute memory over time.

Josias (2011) notes that most studies of memory are influenced in one way or another by Maurice Halbwachs' work on collective and social memory. Halbwachs was the first sociologist to stress that our conceptions of the past are affected by the mental images we employ to solve present problems. He made a 'crucial distinction between autobiographical memory and historical memory' (Josias 2011 p.29). Historical memory is kept alive by written records, commemoration, ceremonies and social bonds while autobiographical memory is specifically that which we have personally experienced in the past. Halbwachs also suggested that 'collective memory is a reconstruction of the past in the light of the present' (p. 34). Bearing in mind the influence of Halbwachs, the work of Nora (1989), Kansteiner (2002), Ernst (2013) and Van Dijck (2007) offers ways of considering themes which are central to an exploration of the role of archives and film in memory work.

Kansteiner offers two models for definitions of memory. His definitions of public memory or officially endorsed memory and vernacular memory or grassroots memory (p.181) are relevant in considering how archives and film might be used for memory work in exploring the ordinary and prosaic. Kansteiner also makes important links between memory and identity suggesting that 'memory is valorised where identity is problematized' (p.184). He also suggests that the relation of the individual to the collective is 'an unsettled area of memory studies' (p.185). As in other areas I have explored, definitions can be subjective and change over time, reflecting social and technological changes. Looking at autobiographical memory, Van Dijck (2007) references American psychologist Bluck (2003) who contends that this has three main functions. These are: to preserve a sense of being a coherent person over time; to strengthen social bonds by sharing personal memories; to use past experience to construct models to understand the inner worlds of self and others. These can be defined as self-continuity, communicative function and directive function (Van Dijck p.3). Van Dijck (2007) goes on to suggest that we need autobiographical memories to develop a sense of self and a self-image based on facts, emotions and experiences (p.3) and that autobiographical memory is crucial for identity formation.

Wang & Brockmeier (2002) discuss autobiographical memory as cultural practice, in an exploration of the dynamics between memory, self and culture. Their definition of autobiographical memory references Brewer (1986) 'memory for information related to the self' (Brewer, p.26) and they suggest that the emergence of 'self-memory in today's Western understanding is functionally related to identity formation' (p. 46). However they note that this 'traditional view of autobiographical memory' (p.47) has been challenged by a social-interactionist approach to memory development, emphasising the social contexts of remembering (p.47). They argue that autobiographical memory is a cultural practice, embedded in a social weave of dialogues (p.47) that links the individual to the larger cultural milieu. Thus one of their major concerns is the cultural context of remembering and they suggest that 'conceptions of selfhood fulfil different, culture-specific purposes and vary across cultures' (p.49). Their research contrasts autobiographical memory and its contexts in the USA and in China. Western cultures such as the USA advocate a strong, independent and unified self (p.51) while many East Asian cultures such as China promote an unbounded, interdependent, relational self, valuing a life of collective activities over a unique biographical history (p.52).The dynamic relationship between memory and self is thus built into the larger fabric of a culture (p.52). In their cross-cultural findings examining Caucasian-American and Asian-American autobiographical memory, they find 'an emphasis on individuality and self-enhancement in American culture and an emphasis on interconnectedness and humility in Chinese culture' (p.52). Their conception of autobiographical memory is that it is 'not a natural and universal process but a cultural practice, or more precisely, an array of practices' (p.58).

Considering collective memory, Josias (2011) points out some of the complexities of defining collective memory resulting from its 'analysis across several disciplines, wide-ranging interpretations and definitions and many categorisations' (p. 95). Hutton (1993) influenced by Halbwachs, suggests that 'collective memory is an elaborate network of social mores, values and ideals' (p.78) and that the attitudes of social groups impact on memory (p.78). Hutton also suggests that Halbwachs' influence as a 'pioneer in the history of memory' (p. 75) is especially relevant in the 21st century

when the politics of representation is increasingly being explored. Hutton makes a useful distinction between memory and history which is that memory confirms similarities between past and present (p.76) while history establishes the differences between past and present' (p.76). Hutton sees history as a 'kind of official memory' (p.77), a representation of the past that happens to enjoy the sanction of scholarly authority (p.77). Hutton suggests that history and memory have diverged in the post-modern age (p.160) with less emphasis on the history and agency of the nation-state and more on the exploration of lost cultural worlds (p.167).

Moving on to consider archives specifically, Cook (2013) notes that 'archives are constructed memories about the past, about history, heritage and culture' (p.101). The 'participatory archiving' paradigm that Cook calls 'the fourth archival mind set'(p.113), arising after the advent of the Internet means that archives have been democratized due to new communications and technological realities (p.113). This will give greater accessibility for users who can engage with memory work without the mediation of professional historians. Cook suggests that, with the Internet, every person can build their own online archive and that 'ordinary citizens can join together in numerous forums to share interests' (p.113). He suggests that this opportunity to document human and societal experience with a richness and relevance never before attainable will lead to 'a more holistic and vibrant total archive' (p.113). In their discussion of the role of archives in memory, Bastian and Alexander (2009) first address definitions of community as their contention is that communities and archives/records interact with each other (p.xxi). As with public history and collective memory, they note the difficulty of defining community suggesting that 'definition is subjective and versatile and there are national, cultural and individual perspectives. There is no one definition of community or archives' (p. xxii). Mander (in Bastian and Alexander, 2009) suggests that community archives are 'collections of material that encapsulate a particular community's understanding of its history and identity. The community might be geographically based or relate to a cultural or thematic community of interest' (p.32).

Flinn, Stevens and Shepherd (2009) go further in a discussion on community archives and 'memory production' (p.76) where archives can be the tools or building blocks upon which memory is constructed (p. 76). Flinn *et al* see this type of memory work as part of community archivists' drive to document and record their own history which may be absent from mainstream archives (p. 72) In thinking about archives as 'part of a changing and evolving memory landscape' (Josias 2011, p. 95), the social and political dimensions of archives give rise to discussions by Harris (2002) and Ketelaar (2009) on how the archive can be not just a collection of material but 'a place of contestation, not merely a storage technique but a force for delegitimation of mythified and traditionalized memories' (Ketelaar 2009 p. 110). Ketelaar uses the example of the International Criminal Tribunal Yugoslavia (ICTY) archive to describe the importance of the archival record for historical accountability for victims and survivors of human rights abuses (p.113). He also suggests that 'archives can become spaces of memory practice where people can try to put their trauma in context' (p.120) and also 'a space of shared custody and trust' (p.120). Since shared pasts may require questioning and contestation, archives can provide space to do this (p.124). Harris (2002) also addresses issues of the 'archive of trauma' and the politics of memory and power, talking specifically about the experience of South African archive practice under apartheid. While my project has not dealt directly with the 'archive of trauma', it has engaged audiences in producing public history interpretations of ordinary urban community and collective memory. Harris focuses on 'social memory' where an oppressive regime used archives to enact 'memory erasure' (p.70). His ideas of 'oppositional memory construction' (p.76) and 'the struggle of remembering against forgetting' (p.76) are particularly relevant to South Africa but his concept of the 'archival sliver' (p.64) where the 'documentary record provides just a sliver of a window into an event' (p.64) is appropriate to describe archive film where materiality creates fragmentation.

In consideration of technological issues, Nora (1989) discusses the equation of memory and history, calling modern societies 'hopelessly forgetful' (p. 8). He discusses (pre-Internet) the deformation and transformation to memory wrought by mass culture and technological change (p.17), a precursor to

what Boscacci (2015) identifies as 'a contemporary preoccupation with memory' (p.1) and particularly the effect of technology and technological mediation on memory. Nora suggests that 'modern memory is archival' (p.13) and notes the changes wrought by mass culture, TV and cinema on memory (p.12). In the same vein, Grainge (2003), writing about mainstream cinema and memory, notes the 'deracinating effect on memory produced by technological media' (p.5) and foregrounds issues of amnesia, ahistoricism and forgetting in a 'postmodern culture of increasing speed, space and simulacra unable to retain or engage with a meaningful sense of its own past' (p.7). Grainge (2003) and Ernst (2013) both suggest this 'amnesia' may be a result of what Boscacci (2015) calls 'an unprecedented externalisation of personal and social memory into the virtual memory spaces of the Internet' (p.7.) Huyssen (1995) agrees that 'there is evidence for the view that capitalist culture with its frenetic pace, its TV politics of quick oblivion and its dissolution of public space…is inherently amnesiac' (p.6) and that the 'high-tech world has profound effects on the way we think and live cultural memory' (p.4). He also discusses 'an obsession with memory in contemporary culture and laments that political, social and cultural amnesia' (p.3) exists alongside what he calls a 'memory boom of unprecedented proportions' (p. 5). This major contradiction is relevant to issues of film and technological mediation.

Grainge (2003) poses a crucial question that is central to my research which is what are the means and possibilities for articulating the past through established and developing forms of technological mediation (p.7). How film is used for memory work has been explored by Stubbings (in Grainge, 2003) who investigates how film memory work is often figured around generational nostalgia, focussing on the specificities of identity and community (p.68).Mainstream cinema has been used extensively for this kind of nostalgia-based memory work both in terms of reminiscence (often with older people) and in terms of nostalgia for 'classic' films – what Stringer (in Grainge, 2003) calls 'raiding the archive' (p. 81). Archive film material has been used in similar ways but because the material tends to be less accessible, the archivist/practitioner will usually act as curator deciding

what can be screened. The danger here is that the audience can become a passive recipient of material which may not be relevant to their lived experience or memories.

Chun (2008) discusses how the digital may conflate memory and storage, suggesting this may 'make the permanent into an enduring ephemeral, creating unforeseen degenerative links between humans and machines' (p. 148). She also suggests that digital media was 'supposed to solve if not dissolve archival problems such as degrading celluloid or scratched vinyl, not create archival problems of its own' (p.154). Chun argues that the major characteristic of digital media is memory and that 'memory allegedly makes digital media an ever increasing archive in which no piece of data is lost' (p. 154). But as she concludes, 'digital media is not always there. We suffer daily frustrations with digital sources that just disappear. Digital media is degenerative, forgetful, erasable. This degeneration makes it both possible and impossible for it to imitate analogue media' (p.160). Looking further at how digital technologies may impinge on memory, Van Dijck (2007) is concerned with the relation between memory, memory artifacts and memory practices and how these are changing in the digital age. A particular concern is how digital objects might change our inscription and remembrance of lived experience (p. xii) and whether analogue and digital objects are interchangeable in the making, storing and recalling of memories (p.xii). This has relevance for the materiality of pre-digital film which has been digitized. This material may exist in what Van Dijck calls 'a limbo between analogue and digital materialization' (p. xiii). Van Dijck stresses the importance of materiality and technology when addressing issues of memory (p.xiii). She suggests that new digital technologies are transforming our notions of privacy and openness and also cast a different light on the relation between personal memory and lived experience (p.xv).

Van Dijck also suggests that digital equipment allows 'the skewering of diverse historical home modes' (p. xv) and that technology, as well as capturing memory, has an inherent ability to shape and manipulate memory. While many theories acknowledge an intimate relationship between memory and media, Van Dijck suggests that these implicitly or explicitly separate 'real' meaning

corporeal and 'artificial' meaning technological memory (p.15). Thus corporeal memory is internal, physiological and a human capacity and technological/media memory is formed of external tools to which part of human capacity is outsourced. Van Dijck suggests that media and memory are not separate entities and that media inherently shape our personal memories (p.16), noting that in the 20th century the terminology of film and video began to invade the discourse of memory and memory research (p.18). However, she points out the memory has been technologized from the printing press onwards (p.15) yet only the recent stages are called 'technologically mediated' (p. 15).

Van Dijck goes on to explore the importance of media which have 'integrated into the construction of memory' (p. xiv) and her discussion then focuses on media objects and especially digital objects. She suggests that these mediate relationships between individuals and groups, raising questions about identity in a specific culture at a certain moment in time (p. 1). An important question is how might our media tools mould our process of remembrance and how does remembrance affect the way we deploy media devices (p.2). If memory work involves a 'complex set of recursive activities that shape our inner worlds, reconciling past and present' (p.5), memory work also involves the production of objects to document and communicate what happened (p.5). Van Dijck gives examples of 'memory objects' such as family photographs, diaries or scrapbooks and includes home movies. She suggests these objects are 'first and foremost creative products' (p.7) but often 'prejudiced assessments characterize these genres as boring, predictable or bourgeois' (p.8). This links to the notion that amateur film and home movies have low value and status as I have explored elsewhere in my literature review. Van Dijck explores the possibility that personal cultural memory is generated by what we call 'home media' (p.18) which includes home movies whereas collective cultural memory is produced by mass media (p.18) including TV, photography and cinema. This, she suggests, is 'conceptually flawed' (p.18) as people derive autobiographical memories from both personal and collective media sources (p.18). She references Thompson (1995) who argues that lived experience in our contemporary culture is interlaced with mediated experience (p.19). Since the dissemination of personal memory is increasingly an online activity the boundaries between public

and private have become more diffuse (p.172). In the same vein that Zimmerman (2008) talks about 'an imaginary archive that is never completed', Van Dijck creates the image of the 'global, digital bazaar of documents, music and pictures' (p.172) including moving images.

LOCAL FILM AND BEYOND

Debates about the nature of the local and amateur film inform how archive film might play a role in public history and memory work as well as in audience/user participation as part of public engagement. Reviewing a range of literature it becomes apparent that writers use the descriptive terms 'archive', 'local' 'amateur' and 'home movie' fairly interchangeably and that necessary definitions are not always easy to access. Fox (2004) makes the point that a concrete definition of amateur film is hard to achieve with an emphasis placed on constructing a meaning of what 'amateur' is *not*- not sophisticated, not technically adept, not of popular interest (p.5). He also points out a negative approach to positioning amateur film, where it is defined perhaps most frequently, and most opaquely as 'not professional' (p.5).

Other writers have posited different definitions over time. In her writing on the social history of home movies, Zimmerman (1995) gives several definitions of amateur film and home movies for consideration. She defines 'amateur film' as a covering term for the complex power relations defining amateur film making and 'home movies' as a descriptive term for actual films produced by families(p. x). She also posits a political definition of amateur film which might locate it within its social relations to dominant cinematic practices, ideologies and economic structures (p. xii). Czach (2014) (in Rascaroli et al) while writing about amateur film as national cinema offers some useful definitions that inform thinking about archive film in general. Suggesting that the 1990s were a 'watershed for archivists and scholars in the discovery and appreciation of amateur films' (p. 27) she proposes a 'continuum of non-professional film production that traverses a spectrum from amateur film on one end to the home movie on the other' (p.30). Her definition of amateur film suggests it is 'aesthetically ambitious, carefully constructed, with identifiable genres, and potentially authored for

example by the use of title cards (p. 30). Home movies are defined as 'unedited with 'point and shoot' aesthetics, apparently genre-less, seemingly plot-less, and often difficult to attribute' (p.30). Czach suggests that amateur films have 'potential aesthetic significance' (p.30) and that home movies have 'potential cultural or historical significance' (p.30). The above definitions have aided an interrogation of the status of archive film. However the advent of new digital platforms and technologies of production may challenge and blur such definitions.

Of particular interest for my research is the lack of critical discourse and scholarly attention given to amateur and local film. This is noted by Shand (2014), Roberts (2010) and Christie (2015). Shand (2008) addresses this by first acknowledging that 'amateur cinema is a hugely under- theorized domain' (p. 56). He also suggests that there is a lack of clarity as to where study of amateur archive film might sit in critical discourse. Film theory, archive theory and practice, social science and memory studies are all possible areas but Shand argues that theoretical frameworks developed are 'insufficient to cover amateur film production as a whole' (p. 38), which may incorporate different modes of production as discussed by Czach(2014) above. Shand explores three possible perspectives for debate within these parameters.

The first of these is the 'domestic' or the 'non-professional' as explored by Chalfen (1987), with 'domestic' referring to films produced for consumption at least originally mainly in the home. Chalfen discusses this kind of amateur film making calling it 'the home mode' (p. 39). Since Chalfen is mainly interested in the communicative function of home photography he sees amateur film making similarly as a way of reinforcing pre-existing social relations, what Morner (2011) calls his view 'that home movies are intended to be shown to family and close friends to strengthen bonds' (p.39). Chalfen (1986) also suggests that what he calls 'native- generated images' (p.58) create a complex relationship between emotional involvement and media viewing (p.61). The range of expressive and emotional engagement is 'broader in the home mode than in other modes of professionally produced mass communication' (p.61). Chalfen writes within a social science convention which is

useful for analysis of amateur film in relation to questions of individual memory and dynamics of group process, but Shand (2008) suggests this ignores what he calls the 'community mode' (p.53) as amateur archive film making and viewing is not always located in a domestic context.

The second critical position is the mode of oppositional practice as explored by Zimmerman (1995). Zimmerman explores alternative film practice as a potential site of resistance where artistry can flourish and film makers can be free from the compromise of the mainstream. Zimmerman uses the examples of Maya Deren and Jonas Mekas, among others, who worked in the context of the avant-garde during the 1950s. These filmmakers were hostile to mainstream culture which they felt was degraded and 'the only alternative was to construct a 'purer' alternative film practice' (quoted from James 1992). Rascaroli et al (2014) also note that the practice of using private home movies in experimental film and video has resurfaced over the past few decades. Oppositional film makers such as Peter Forgacs and Joseph Morder have over four decades made documentaries and fiction films incorporating amateur footage (p.3). Fox (2004) uses the example of Forgacs as an artist who 'stands out in particular as someone whose works, to this point, are composed entirely of footage appropriated from private amateur collections' (p.11). Fox also suggests that Forgacs' use of archive amateur footage is unusual in that he consistently maintains the link between footage and its source, naming the amateurs behind the images through superimposed titles (p.12). Kilborn (2014) (in Rascaroli et al) notes Forgacs' quiet insistence on the importance of the private, the individual, the ordinary (p.8). This is a very different use of amateur film than that which Shand (2008) calls 'evidential purposes ' where films, their makers and participants are not named or contextualised (p.48).

The third critical position is what Shand (2008) calls 'evidential' (p.46) and is connected most strongly with the archive sector and the use of amateur and local film as evidential discourse. This was the most relevant for my research into modes of creative practice with archivists and audiences. Shand (2008) suggests that ongoing debates within the archive sector on the nature of local and amateur film have more energy and vitality than in some areas (p.46) and my studies add to that

debate. However one of the issues for amateur and local film within this discourse is that it can become, as Shand (2008) says 'a scientific tool for the recording of moving images and objects that will be of interest to the retrospective viewer in years to come' (p. 47.) This evidential function has led to amateur non-fiction film being privileged for preservation and access (p. 47). Archive film has also been used in recent years as illustrative or supplementary material for television, often in programmes concerned with reminiscence. Shand notes that 'films being used for apparently evidential purposes are not named or contextualised' (p. 48) leading to a use of moving image footage as 'moments' which take priority over the integrity of the film as an integrated whole (p. 48).

Shand (2008) notes that 'the aesthetic history of amateur cinema is now waiting to be written' (p.57) but he agrees with Cookson (1989) and Carroll (2000) that a way is needed to discover the correct categories for evaluating the film in question (p.57) and that the crux of what needs to be done with theorizing on amateur cinema is to 'use methods of analysis that are appropriate to the film under scrutiny' (p.57). This thinking was relevant to my interviews with archivists/practitioners as one area flagged up was how archive film might be evaluated. Although a film studies/theory perspective is not always a useful approach to amateur and local film, placing the actual film at the centre of discourse may enable a new critical perspective. Morner (2011) responds to Shand by suggesting other possible perspectives for debate within these parameters. She suggests that amateur film may be explored by historians, anthropologists and film scholars (p. 23). Historians may use amateur film to verify the past, anthropologists to understand human interaction and film scholars to explore private practices of visual technologies, as domestic visual culture is distinct from commercial media (p.23).

Malik, Chapain & Comunian (2014) also reference Shand (2008) and his assertion that 'community film making, as a field of enquiry, has been characterised by a lack of academic writing' (p.10) as part

of their project 'Spotlight on Community Filmmaking'[3]. This joint project of Brunel University, the University of Birmingham and King's College, London took place in 2013 and involved a wide variety of partner organisations including the British Film Institute (BFI) I and the Light House, Wolverhampton. The project aimed to integrate theory and empirical fieldwork to attempt to address the lack of scholarly attention given to amateur film. In a similar way, my research intended to address this lack by allowing archivists/practitioners to talk about their creative practice and by allowing audiences to interact with archive film in innovative ways.

The researchers adopted a 'complex and multidisciplinary framework with a wider perspective to consider the cascade of connections which are behind community filmmakers' engagement with communities, industries and supporting institutions (p.10). This echoes Shand (2008) in his assertion that the lack of clarity as to where study of amateur archive film might sit in critical discourse (p.38) necessitates a multi-disciplinary approach. Malik et al use five main thematic frameworks to interrogate amateur film, community filmmaking and cultural diversity. These frameworks are: identity and representation; film as media; film between arts and commercial practices; innovation, skills and networks; policy and place. Wisniewski (2007) defines archive film as 'non-theatrical films viewed in classrooms, churches, workplaces and community centres' (p. 4). He agrees with other scholars that these films are widely undocumented by historians and that assessing the value of this material requires 'a different theoretical approach – a reading of evidence against the grain' (p.5). This practice of reading historical documents through fragmentary traces has relevance for archive film but the fact remains that defining what is meant by archive film is particularly challenging.

Another connected area for exploration in the discourse around local and amateur film is the low value and status afforded to this material. Only one chapter of Brunsdon's 2007 monograph on London as a cinematic city is devoted to 'local London'. She defines 'local film' partly in the negative as 'ordinary, quotidian and unspectacular' (p.57), calling 'local London a duller and less special place'

---

[3] Malik, S., Chapain, C., & Comunian, R. (2014) *Spotlight on Community Filmmaking: a Report on Community Filmmaking and Cultural Diversity Research*. Brunel University, University of Birmingham and King's College, London

(p. 58) in comparison to the spectacle of landmark London as portrayed in cinema. She does note however that 'local London' shows us 'a village within a village' (p.60) and makes a case for 'how cinema can render the banality of everyday life tenderly' (p.83). Brunsdon does not discuss archive film in the sense of film material confined to the archive which is not readily in circulation, but her work fits into the discourse around the low value and status of local film.

Various writers have explored methodologies for studying and analysing this material, often in ways that compensate for what they perceive as low value and status. Shand (2014) puts emphasis on oral history, presentation and cataloguing, particularly seeing exhibition in terms of aiding contextualisation of the material. Roberts (2010), uses a selection of amateur local transport films of Liverpool from the 1930s to the 1970s to explore issues of place and identity. He tends to afford low status to amateur film, while recognising the contribution of amateur filmmakers who 'engage and respond to the perceptual, symbolic and material changes accompanying processes of urban renewal' (p.88). However he describes individual films as 'aesthetically offering little in the way of interest' (p.92) and 'mundane and prosaic' (p.92). This echoes the evidential discourse discussed earlier where local and amateur film is used as a historical tool while the material is seen as having little intrinsic aesthetic value. The approach taken here has been to exert pressure on the material in terms of textual and shot analysis and Roberts contends that by a 'critical insertion' (p.105) into a discourse of social geographies of mobility, these films can be useful despite the suggestion that from a contemporary perspective they might be dismissed as 'mere exercises in nostalgia' (p.105).

Morner (2011) foregrounds the use of ethnographic methods to interrogate amateur film, especially home movies. She suggests that interviewing makers of and participants in this material will 'compensate for the lack of both textual analysis and contextual analysis in this material' (p.24). Her other reasons for this position are that home movies consist of 'more or less incoherent shots and lack structure' (p.40) and that they 'deploy no systematic cinematic language' (p.28). Also that home movies lack 'paratexts that provide information about such aspects as who made the film, for what reasons and under what circumstances'(p.41) and that home movies lack reception information.

While some reception analysis is possible through paratexts (p.33), she nevertheless stresses the need for direct contact with the people involved in the material (p.33). She suggests that 'talking to people who are familiar with the historical context of the actual shots can result in more precise knowledge about how domestic visual cultures were constructed in past times'(p32). She tends to stress the negative aspects of amateur film for example, its 'poor technical and aesthetic quality' (p.23) and the need to constantly compensate for a lack of information and coherence. Since she is dealing with what she calls 'the predigital era' (p. 22), meaning films made prior to the arrival of new technological means of production and digital platforms, it might be surmised that the number of potential interviewees might be smaller than hoped, even assuming there would be a possibility of tracing the individuals involved.

Lury (2014) (in Rascaroli et al) suggests that amateur film can be analysed in terms of an anecdote/artefact dichotomy, where film footage is seen as 'a material object of history' (p. 109). Film as anecdote suggests the material has narrative and symbolic potency (p.110) and functions as a form of historical storytelling (p.110).Her definition of the anecdotal form references Grossman (2003) where anecdote means 'a structured narrative which epitomizes and confirms generally accepted views of the world' (p.167-8). This approach in some ways echoes Roberts (2010) in that defining the film as 'artefact' means it 'needs to be interrogated according to detail and visual evidence' (p. 113). Lury places emphasis on identifying and contextualizing the individuals and places captured in specific films. She also places emphasis on an analysis of amateur film employing 'forensics and scientific methodology' (p.120) that focuses on working 'up and out' from the material (p.120). This approach takes no account of public engagement with material but sees amateur film as an object of scientific study removed from publics.

Cuevas (2014) (in Rascaroli et al) focuses on home movies and amateur film as 'documents for a history of everyday life' (p.140) thus privileging the evidential. However he does suggest that home movies are more than just an interesting visual archive for historical accounts (p.140). This material can be a way to study 'history from below' (p.140) and he foregrounds the use of amateur film for

microhistorical approaches. Cuevas discusses documentary film makers who use amateur film to create 'quotidian episodes' (p.139) and 'collective portraits of a generation or a minority' (p.141). He references Gregory (1999) in defining microhistory as 'affirming the human decency of past men and women at every level of society but always within a specific concrete network of social relationships' (p.103). Cuevas sees home movies as a useful source for recycling in contemporary documentaries, providing a clear change of scale and offering new perspectives (p.150) but, as with other approaches to study of amateur and local film, there is little suggestion of direct engagement with audiences.

The value of local film is discussed by Szczelkun (2000) who suggests many of the images can be dismissed as having little value once they have left the localised context (p. 97). Similarly Bottomore (2004) (in Toulmin et al) says 'local film is only 'local' if there is considerable overlap between the people appearing in the film and those who watch it or are intended to watch it' (p.33). Bottomore states that 'until quite recently, locally produced films were scarcely discussed or even recognised in film history' (p. 33). He is optimistic that the rediscovery and conservation by the British Film Institute (BFI) of the Mitchell and Kenyon Collection will give this kind of material greater value. However since 2004, increasing financial constraints have made conservation and research into such material increasingly problematic.

Christie (2015) addresses the of issue of proximity, saying that while a sense of local may rest on an assumption that what is proximate is of greatest concern to most viewers in any specific locality, it is necessary to define what is meant by 'locality' in the first place (p.2). He defines two concepts of 'local' – one subjective (local to me/her) and the other bounded spatially (local shops/local community) which are prone to being elided (p.2). Christie explores his personal experience of working with archive film and audiences with the LSSC at Birkbeck College and at venues throughout London, noting the challenges raised by the apparent low status of local archive film. My own work with the LSSC over nine years also made me aware of certain challenges, one of which was how to make a disparate collection of local archive film of interest to wider audiences beyond the local

while addressing the demands of funders. This was also a challenge for my research particularly in terms of the audience studies. Beyond identification by local audiences of local landmarks, Christie asks how 'does a quintessentially local film strike any chord with 'foreign' audiences, either elsewhere in London or further afield?' (p.5).

Shand (2014)suggests that all three issues (lack of scholarly discourse, low status and proximity) as applied to local amateur footage may be because this material is seen as substandard, often having no synchronized sound and no corpus of contextual information available (p. 197). Shand (2014) makes a useful distinction here between amateur *films* 'crafted and edited works that often included either a soundtrack or intertitles' (p.202) and amateur *footage* which is fragmentary, often 'without explanatory intertitles or soundtrack' (p.202). He calls amateur archive footage, particularly non-fiction footage, 'an incomplete object' (p. 199) and suggests these films are 'opaque' (p.202), removed as they are from their original context. He quotes Orgeron (2006) to say a film like this is 'stripped of its aura, its temporal, geographical and personal specificity' (p.202). Archive film footage's materiality is such that it is fragmented and often associated with rusty cans or mildewed boxes and archivists and researchers have to engage in what is analogous to archaeology or detective work to find a context for such material. Czach (2014) (in Rascaroli et al) suggests that the 'orphaned home movie can be a stubbornly resistant text' (p.35). With little provenance, genre or narrative such film may be seen purely as a 'stray' (p. 36) resistant to being part of national film culture.

Thus the work of various writers/practitioners opens up a space to map locality by discussing ways of theorizing and working with archive film but engagement with publics has not been explored as much. I now move on to explore aspects of the relationship between amateur and professional film to elucidate further where amateur film might be located in critical discourses about film theory and practice. Rascaroli (2014) suggests that the 'boundary between amateur and professional has never been more porous' (p.12). This is doubtless partly due to the rise of the Internet and the accessibility of amateur film through platforms such as YouTube as well as greater access to appropriate

technology through the digital. I will first discuss debates around amateurism/professionalism in what Morner (2011) calls the 'pre-digital era' (p.23) then move on to look at some of the effects of the Internet and digital platforms on these debates.

Zimmerman (1995) wrote a major historical study of amateur film, charting the history of non-professional film from 1897 to the 1980s. This work looks specifically at the pre-video era and traces as Fox (2004) says 'the progressive de-politicization of amateur film technologies, a historical process of social control over representation' (p.6). Zimmerman suggests that the history of amateur film 'parallels, imitates, circumvents and occasionally disrupts traditional film history' (p. x). She believes that amateur film must first be 'retrieved from the garbage dump of film and cultural studies' (p.xv) so that its position in historical, technological, economic and cultural debates can be clarified. In the same vein she suggests that' to study amateur film, we need to detour from an 'analysis of textuality into the power relations of discursive contexts' (p.x) and to move away from a position where power relations marginalise amateur film as an 'insignificant media discourse and practice' (p.xv) . She also suggests that 'the deficit of historical study on amateur film underscores the power of 'professional' film studies' (p.x), an area for debate that continues to the present day.

In terms of the relationship between amateur and professional film, Zimmerman critiques Hirsch (1981) in her presumption that 'amateur filmmaking operates in a purified, ahistorical and aesthetic vacuum' (p.102) but instead suggests a symbiotic relationship between professionalism and amateurism (p.6) where one might represent work and the other freedom. Thus differences between professionalism and amateurism traverse the dichotomy between the public sphere and the role of experts as expounded by Habermas (1962) and the private sphere of home and personal life (p.2). Zimmerman describes the images produced by amateur film making as 'a confluence of an unstable intersection of family history, state iconography and consumer technology' (p. ix). In the pre-digital era the difference between professional and amateur film 'marks a social distance sustained through the specialization of technique' (p. 2). Amateurism may mean 'doing something

for love' so that work/free time are not locked into a binary opposition (p.1), but amateur film making was still wedged within the private sphere in the pre-digital era (p.5) where Zimmerman also suggests it operated as consumption (p.3). This is the case in terms of the marketing of technology for use in amateur film making especially home movies.

Zimmerman discusses how the 'do-it-yourself- movement' in the US in the 1950s meant upwardly mobile suburbanite families were able to lavish time and money on amateur film cameras (p. 117) and that the technology around 8mm film was assigned as best for amateur filmmaking in the home (p. 121). This was despite the 8mm manifesto of George Kuchar where he and other avant-garde filmmakers 'recast amateur technology as resistance' believing there would be an 'emergent film utopia' (p. xi) where 8mm footage would be appreciated as art, like songs and lyric poetry (p.xi). Zimmerman suggests this was overly optimistic (p.x) as does Fox (2004). Fox notes that in 1960, Mekas had written 'Films will be made everywhere and by everyone. The empires of professionalism and big budgets are crumbling' (p.9). Even with the advent of digital media, amateur film still has not entered the public sphere in the way envisaged by Mekas and others. In the 1950s the terms 'amateur film' and 'home movies' functioned as synonyms (p. 132) and Zimmerman notes that amateur film making of this kind was seen as simultaneously as an 'innocuous and frivolous hobby' (p. 121) and a 'cultural reservoir for liberal pluralist ideals of freedom' (p.5). It was however firmly located in the private sphere at this time. Conversely, professional film making with its codes of expertise such as narrative paradigms, capital-intensive production and market control was located firmly in the public sphere. Zimmerman argues that professional media was the public sphere of the 20th century, containing any possibility of a productive participatory public sphere in the Habermasian sense of the word.

Zimmerman and other writers such as Fox (2004) and Rascaroli et al (2014) explore alternative film practice as a potential site of resistance and as a space to explore amateur/professional boundaries. They use the examples among others of Maya Deren, Jonas Mekas and Stan Brakhage who worked

in the context of the avant-garde. Zimmerman suggests that within the discourse of cinema the terms 'avant-garde' and 'amateur' often collapse into each other with 'amateur' connoting creative freedom (p.129). To further explore these issues, I focus specifically on the writings of Maya Deren and Stan Brakhage. I first look at some literature about their writings, then at Deren's 1965 essay 'Amateur v. Professional' and at Brakhage's 1971 essay 'In defence of amateur'.

Zimmerman (1995) notes the differences between 'artistic amateurs and more frivolous hobbyists' (p.131) and suggests that only a few talented amateurs could join the ranks of 'true art filmmakers '(p.131). Responding to this, Rascaroli (2014) coins the phrase 'amateur auteur' (p.8) suggesting that both Deren and Brakhage were artists who used 'amateurism' as a way to have total control over their personal visions during the film making process. In her view the work of Deren and Brakhage, among others, 'throws into sharp relief the ambiguities and ideological implications of the distinction between the two figures and categories (p.231).This suggests there might be two categories of amateur, which was important for my research because of the nature of the film used throughout the project. This film material is not seen as consciously artistic and it is often not possible to know its provenance. Zimmerman (1995) agrees with Sitney (2002) that Deren was 'an apologist and propagandist for the avant garde '(p.40) and Zimmerman suggests that Deren viewed the amateur film maker as democratic (p. 129) and that this discourse on amateur film 'situated amateurism as a haven for pure art not sullied by market relations' (p.132). Zimmerman suggests that Deren and Brakhage 'appropriated' home movie style as a formal manifestation of a spontaneous, untampered form of filmmaking' (p.146).

Fox (2004) discusses both Deren and Brakhage, noting their 'power and importance' (p. 6) but also their use of amateur film technologies towards artistic and political aims at odds with some classifications of amateur film (p. 6). Fox also notes how both Deren and Brakhage both were to some extent anti-technology. Deren suggests that 'the human body is more miraculously versatile than any tripod' (p. 8). Fox also notes that Brakhage, in his film making sometimes went so far as to

obviate the requirement for a camera at all (p. 8). Deren (1965) suggests that a major obstacle for amateur filmmakers is their own sense of inferiority vis- a- vis professional productions (p.1). She feels the very classification 'amateur' has 'an apologetic ring' (p.1) but that amateur filmmakers should be aware that amateur also means doing something for 'love rather than economic necessity' (p.1). Deren, like other avant garde filmmakers, sees amateurism as a space for artistic freedom, enabling the creation of 'visual drama, poetry and beauty' (p.1). She also, as noted by Fox (2004) sometimes eschews even amateur technology as she suggests 'the most important part of your equipment is yourself: your mobile body, your imaginative mind and your freedom to use both' (p.2).

If, as Rascaroli (2014) suggests, there are two 'categories' of 'amateur', it is less easy to define what the other category might mean in terms of authorship and creativity. I now move on to examine some of the debates about the rise of the Internet and digital platforms which may impinge on amateur and local film. Although the archive film used in my project is not defined by the digital, the relationship between pre-digital archive film and the development of new technologies was an important area of discussion for my research. This was particularly relevant to the interviews as discussed in Chapter 4, where archivists and practitioners talked about their use of the Internet to obtain film material for their practice when other routes to access were more problematic.

Given the volume of writing on the Internet and media, for the purposes of this chapter I will focus on a small number of particularly relevant areas of concern linking the rise of digital platforms with amateur film. After an introduction to issues around the prosumer, amateur authorship, self-inscription and ideas about the meaning of 'home' in this context (Fox 2004, Jenkins 2008, Rascaroli 2014), I will consider home movies and amateur film in the digital age especially archival practices and issues for user-generated content as contrasted with archival issues for pre-digital archive film.

Rascaroli et al (2014) note a new interest in home movies among scholars and the public arising out of the development of digital platforms (p.1). This new concern is 'undoubtedly motivated and

shaped by a complex array of sociocultural and ideological developments' (p.1). Foremost among these she notes an upsurge in practices of self-inscription, self-representation and personal expression in the mass media and arts (p.1). Also a greater emphasis on microhistories and communal practices of memorialisation has opened up a space for fresh appraisal of the significance of amateur film and other mundane documents in retracing historical accounts from below (p.3). She also notes that the publication of certain key works on the archive and also on amateur film (Derrida 1995, Zimmerman, 1995, Ishizuka & Zimmerman, 2007) has helped develop a multi-disciplinary methodology for exploring amateur moving image material (p. 3) and to give the study of this material a legitimate place in film and cultural studies. However debates are still ongoing about the positioning of amateur film within scholarly discourse as I have discussed earlier.

Fox (writing in 2004) predicts that the new technological age will democratize the means of production and change the relationship between amateur and professional (p.13). The consumer will have access to digital tools never before available and this will change the nature of amateur filmmaking. Previously, he suggests, 'most families left their images unedited, silent and private' (p.14). Fox (2004) speculates as to how these distinctions may shift as what constitutes an 'act of media production' changes (p.14). Emergent technological advances will mean that media production is an inescapable part of daily life (p.14) rather than something practiced by professional elites. His predictions seem correct and platforms such as YouTube, Instagram and Vimeo now give almost unlimited opportunities for media production. Jenkins (2008) discusses the growth of convergence meaning here the flow of content across multiple media platforms and the migratory behaviour of media audiences (p.2). He maps the 'shifting roles between producers and consumers' (p.13) using the term 'participatory culture' to define a practice that contrasts with older notions of passive media spectatorship (p.3). Media producers and consumers will no longer occupy separate roles but instead will be 'participants' who interact together (p.3).

Following from Fox (2004) and Jenkins (2008) Rascaroli (2014) suggests that distinctions between amateur/professional and producer/consumer have blurred further as new technology has progressed over a decade. She suggests there is now a 'foregrounding of the self and a prominence accorded to subjectivity' which can be seen as markers of globalized culture and society (p.229). This 'pervasive autoethnographic urge' (p. 230) is facilitated by new digital technologies and platforms. Rascaroli (2014) thus places the prosumer at the centre of contemporary audio-visual communication (p.2), with prosumer in this context meaning someone who both produces and consumes media. If digital platforms facilitate authorial expression and self -expression for amateurs, then Rascaroli (2014) goes on to question what 'self' is becoming represented through new digital artistic forms and media (p. 230) and how this may impinge on issues of identity. She suggests that a screen-saturated environment has led to growing mediation, fragmentation and derealisation of experience (p.232). In terms of self-representation, digital technologies of the self may be 'narcissistic, fragmented and unstable' (p.232).

Fox (2004) foregrounds the 'private' nature of pre-digital amateur filmmaking especially home movies, but Rascaroli (2014) suggests the Internet and digital platforms have led to forms of authorship that are 'shared, multiple, at times anonymous and not temporally delimited or geographically anchored' (p.236). Miller (2014) similarly suggests that encounters with media in a digital age are 'personal, portable and public' (p.211) and that such encounters will also be 'shared and quite separate from the body' (p.211). In terms of amateur film and filmmaking, the notion of an authorial voice seems possible in ways not available in the pre-digital era, since as Rascaroli suggests, today's amateur has access to quasi-professional tools and channels of distribution and self-promotion that were once inaccessible (p.242).

Earlier in this chapter I discussed Stan Brakhage (2001) and his writing about the meaning of home suggesting that an amateur is 'at home' anywhere he works (p. 144). However in a digital age, the meaning of home has shifted. Rascaroli (2014) suggests that the advent of digital cameras, cell

phones and tablets means that 'home is now in one's pocket' (p.231), leading to a transformation of skills as above and a new attitude to self-representation (p.231). This definition of home is very different from the 'home mode' of amateur filmmaking as defined by Chalfen (1987). The mobility and portability of digital media, especially smartphones and tablets, challenges what is meant by home-made. Miller (2014) focuses on smartphones suggesting they 'engage deeply personal and emotional social interaction and self-identity' (p.211). At the same time the smartphone is 'an instrument to negotiate daily life enabling the capacity to engage with the larger multimedia networked world' (p.211). Miller calls the smartphone an object with a 'double-sided nature' (p.214) mediating between the subjective and objective worlds (p. 214). The everyday life of a smartphone user is a 'mixed reality' (p.213) combining an intermingling of personal media and media ecologies (p.213).

Miller (2014) references Morley (1986) who observed that watching television in a 'pre-digital' context was the opportunity for family members to sit together (p.213), especially as TV sets were fundamentally immobile. This could also apply to pre-digital era home movies in that families could gather to view this essentially private footage, using technology that was immobile. Amateur film also had a community function as organizations and local boroughs recorded their activities on film. Audiences would tend to be localised according to their engagement with the material, though this is an area for debate. Both Miller (2014) and Rascaroli (2014) argue that the portability and connectivity of digital media foreground the individual and the prosumer. Aasman (2014) also suggests that sharing online means that families can watch footage without being in the same room together and view images simultaneously while being physically apart (p.253).The idea of a 'home mode' may still exist but has a different definition where families and groups are scattered geographically. Rascaroli (2014) has noted that the effect of digital platforms on 'filmic authorship, self-fashioning and self-representation' (p.230) and the complex relationships between the individual, the group, the family and wider connectivities is still largely uncharted, as digital platforms transform at a rapid pace.

Aasman (2014) focuses on home movies for her exploration of archival practices and issues for user-generated material. She notes that in the pre-digital era the home movie was a private archival practice, part of a domestic ideology, celebrating family life by building a 'family archive' (p.250). Archiving amateur film as a public record had no formal beginning and she suggests that because film was not a traditional text, archivists were slow to collect and save it (p.248). However by the mid-1990s there was a growing appreciation of home movies as archival documents, though archives had to be willing to collect what she describes as 'intimate images' which might not directly represent public events historically (p.250). She references both Derrida (1995) who declared the importance of archives for the future and also Cook (2001) who posited a post-modern paradigm of archival practice in which archives serve society rather than the other way round and where documents are active agents (Cook 2001 p.10). Aasman suggests that at the end of the 20th century, home movies became 'a rich treasure ground. Local regional and national audiovisual archives began to save this material' (p.245). While amateur film and home movies have relatively recently acquired value and material quality (p.251) as historical documents, they also have what Aasman describes as 'artefact value' (p. 251) where the materiality of film especially celluloid (scratches, faded colour) produces a kind of historical valorisation and authenticity (p.251) in its representation of the past.

However, Aasman suggests that in terms of the digital, film must be regarded as a practice not an object since materiality is changed by the advent of the digital. If as Zimmerman (2007) suggests 'home movie making is a multiplication of practices, technologies, discourses and representations' (p.275), the rise of the Internet and digital platforms creates the need to query traditional archival practice and discourse. With this in mind, Aasman poses various questions relevant to an era where the omnipresence of new technology and the rise of social media have changed personal communication so radically (p.252).She suggests the need for a 'more plural concept' (p. 253) of domestic media technologies and recognition that new digital actions (peer-to peer, one-to-many, diffused connections) may produce home movies in a new way. She renames home movies 'digital memories' (p.253) and interrogates how these 'dynamic artifacts' (p.254) can be archived, given

they are networked, collaborative, contain multiple voices and are collective and unfinished (p.254). Her conclusions point to a need for new archival paradigms as archives are no longer stable institutions and in the future, the emphasis may be on immateriality, instability, fluidity, lack of hierarchy and plurality (p.255). The plethora of user-generated content may create a situation where every community and every individual could become an archivist, with the effect that there may in the end be too many records and too much memory (p.255). However archival preservation has always been about selection, sampling and mediation. As Rascaroli (2014) suggests, these complexities still remain to be explored so no definitive conclusion can be reached.

I now move on to consider some relevant issues around YouTube in more detail. I have focussed on YouTube for discussion as opposed to other video sharing platforms as my work as a practitioner involved setting up YouTube channels to showcase pre-digital archive film and several interview respondents talked about their use of YouTube to access film material for their practice.

In discussing archiving of user-generated content Aasman (2014) suggests that YouTube can be seen as an 'archive' for the home movies produced on this platform. She also suggests that in the public mind, YouTube functions in this way (p.254) though this may not necessarily be true for all users. In her detailed examination of YouTube, Berliner (2014) notes that since the emergence of this platform in 2005, what she describes as 'funny home movie clips' (p.290) have become among the most watched content on the site. Berliner (2014) suggests three factors which may be relevant (p.290). The first is that this material content is easy to upload and circulate without challenge and this accessibility was a crucial factor particularly for practitioners. Secondly, YouTube illuminates a shift in the mode of production. Pre-digital home movies were produced to be viewed by 'invested spectators within a delimited sphere' (p.291) while YouTube creates a negotiation between discrete social worlds on one hand and a potential world-wide mass audience (p.291). Thirdly, this content has social capital, but also monetary reward, which, Berliner argues, may reinforce commodification

of everyday life incidents (p.291). It is also possible to see a breaking down of boundaries between home movie production and commercial production.

Berliner then goes on to interrogate other aspects of YouTube especially what she describes as a lack of diversity of content, with videos of children, pets and humorous incidents being dominant (p.295). She also suggests that YouTube content may be of poor quality though this is not necessarily commensurate with its popularity. Most YouTube representations share generic conventions that reinforce a 'happy family' ethos and also reinforce particular modes of practice amongst those seeking to monetize (p.297). These modes of practice reflect Google's business model which demands content that is 'suitable for everyone' and tightly polices copyright (p. 293). 'Successful' videos often have a total running time of under two minutes, thus isolating 'monetizable moments' (p.298). Finally, Berliner references Van Dijck (2007) who suggests that the combined presence of camcorders, webcams and digital file sharing platforms means that people have access to images of other people's families (p.296). Berliner argues that this has created an 'oppositional home mode' (p.296) which differs from that of pre-digital amateur film. The audience for YouTube home movies may be one viewer or a global multitude but Berliner suggests that one result of YouTube's modes of practice is that individuals are empowered to undercut normative notions of domesticity and privacy (p. 296). Berliner argues that the potential of YouTube to bring about celebrity and forms of social and monetary capital will influence the moment being recorded (p.298). These recordings of 'private moments' for a potential global audience stand in contrast to 'private moments' in pre-digital home movies.

THE CINEMATIC CITY

This section of the literature review about the cinema and the city looks at of some of the literature extant on this wide ranging topic, with particular consideration as to the positioning of my research on archive film and urban public history and memory. I begin by looking at aspects of early cinema and the city as discussed by Christie (1994) and Gunning (2004) and how this history may relate to

local archive film. I then look at some discourses around the city and spatial representation and the relationship between place and identity. Linked to this theme, I briefly explore some relevant discourses on modernity and post-modernity, the growth of the 'masses' and effects on film and place. I then explore two cities more specifically, first looking at the work of Hallam (2012) arising from the 'Mapping the City in Film' project based in Liverpool before moving on to examine in more detail ideas around London as a cinematic city.

London is the case study city for my research and I will focus on two areas of concern for London as a cinematic city. One is the idea of 'landmark London' as expounded by Brunsdon (2007) which has relevance for archive film where 'landmarks' are often present in amateur and local film. A second area is a brief exploration of the influence of documentary and the British Documentary Movement on representations of London. This again has relevance for London archive film where most footage is non-fiction and often documentary in nature. I have previously explored the lack of critical discourse and scholarly attention given to amateur and local film. This is particularly noted by Shand (2014), Roberts (2010) and Christie (2015). Shand (2008) addresses this by first acknowledging that 'amateur cinema is a hugely under- theorized domain' (p. 56). He also suggests that there is a lack of clarity as to where study of amateur archive film might sit in critical discourse. For the purposes of this section of the literature review I intend to make film history a major focus of discussion. Brunsdon (2007) references Ogborn (2005) in discussing the difference between 'representations' (images of the city) and 'metaphor' (the city as text) (p.6). Brunsdon follows this by suggesting that in the cinematic city 'images and spaces' are the analytic concern (p.7) and this can apply equally well to local archive film as to mainstream cinema though Brunsdon's concerns do not directly include archive film in the sense of film material confined to the archive which is not readily in circulation.

Film historians use the example of the Mitchell and Kenyon Collection to discuss early local film. In Chapter 3 I have written about the discovery and acquisition of this material and its importance for

the film archive sector. The collection has been preserved by the British Film Institute and various film historians including Gunning have written about this filmic record of everyday life. The 'factory gate' films he analyses began as a genre of early cinema when the Lumiere brothers shot three films of workers leaving their factories in 1895. This genre evolved further and Mitchell and Kenyon made many such films in the industrial north of England. These films relied on a close relation between exhibition and production, where film showings could be adapted to local audiences (Gunning 2004 p. 52). Bottomore (2004), in discussing the Mitchell and Kenyon Collection notes that 'local film making began very early' (p.33) and that some early films of the Lumiere brothers were shot in local communities sometimes at the request of local people (p.33). Thus it seems at this early stage there was not such a clear division between 'local' and other types of film since in the early 1900s most films could be said to be effectively 'local'.

Cinema and the growth of the city are also linked with the growth of the masses here meaning the public or the common people. Walter Benjamin, writing in 1935, argued that the growth of the masses produced a change in the mode of participation (p.232). He argued that the mechanical reproduction of art changed the reaction of the masses towards art. This was partly because 'the mass is a matrix from which all traditional behaviour toward works of art issues today in a new form' (p.232) but also because the reproducible nature of modern art, and this includes film, destroys 'aura' and authenticity. Robinson (2013) writing on Benjamin, describes 'aura' as a magical or supernatural force arising from the uniqueness of a work of art (p.1). He notes that Benjamin believed the masses contributed to the loss of aura by seeking constantly to bring things closer, creating reproducible realities and destroying uniqueness (p.1). Robinson moves on to consider what he calls collective responses to art in the 20th century in the light of Benjamin's writing (p.2) suggesting that in film 'the individual reaction is produced or compounded by the reaction of the entire audience' (p.2). In his discussion of Benjamin and film, Robinson also looks at new forms of media in the 20th century such as reality TV, Facebook and YouTube and he includes home videos. He suggests that such media turn people into 'film actors' and the divisions between author and public

disappear (p. 4). Thus art can be disconnected from its past uses and brought into new combinations by the reader/author (p.2). However in terms of local archive film, questions may be raised about authenticity and reproducibility. There is the possibility that there may only be one copy of a piece of film in existence with limited means of reproduction due to the original format of the material. With some archive material, provenance and intellectual property rights are unclear which will affect access and audience engagement.

Gunning (2004) suggests that cinema, a dominant mass medium in its first decades, can be seen as a potentially transforming force through its relation between the medium of moving pictures and the masses/working class (p.50). Here 'cinema' can be defined as a medium requiring an audience and 'film' as the materiality of that medium, which in the case of early cinema is nitrate or celluloid. The masses were seen in the early 20th century as a 'many headed mob' but also as a 'positive or potentially positive force' (p.49). The masses here can also be revealed as both the audience and the subject of representation (p.50) and Gunning further explores the portrayal of this group through art and literature with the growth of the naturalist novel and Impressionist and Futurist painting. However it is cinema that can best represent the life of the masses in urban space. Gunning quotes from Lumiere who stated that 'the cinematic apparatus can represent the movement of the streets, of public places, with astonishing fidelity' (p.50). Gunning's assertion that the Mitchell and Kenyon factory gate films 'involve a unique perspective in being films of the working class filmed primarily to be seen by the working class' (p.50) can be applied to local and archive film in general, especially in terms of what he calls 'the melding of the idea of reception with production' (p.52) .These films were intended to be seen by those who appeared in them (p.52) and Gunning suggests that early cinema, as well as beginning to display an international consciousness, also marked the era of local cinema (p.52) in the making of films that were intended to be seen by those who appeared in them and where viewer and film share a dialogic relation (p.53).

Gunning (2004) has called early cinema a cinema of attractions (p. 53) and he is clear that the films he analyses provide 'a pleasure that is certainly both aesthetic and filled with information' (p.53). He

stresses aesthetic value suggesting these films 'address us directly in their humanity and spontaneity, and beauty' (p.53) and that they are 'invaluable works of art as well as documents of history' (p.53). Such films are also 'fragments of history, containing the contingencies of the everyday' (p.53). Only a few years after Gunning made these observations, Roberts (2010), Brunsdon (2007) and Morner (2011) afford low status to local amateur film and are concerned with ways of engaging with this material apart from as aesthetically valuable. Such debates are ongoing but there remain links between early cinema and what it now called local archive film in terms of audience and proximity. My research focussed on the everyday and how local audiences respond to local film and I found that audience responses generally focussed on the 'fragments of history' aspect as I analyse in detail in Chapter 6.

I will now look at some discourses around cinema, the city and spatial representation and the relationship between place and identity. I will move from a general discussion to a specific focus on cinema. Massey (1994) in 'Space, Place and Gender' explores the development of ideas about the social nature of space and place. She asks what definitions of 'local', 'place' and 'community' can be identified and explores the idea of 'time-space compression' (p.146), asserting that 'space, place and postmodern times emphasises a new phase in the annihilation of space by time' (p.146). Debates on locality are affected, Massey argues, by the fact we are living through a period of immense spatial upheaval (p.157) caused by globalization and new technology with a 'disruption of horizons' (p.121). The resulting time-space compression (as characterized by speeding-up and the global village) means that debates about concepts such as place, locality and identity exist against a backdrop of dislocation, fragmentation and disorientation (p.157). Massey argues that any exploration of time-space compression must look at who controls and experiences this phenomenon. She suggests that those with power and influence control it but two other groups are affected by it. These are those on the receiving end of the effects of globalisation and those who do a lot of physical moving in space such as refugees and migrants and notes that these groups are not in control.

Massey challenges the philosophical arguments of scholars such as Bachelard (1964) who posited that whereas Time connotes Becoming assumed in modernist terms to be progressive then Space connotes Being implying stasis and fixity. She suggests that these ideas have less importance in an era of spatial upheaval (p.136). Massey notes the political, social and economic changes beginning the UK in the late 1960s which led in the 1980s to the growth of locality studies (p.153). These changes included the decline of industry, geographical restructuring, decentralisation of population and an increase in unemployment. In terms of urban areas, the economies of big manufacturing cities went into severe decline in the 1980s. In the light of these changes, Massey seeks to define issues of place, identity and identification of place with community (p.153). Localities are not just about physical buildings but 'the intersection of social activities and social relations which are dynamic and changing' (p.136). A sense of locality is needed for identity formation. Both Massey (1994) and de Certeau (1984) further elucidate what might enable this identification of place by discussion of what de Certeau names as 'pedestrian rhetoric' (p. 163). His definition of 'local' is bound up in his description of the 'voyeur' walking the streets of Paris, where the 'ordinary practitioners of the city live 'down below'-they walk' (p. 158). He goes on to suggest that 'by walking, wandering and window shopping' (p.161) pedestrians actualize their locality and also turn that locality into something else, creating new spaces.

Massey's mapping of a walk down Kilburn High Road in North London has connections to my research in the suburbs and on the borders of London. She suggests that this particular suburb of London, while having a character of its own has no seamless coherent identity, a single sense of place which everyone shares (p.153). Instead, people map their own routes through this locality, occupying different positions within the community. This community therefore does not have a single unique identity or boundaries but as Massey says 'places are not so much bounded areas as open and porous networks of social relations' (p.121) and that 'places have multiple identities' (p.154). Massey (1994) suggests four considerations that are helpful in developing a progressive concept of place. Firstly, such a concept cannot be static since social interactions are not motionless

but are processes, which means place is a process as well (p.155). Secondly, places do not have to have boundaries in the sense of divisions that frame enclosures. Boundaries can be imaginary. Thirdly, places do not have unique identities but are full of internal conflicts (p.155). She uses the example of London's Docklands here which has been the subject of conflict over its past and heritage, its present development and what could be its future. Finally, the specificity of place derives from the fact that each place is a focus of a mixture of wider and more local social relations (p.155).

Massey (2004) further explores the relationship between identity and place, suggesting that identities are 'not rooted and static but mutable ongoing productions' (p.1). She references Tilley (1994) to suggest that personal and cultural identity is bound up with place (p.5) and that this can be true for both individuals and cultures. Massey places the local as a seat of genuine meaning for identity formation noting the idea that in Western societies a 'hegemonic geography of responsibility' (p.9) takes the form of a nested set of Russian dolls , with 'home' first, followed by place/locality, then nation (p.9). Massey suggests that identity is 'utterly territorial and proceeds outward from the small and near at hand' (p.9). My audience studies were concerned with how audiences formulate their collective and personal identities through a sense of place.

Moving on to look at how cinema, space and place might be positioned within this discourse, Odin (2015) suggests that 'seeing a film is so frequently like visiting a city' (p.75) and that the birth of the cinema was contemporary with the urban revolution (p.71). Odin (2015) writing about the city and film notes that to 'travel around a city is always to some degree to invent it' (p.71). Odin suggests that seeing a film (or visiting a city) require the viewer/visitor to 'produce a world and a diegesis and to function as enunciators who build this world from the signs provided' (p.71). He expands on this link between the city and film to suggest 'watching a film, like visiting a city, falls within the realm of discourse and most often of narrative' (p. 72) and that 'visiting a city has always meant making up one's own cinema' (p.75). He uses the example of Berlin, where he suggests there are a series of

spaces including the Berlin Jewish Museum and the Holocaust memorial 'Fields of Memory' that have the explicit function of 'dislodging me from my position as visitor/spectator and forcing me to adopt the point of view of a Berliner and more generally of a German' (p. 74). He suggests that Berlin 'uses a subjective camera and identification' (p.74) in order to create this effect. Odin also notes that more and more the city is apprehended through the screen of the video camera held by the visitor (p.76) making a useful link between the city, the cinema and the home movie. He calls the camcorder 'the go-between, the indispensable catalyst without which the city cannot be seen' (p.76) and that the camcorder transforms public space into private images (p.76). It is now possible, he suggests, to wander a city vicariously through portable media.

Similarly Shiel & Fitzmaurice in their introduction to *Screening the City* (2003) make explicit the close links between cinema and the city. They suggest that the cinema-city relationship is a two way process (p.1) and that 'cinema impacts upon the formation of cities, both physically and as cultural constructs' (p. 1). The city has also impacted upon cinema 'providing a dynamic space of representational interest (p.1). Siegel (in Shiel & Fitzmaurice2003) discusses representation of urban space, suggesting that in the 20th century the cinema, as a site of spectatorship and medium for entertainment, became a primary means for representing the realities of urban life (p.137). However Siegel suggests it would be 'erroneous to talk of the city as a singular unified social reality' (p.143). More appropriate are images of a multi-faceted city that represents ideological concepts, economic forces and social spaces' (p.143). Siegel also notes that social space is both the filmic representation of urban reality and the site (arena) within which the cinematic spectacle takes place –the home, the movie theatre or the cineplex (p.144).

Gunning (2004) also suggests that the 20th century was the 'century of new hierarchies of space and time' and that cinema became a dominant mass medium with physical, psychological and social effects (p.49). Mennel (2008) in a discussion on urban and cinematic space and temporality suggests that 'analysis of both film and the city involve the coordinates of space and time' (p.15). Spatial

categories of analysis change throughout history and Mennel suggests that 'films cinematically construct space to mark social class and cultural developments' (p.15). Shiel (in Shiel and Fitzmaurice 2003) focuses primarily on Hollywood cinematic representations of the city over a thirty year period. He asserts that 'cinema exists as a part of a lived social reality or a whole social process' (p.161).

I now move on to explore a number of relevant discourses on modernity and post-modernity and effects on film and place. Mennel (2008) references John Rennie Short (2006) who suggests that 'modernity, capitalism and postmodernity' link the study of film and the study of cities (Short 2006 p.2-3). In his discussion of modernity and the city, Clarke (1997) stresses the central role of urbanization in shaping the historical transition to a modern form of social living (p.3). Clarke also states that the city has been undeniably been impacted on by the cinematic form and that the historical development of the city also has helped shape the growth and nature of cinema (p.2). Clarke suggests that in pre-modern society 'social and physical spaces formed an intimately related, lived totality' (p.4). Modernity brought about a 'thoroughly abstract space (p.4) where time and space were no longer 'stable, solid and foundational' (p.4). Clarke references Baudrillard (1988) in discussion of cinema and modernity and in the recognition that 'cinema has a complex relation with the real' (p.3). Baudrillard's conceptualization of the 'cityscape as screenscape' (Baudrillard 1988 p.56) informs Clarke's writing on the cinema and postmodernity. Clarke suggests that one of the transformations of modernity is that vision became the 'master sense of the modern era' (p. 7). Clarke raises questions around reproduction, representation and realism. He notes debates between realists such as Bazin (1967, 1971) who celebrated cinema's power of realism over and above other art forms and formalists such as Balazs (1952) and Eisenstein (1963) who perceived cinema's ability to transcend the real (p.7).

Orr (in Shiel & Fitzmaurice, 2003) in his discussion of cinema and the city at the turn of the 21st century suggests that 'the concept of the cinematic city suggests for us an objective material world, the narrative or documentary framed against the *agora* of human densities (p.284). He argues that

the designed world of the cinematic city refracts the designed world of the living city (p.284). Thus the cinematic city always imitates urban life. Echoing Massey (1994, 2004) Orr suggests that city dwellers create their own life-worlds within a city as well as living in a world planned for them by designers, builders and architects (p.285). Orr suggests that the cinematic city on film is undergoing a revival in the late 20th/early 21st century (p.286) and looks at various representative cities and films which he suggests create the *fabula* of the cinematic city. In terms of London, Orr particularly notes the films of Leigh, Loach and Oldman, where London is portrayed as a 'spatially disconnected' (p.287) city which is a 'homeless place' (p.295). He notes that the cinematic city can also create 'a clichéd sign-posting of the postmodern as a pure site of pastiche or nostalgia' (p.287).This has relevance particularly for the uses of archive film which has often been used for nostalgic and reminiscence purposes, especially in audience engagement.

In considering how a particular location might illuminate debates about the cinematic city in general Hallam (2012) focuses on the 'Mapping the City in Film' project which examined the relationship between film, architecture and urban space in Liverpool (p.37)[4]. Hallam suggests that films made in and about cities offer a rich source of material for investigating projections of civic identity and citizenship and their relationship to the changing urban imaginary of the 20th century (p.37). This project focused on factual productions such as actualities, travelogues, newsreels and amateur film to enable an in-depth analysis of the city of Liverpool and the wider area of Merseyside. Hallam suggests such analysis will develop a 'socially and spatially embedded reading of the archive city' (p.38) referencing Roberts and Koeck (2007). Hallam notes that Liverpool is not 'in conventional academic understandings of the term a cinematic city' (p.38) yet feature films have been made in and about the city since the early days of cinema (p.38).Unlike the archetypical 'cinematic cities' of London, Berlin, New York and Los Angeles, Liverpool has not been the subject of intense studies of its cinematic fictions. Yet Hallam argues that a provincial city such as Liverpool offers 'an exemplary range of iconic sites and environments' (p.39) for analysis in terms of spatial function and use.

---

[4] http://www.liverpool.ac.uk/cava

'Mapping the City in Film' took as its particular concern an exploration of how various forms of place-making activity are projected at particular times by different cultures of film production. By the use of GIS (geographical information systems software) in partnership with traditional film analysis, an affective architecture of place can be mapped (p.37). This concern with the 'extra-diegetic spaces and histories that have informed the city's geographies (p.38) connects with my research into local film which maps the borders and hinterlands of London. My affective architecture of place was explored through audience voices rather than software.

I will now explore in more detail some relevant discourses on London as a cinematic city. Brunsdon (2007) suggests that London tends not to fare well in discussions of the cinematic city, as Paris, Berlin and Los Angeles are more readily proposed (p. 16). This is, she suggests, because London resists definition and there are a multiplicity of representations of London, meaning here that 'cinematic Londons are only one contribution to the myriad histories and textualities of the city' (p.5). She argues that London has a 'strong metaphoric and metonymic presence in the cinema' where it stands variously for England, Britain, the British Empire and the government (p.13).However no one system of classification or approach to London as a cinematic city is adequate (p.14). This is because London in the cinema is 'interesting in different ways, in different films at different historical moments. It cannot be unified' (p. 14). The city can be background, character and subject cinematically (p.8). One of Brunsdon's main themes in her monograph on London in cinema is the spectacle of 'landmark' London as portrayed in cinema, here meaning familiar images of a specific London known to the audience. She calls this the 'shorthand iconography of location' (p.21). 'When a film shows Big Ben, the Houses of Parliament, Piccadilly Circus, red buses and black taxis, you know you are in London' (p.21).

Brunsdon suggests that landmarks of capital cities carry complex and sometimes contested meanings (p.21) and her discourse on landmark imagery suggests that there are different cinematic ways of deploying landmark iconography (p.22). One is the 'landmark montage' which often functions as an establishing shot sequence at the beginning of a film (p.22). Here shots of key

landmarks are inserted into the space and time of the film's narrative (p.22). These montages raise issues about the historical city in time as well as questions about cinematic space and location (p.37).Another way of using landmarks is the creation of 'this is London' sequences in films (p.24) with iconic imagery such as the red London bus, the London fog, the River Thames. By using recognisable images a film refers to the urban imaginary of a specific city but also may contribute to that imaginary (p.21). Brunsdon argues that 'all films that claim London as their setting must engage with a hegemonic discourse of location' (p.23). These images may be clichéd and Brunsdon does suggest that some films eschew landmark London in order to 'make a realist claim to show an authentic London' (p. 24). One example she suggests is *Night and the City* (Dassin, 1950) which shows a 'complex presentation of a doubled London' (p.24) where London landmarks are the superficial attractions of a much grubbier underworld (p.24). Brunsdon suggest this film is unusually generically both *film noir* and British realist (p.24). One issue for my research on the peripheries of London was the positioning of local archive film within this type of discourse on landmark iconography. If cinematic London is magical and spectacular, then Brunsdon suggests that 'local London' and therefore archive film about this specific London may be prosaic and dull by comparison. Brunsdon suggests 'Local London is partly defined in the negative: it is not landmark London. Instead of the exceptional, local London offers the ordinary and quotidian' (p.57). Many local amateur films feature images of London landmarks but these images do not appear to have the iconographical power that they may have in mainstream cinema and may be incidental to the prosaic and every day.

McArthur (in Clarke 1997) focusses his main discussion in 'tracking the elusive cinematic city' (p. 19) on the USA and Hollywood, particularly engaging with a structural opposition (p.23) between city and country. However he does make some relevant comments on what he describes as the 'London discourse' in cinema particularly in terms of the influence of documentary, ideas of realism and the place of landmarks within this. McArthur references Sutcliffe (1984) who had suggested that a new cinematic discourse relating to London emerged through the British Documentary Movement of the

1930s who made propaganda films about World War 2. The orientation of this new London discourse is signified by one particular film *London* Can *Take It* (Jennings,1940) which 'mobilises particular London landmarks such as St Paul's and uses Vaughan Williams' *London Symphony* to create a narrative about a proud city enduring under the bombardment of the Luftwaffe' (p. 35). He also references Petley (1978) in a description of the work of Humphrey Jennings which is described as a 'curious melding of Surrealism and Englishness' (p.35). The 'fog-ridden London images' (p.35) of the war time documentaries influenced post-war London based films such as *Waterloo Road* (1945) and *The Blue Lamp*(1950). Mc Arthur (1997) goes on to suggest that this discourse mutated in the post-war period to the making of more diverse films dealing with post-war planning and tourism and then later into the 'all-pervading discourse of 'Swinging London' best signalled in Antonioni's *Blow-Up* (1966).

In Britain the mainstream documentary movement neglected the city until the 1930s (Clarke 1997, p.62) when John Grierson gave impetus to a movement that produced more than 1000 films between 1929 and 1952. Grierson emphasised 'public service' and the documentary film as having 'didactic functions', having spent his formative years in the USA where he was impressed with cinema's power to reach mass audiences (p.63). Gold & Ward (in Clarke 1997) continue to discuss the documentary tradition and its links to the city and film and London in particular. Their focus is on the years 1935-1952 and the films made before and just after WW2 to illuminate issues around housing and town planning. London was the subject of many of these films. Gold & Ward (1997) note that as early as the 1920s films made in Berlin and Hollywood started to reflect intellectual hostility to the city, with cities seen as 'enclosed, overcrowded, noisy and tense' (p.61). Documentary films sought to present the truth about the real world and the city, but not to passively mirror it. Gold and Ward reference Aitken (1990) who suggests that Grierson believed the truth was an interpretation or perception that would be revealed only when the film maker had arranged the subject matter into a suitable form (Aitken 1990 p.7) . Documentarists followed the ideological leads provided by Grierson stressing aesthetics and sociological purpose to highlight social and economic

conditions of the 1930s and 1940s. A particular focus was housing with films such as *Housing Problems (*Anstey and Elton, 1935), *Housing Progress* (Nathan, 1938) and *New Worlds for Old* (Rotha, 1938) charting the decrepit state of slum housing and chronicling the progress of clearance schemes (Gold & Ward, 1997 p. 65). *Housing Progress in* particular focuses on London and the growth of suburban dormitory estates.

After World War 2, the focus for many documentaries was reconstruction and Gold & Ward note four strategies for filmic representations of town planning. These ideas connected particularly to the New Towns audience study since these towns were visions of post-war reconstruction and planning. The first strategy is what they describe as 'science and rationality' (p.66) which stressed rational philosophy and the socially redeeming virtues of science and technology in addressing the problems of cities. *The City* (Calvalcanti, 1939) is an analysis of London's housing problems and radical proposals for improvement. Themes from this were taken forward after World War2 in films such as *Proud City* (Keene, 1945) which provides the most consistent cinematic discourse on planning as applied science. A second strategy is what Gold & Ward call 'social medicine' where town planning is seen as social medicine with a preoccupation with physical health and sanitation (p.69). Some of these films have 'powerful images of vermin and fungus growing on damp infested walls' (p.69) and show scenes of urban and industrial life with images of pollution, dirt and grime and poor housing, testifying to the impoverishment of life for the urban masses (p.69). Gold & Ward suggest the influence of King Vidor's silent Hollywood classic *The Crowd* (1928) in the making of these films, particularly in terms of lengthy scenes of jostling crowds and traffic chaos which indicate the triumph of the machine over human life. These scenes are juxtaposed with images showing how technology and planning can restore the health of urban communities (p.70).

A third strategy is 'the pursuit of vision' (p. 70) where radical schemes for how cities, including London, might be improved are explored in films like Rotha's *Land of Promise* (1946). Film becomes 'a powerful vehicle in the popular articulation of this vision' (p.71) which harks back to earlier visions as far back as Sir Christopher Wren of a London 'of broad sunlit avenues, well-placed monuments

and public buildings'(p.70). Rotha's film develops into a discourse on the benefits of a planned society (p.71) showing homes 'as they were, as they are and as they might be' (p.71). In this strategy, there is optimism about the possibilities for change with the use of new technology and the opportunity presented by the post-war situation (p.71).

The fourth strategy explored by Gold & Ward is what they call 'planning as wizardry' (p.72). Filmmakers wanted to find engaging and illuminating ways to put concepts about town planning over to a lay audience. Despite efforts, the subject came across as dull and worthy (p. 72). Film makers turned over time to using actors and simplified scenarios and another new approach was the use of animation and especially the work of John Halas and Joy Batchelor. Their film *New Town* (1948) was commissioned by the Central Office of Information. This short film uses cartoon format and the central figure 'Charley' explains in a humorous and surreal way how new towns will solve urban problems (p. 72). Charley also featured in other films by Halas and Batchelor including *Your Very Good Health* (1948) where he explains the new National Health Service. Here Gold & Ward suggest that town planning could be likened to wizardry, able to work magic for society while being beyond the grasp of ordinary people (p.77). Gold & Ward also note two films (*Planned Town,* 1948 and *Home of Your Own,* 1951) which encouraged people to move to new towns such as Welwyn Garden City and Hemel Hempstead. These films used actors to portray 'ordinary people' being inducted into the wonders of new town living (p.73). Gold & Ward suggest that documentary film serves as a sensitive guide to wider debates about the urban environment (p. 77). Many of the films they discuss focus on London. Gold & Ward's writing is particularly relevant to my research as the subject material of a lot of the pre-digital archive film that forms the resource for my project is very similar to the type of documentaries they describe, particularly in terms of illuminating everyday life and the conditions of life and suggesting that planned communities can solve social ills.

The role and positioning of local, amateur and archive film in discourses about the cinema and the city seem to change and transmogrify over time. In terms of early cinema, much of the film making, distribution and exhibition were local and amateur. Clarke (1997) notes that Gunning (1981) among

others suggest that 'it was only after an initial period of experimentation, technological innovation and change' (p.8) that narrative cinema became the dominant form. Considering the city and spatial representation, Massey (1994, 2004) and de Certeau (1984) are concerned with the local and the mapping of suburban space. However, writers on cinema and representation of place do not tend to include archive and local film in their discourse which may be because of the perception that archive film has low status and its often fragmentary nature and lack of accessibility and provenance makes analysis difficult.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I note some particular challenges in writing this literature review. These include working with many variable and fluid definitions of concepts such as: archive; amateur; local; memory; public history; space; place; audience; public engagement; community; heritage. Within extant literature there is also a cross-over and blurring here of what is documentary, what is archive film, what is local film and what is amateur. Definitive conclusions are difficult to reach, depending as they do on the film maker, his/her intentions, issues of amateurism versus professionalism and how to discover provenance. In addressing research questions by carrying out my interviews with archivists/practitioners into their creative practice and in working with audiences, I have worked within these challenges to interrogate modes of engaging with film material that is often fragmented.

Chapter 2 Methodology

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

In order to address research questions and further exploration of the relationship between the archivist/practitioner and the audience in this chapter I give an overview of my research in terms of broad methodological approaches and impulses. This includes discussion of my own career and the autoethnographical aspects of the research which reflect my practice. I go on to further explore and discuss methodological approaches to the interviews and the audience engagement studies. The former includes discussion on the use of unstructured interview as narrative enquiry which is a methodological approach particularly appropriate to my respondents who are very knowledgeable and experienced as archivists and practitioners within the film archive sector. The latter foregrounds the idea of the voice of the audience allowing an exploration of cultural participation and creative practice with archive film. I examine methodological challenges for both aspects of the research including the distance between theory and practice and real-world issues concerning the film archive sector.

Should we be concerned about archive film outside the digital domain? Who needs to watch 'old' archive film in its original formats and conditions when it is ostensibly all out there for the taking on digital platforms? There are challenges in investigating a world that is seen as disregarded and invisible. In considering how to investigate that world and what it might embody for those who work within it, I set out to collate stories, hopes, fears and experiences from a cohort of dedicated archivists and practitioners with whom I aspired to create a coherent narrative of their world. Secondly I set out to investigate what this world means for audiences who engage with archive film and what opportunities that world embodies for them. As I have stated previously, there is in general a lack of critical discourse on local archive film and its uses. Lury (2014) argues that 'amateur film has narrative and symbolic potency-a historic potency' (p.110) suggesting an intrinsic value beyond a use as a tool. This idea of narrative potency can be seen in the use of archive film for public

history where stories unfold on screen. Other writers argue persuasively against this notion of potency and suggest that this material is best seen only as a tool. They suggest ways for studying this material that in their thinking compensates for what they perceive as low value.

The two aspects of my research engage with and extend some of the theoretical debates explored in Chapter 1. The first aspect was to discover what is actually happening currently in the film archive world through conversations with archivists and practitioners and through an autoethnographical case study of my own engagement with practice. The second aspect focused on audience engagement, creative intervention into practice with archive film and its use as a tool, and what that engagement might mean in terms of public value. Linking the two aspects is an interrogation of the narrative practices of presenting this film-what opportunities and what limitations exist and how can observation and participation illuminate the ways by which we perceive value. I also explore what the perceived relationship of the audience to this material might be. This includes their understanding of the material and their responses to issues raised by archivists and practitioners.

Perceptions and definitions of value for this material are varied and slippery. This type of film material overwhelmingly deals in the mundane and prosaic, illuminating ordinary lives through different kinds of archive film footage. This material can empower people and communities to discover/rediscover individual and communal memory and history and memories of ordinary life and the mundane are thus preserved outside of 'official records' giving a voice to marginalised groups. This also links with themes in academic literature especially concerning the practice of public history. One starting point for consideration of all aspects of the research and working towards a methodology is the work of Raphael Samuel (1994) as I discuss in detail in Chapter 1. My research and the methodological approaches to it were influenced by debates on public history particularly Ashton and Kean's (2008) suggestion that public history could be defined as 'the range of historiographical processes that could lead to the possible creation of shared meaning and different understandings of the past' (p.1). This film material can be a way of enabling people to value their lives and their experiences of the past by making possible an illumination of and connection with the

fashions, employment, entertainments and the experiences and everyday concerns of people through time. Making this material accessible and allowing engagement can enable audiences to connect with their own locality and history. Bearing in mind core issues of public history, community and value that underpin my research, I suggest four areas to consider in terms of archive film and its impact which I particularly explored through the audience studies. These areas can be defined as aesthetical, emotional, digital and technological. While using these as a framework, I was aware that there are other possible approaches such as considering alternative economies of value for this material, examining it outside the mainstream and finding new methods to give it status and value.

In practical terms and considering methodological approaches, accessibility is a real and ongoing issue with archive film both in terms of actual material which is often fragmented and the fact that technological mediation of some kind is always needed to view it application of the precautionary principle. The role of the archivist as keeper of culture and issues of preservation versus access points up issues of the usefulness and function of the moving image archive and its political economy. For example, In the New Towns audience study access to archive material was strictly controlled by regional film archives making curation of programmes difficult because fragmented material was further fragmented. Archive film material may be seen by practitioners as a tool or gateway for education or reminiscence work, which is one route to access. However this can negate any intrinsic value outside of utilising it for projects especially if there is limited choice as to what material is available.

RESEARCH OVERVIEW

I used a multi-method approach in order to investigate, analyse and review models of public engagement with archive film in institutions and community organisations. This research was qualitative in nature, defined by Silverman (2001) as 'naturally occurring data-observation rather than experiment' (p.38). Silverman suggests that qualitative data is understood as the analysis of words and images (p.38) which applies to the concerns of my research dealing with the moving

image and audience engagement and response. Silverman notes that qualitative research can create inductive hypothesis, generating research ideas rather than hypothesis testing (p. 38). Naturalism is defined as 'a reluctance to impose meaning and a preference to get out and observe the field' (p.8).

The research consisted of major two aspects as described above. Firstly, I carried out interviews to determine how archive film is being employed as a tool for public engagement and what the role of the film archivist and practitioner might be in public history work with film archives. These in depth interviews with archivists and practitioners gathered testimonies, narratives and insights into a particular world. My own narrative and experience were added to this aspect of the research. The second aspect explored how archive film might play a role in public history and also in exploration of memory in specific peripheral spaces and places around London, these being Eastcote in the outer London borough of Hillingdon and four New Towns around London(Harlow, Hemel Hempstead, Crawley and Stevenage). The audience engagement studies explored ways of working with archive film and audiences and also innovative, creative ways of doing history with this film material, moving beyond a 'passive screening' model by which I mean here that audiences watch a programme of film chosen by a practitioner/curator and are not engaged in any conversation/feedback about what they might see or have seen. This is not to denigrate the social aspects of community film screenings or the possible benefits to audience members. However this model does not easily create a space for the voice of the non-professional to emerge strongly.

Autoethnography and ethnography have informed all aspects of the research. Hill (2015) discusses the idea of 'provenance' (p. 154) and particularly 'personal provenance which describes the practitioner's personal experience with the practice' (p.154). Hill references Finlay (2002) in coining the term 'reflexive ethnography' and suggests that 'by examining one's personal provenance with a practice an inquirer can examine how problems within the practice have been framed and this helps to identify assumptions that underpin one's understanding of the investigated practice' (p.155). Hill's writing on practice-led inquiry and ideas that 'a practice-led inquiry might involve reflection on the inquirer's own prior experiences with the practice being investigated' (p. 154) was also useful in

consideration of my own role. Ellis et al (2011) suggest that autoethnography 'is one of the approaches that acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher's influence on research, rather than hiding from these matters or assuming they don't exist' (p.2). Ellis et al make a case for autoethnographers not only to 'use their methodological tools and research literature to analyse experience' (p. 4) but also to 'use personal experience to illustrate facets of cultural experience' (p.4). My own career, working experience and personal investment in the sector over almost two decades led the way in planning the project from the start and my research involved interacting with former colleagues and other practitioners. Ellis et al suggest that 'relational ethics' – the implication of others in our research-is heightened for autoethnographers as 'in using personal experience, autoethnographers not only implicate themselves with their work but also others' (p.8).

Valuing interpersonal ties with participants can make relational ethics more complicated as one cannot then regard them as impersonal subjects. Bearing this in mind, an awareness of my own role and positionality within the research led to certain benefits and challenges. In terms of the interviews, I knew all of my respondents and approached them in a context of being a colleague or having met or worked with them professionally. This was a benefit in that obtaining the interviews was relatively straightforward and achieved by personal contact. All interviewees were keen to take part and were very honest in their responses.   However the latter was also a challenge as for most respondents talking about their practice and emotional engagement with the film archive was something they had not done before.   Thus another challenge for my own positionality was the need to keep focussed on respondents, not talk about my own experience unless relevant and to be respectful of emotional needs.

Therefore I was aware that relational concerns were important in my inquiry and that, as Ellis et al suggest, I was obligated to show my work to participants and allow them to respond and talk back to how they have been represented in my writing. Anderson (2006) in his discussion on key features of analytical autoethnography discusses the idea of the 'complete member researcher' (CMR) where

the researcher is 'a complete member in the social world under study' (p.379). Anderson suggests that an 'opportunistic CMR' such as me has acquired familiarity with a group through occupational, recreational or lifestyle participation (p.379), where in this case the group membership precedes the decision to conduct research on the group. Anderson suggests that being a CMR confers a 'most compelling kind of 'being there' on the ethnographer' (p. 379) and references Adler & Adler (1987) saying 'CMRs come closest of all to approximating the emotional stance of the people they study' (p.380). In this model of ethnography, as Anderson suggests, the 'autoethnographer's understandings, both as a member and a researcher, emerge not from detached discovery but from engaged dialogue' (p. 382). Similarly autoethnography for a CMR requires that the researcher be active and reflexively engaged in the text of the research. Anderson suggests that his idea of analytical autoethnography involves 'sustained reflexive attention to one's position in the web of field discourse and relations' (p. 385) and also 'textual visibility of the self in ethnographic narratives' (p. 385).

An important aspect of methodological approaches to research and for consideration of my role was what Hill and Lloyd (2018) label as 'practitioner research' (after Stenhouse, 1981) and 'first-person action research' (after Reason & Bradbury, 2001). First-person action inquiry involves the researcher in researching their own practice. Hill and Lloyd suggest that 'practice-led inquiry is distinguished from other forms of practitioner research by its initiating point within the inquirer's own practice' (p.1). Hill and Lloyd reference Nicolini's (2009) critique of the 'practice turn' which calls for approaches other than ethnography for investigating practice. Hill and Lloyd expand the concept and definition of Provenance as a strategy or process to enable practitioners to recognise knowledge arising from their own experience and use that knowledge in research and theory building. Provenance creates 'a starting point and scaffold for practice-led inquiry, enabling a professional to interrogate their practice' (Hill and Lloyd, p.1). They reference Gray (1996) whose definition of practice-led inquiry is 'research initiated in practice and carried out through practice' (p.4). This approach requires reflection on action.

These ideas around first-person action inquiry and reflection on action were particularly useful in the audience engagement studies which were influenced by my previous practice, both in terms of the need to challenge my own ideas about what constitutes good practice and how to create radical interventions to practice based on my own experience. Hill and Lloyd reference Marshall (2011) who defined first person action inquiry as 'the researcher adopting an inquiring approach to their own assumptions, perspectives and action' (p.4) and note that 'Provenance is often evident when a researcher frames their focus within discourses relating to what is 'known' about their topic' (p.5). It was also necessary as part of thinking about methodology for me to address what Hill and Lloyd call 'placement in (my) repertoire of professional practice' (p.6). The reflexivity of Provenance helped my thinking about my own expertise in the field and how to use it to discover beliefs and assumptions about practice. 'Practice itself cannot speak but practitioners can make practice explicit by giving voice to their practice' (Hill & Lloyd, p.6).

The idea of Provenance was also useful in enabling me to perform a form of 'backward/hindsight reflection' (p.8) on my previous practice, since knowledge about practice emerges from reflection. Reflection back to recall incidents and experiences in past practice is one way to do this. Hill and Lloyd suggest a second reflective approach which they describe as 'dialogue between practitioners as they tease out similarities and differences in the ways they developed their practice' (p.10). This informed ideas for the practice review interviews where a shared professional discourse emerged. The idea of 'parallel stories' where Hill & Lloyd suggest the juxtaposition and analysis of these stories 'invite critical reflection on the practices described' (p.12) was also relevant for the interviews. Both in terms of examining my own practice and hearing and engaging with the practice of others, the idea of Provenance was crucial in considering how to frame problems, critique assumptions and understand institutional power issues. Provenance as a conceptual map of reflexivity helped to generate outcomes that were valuable for the research especially an illumination and comparison of differing professional narratives. The idea that Provenance 'enables professionals to gain a deeper

sense of where there may a deficit in the knowledge about a particular practice' (Hill & Lloyd, p.13) added to the conceptual map.

Dallow (2003) in discussing practice based approaches to research in creative arts suggests that 'the practice based approach to contemporary arts research usually involves the practitioner investigating the 'enframing' practice/s of their area of the creative arts to distinguish and illuminate the general and specific processes at work' (p. 53). This involves the practitioner engaging with their own creative work and this approach augments and complements what Dallow describes as more conventional ways of researching creative arts which he suggests ' focus upon the historical and theoretical contexts of art works and/or their broader social and cultural situation(p.53). In practice-based research, investigation through practice becomes the methodology. Of particular interest here is the idea of practice based research activity being located within a 'third space' 'situated between the limits of theory and the limitations of practice' (p.59) and the need to 'find a new way of considering the relation between knowing and doing' (p.50). My research involves a process of negotiation and exchange with others, leading to problem solving and knowledge generation. As Frayling (1993) suggests 'reflection following action in research into creative practice is calculated to generate and validate new knowledge or understanding' (p.4). While much writing on practice-led inquiry has referred to the creative and fine arts, Hill and Lloyd, in positing Provenance for practice-led inquiry, suggest 'it has relevance to any professional practice and to action inquiry about professional practice in any discipline' (p. 9). This enabled me to find new ways to interrogate my practice.

INTERVIEWS/METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Local archive film defined in different ways has been used across the UK over some years for public history and memory work in a variety of projects. Some projects, such as 'London: A Bigger Picture' which ran in London 2014-2017, have received substantial funding and engaged a large number of attendees. Other projects have involved small organisations, limited funding and a small number of

people, both staff and audience. However a unified and systematic review of different models of working with local archive film has never been undertaken to date particularly in terms of specific outcomes and performative quality. The interviews with film archive sector professionals were a way to ask questions beyond description of ongoing projects and models of working with archive film. It was a way of interrogating what archivists and practitioners think and feel subjectively about their role and their professional *raison d'etre.* By collating stories, hopes, fears and experiences in collaboration with a cohort of archivists and practitioners (these roles often overlap) I created a coherent narrative exploring aspects of this world and how professionals operate within it. This created a set of discursive materials and narratives articulating the particularity and status of practice as well as personal testimonies and insights into roles and world views.

I conducted ten individual interviews, one group interview with five participants and a small group interview with two participants. The total number of respondents was thirteen as four participants were interviewed individually and then again as part of a group. Five respondents were archivists (one retired after forty years in the sector); five were practitioners working at various organisations in the UK; two had been archivists but now worked in the film archive sector in different roles; one was the former director of the LSSC project and is an academic who has an international profile in the film archive sector and is a world authority on the subject.

Interviews with archivists/ practitioners were intended to discover models of working with archive film and subjective appraisals of the archivist's role. Themes I had identified for exploration in interviews included the creative possibilities and cultural impact of archive film, funding models, nostalgia, memory, value and status of archive film as well as locality, personal reflections on working with archive film, subjective appraisals of the archivist's role and the role of archivists/practitioners in concepts and practices of heritage. Other areas for reflection by respondents included an exploration as to why the use of archive film might be self-evident to them and what was their sense about how to work with film and the purposes film might serve. This list was not definitive and respondents were free to introduce their own topics as in terms of

methodological approaches, I intended the interviews to be what Gillham (2005) describes as 'unstructured' (p. 45) because the respondents were all experienced and very knowledgeable. Gillham (2005) describes the unstructured interview style as 'giving responsibility for determining the structure to the interviewee, who has to lead the way' (p. 45). Rapley (2004) suggests that this style of interviewing encourages interviewees to 'produce thick descriptions and elaborated and detailed answers' (p.15). Raune (2005) also suggests this style leads to a 'conversational exchange with a personal exchange of information' (p.147). This aspect of the project was an exploratory piece of research where I was trying to 'paint a descriptive picture of some phenomenon and process' (p.150). Raune also suggests that unstructured interviewing is a good idea when 'trying to understand a respondent's unique experience or perspective' (p.149). However in carrying out the interviews, I was aware of Raune's assertion that an unstructured interview is 'not an everyday conversation, but a purposeful conversation wherein the interviewer has key points or questions that must be addressed (p.149).

Gillham (2005) discusses the unstructured interview as open-ended inquiry and narrative inquiry (p.47). This was relevant as I was concerned with discovery and wanted to be non-directive in order to 'get the story as constructed by the interviewee' (Gillham p.48). Gillham also notes three main uses of unstructured interviews (p.45) which were relevant to this strand of my research. These are: when the researcher is looking for those things that need to be investigated in a more structured stage of the research; when the person being interviewed might be constrained by a more structured approach; where significant themes can be elicited by allowing the individual to give their account in their own way. Thus these interviews were also an effective way of allowing people to think about their experience reaching areas that would otherwise remain inaccessible including people's emotions and attitudes.

Since the interview respondents fell into the category which Gillham (2005) defines as 'elite' (p.54), in this context meaning 'people who are especially knowledgeable about a particular area of research or about the context within which you are researching' (p.54) I needed to address ethical matters with care.

The word 'elite' in this context does not imply superiority in any sense, but rather that respondents will, as Gillham suggests, 'be alert to the implications of questions and of their answers to them'(p.54). My respondents are or have been in positions of authority or power and are, as Gillham suggests, 'not naïve subjects' (p. 54) which means interviews needed to be loosely structured. The respondents are also what Gillham defines as 'advanced practitioners' (p.56) and able to provide extra information such as other people in the field it would be useful to speak to, other contacts/organisations one should be aware of and also documentation if relevant. The advanced practitioner may have in depth knowledge of how a given reality is constructed, although their own perceptions and experiences will colour this knowledge.

The ethical issue of anonymity/confidentiality arose here because of the nature of the respondents. All respondents signed informed consent forms which described the project parameters and made it clear that it had been approved by the university's ethical review procedures. Participants' rights were also made clear: their data would be stored securely, they could stop participation at any time without explanation, there were no foreseeable risks to health and wellbeing and the voluntary nature of their contribution was made plain. I was aware that some respondents were very well known in the sector and that complete anonymity could not be guaranteed. However informed consent assured that no information could be made public or provided to third parties without their consent. Because of the value of their contribution, while anonymity could not be assured it could be provided on request and confidentiality could be maintained.   All respondents are identified by initials only.   In further attention to ethical issues, before each interview I had a personal conversation with each respondent face to face to talk through confidentiality and other concerns. It was agreed that I would not record or write about anything said if interviewees requested this. This

had also been flagged up in the informed consent form where it was made clear that any data supplied could be withdrawn/destroyed on request.

In planning the initial interviews, I had email correspondences with potential respondents prior to the interview giving details of my project. I prepared a short list of possible questions and potential themes and topics to cover as above and sent these in advance. I was clear these were not definitive, as I wanted there to be maximum flexibility for respondents to create their own topics. Key to this was developing what Rapley (2004) calls 'a relaxed and encouraging relationship' (p. 19) with respondents and creating what Denzin (2002) notes as a 'collaborative or active format where interviewer and respondent tell a story together' (p. 839) so that in this format a conversation occurs and interviewer and respondent collaborate in telling a conjoint story. In these unstructured interviews, I wanted, as Silverman (2001) suggests to enact a 'reluctance to impose meaning and a preference to get out and observe the field' (p.38). Interviews were held in a variety of venues including respondents' workplaces, cafes and in one case my home. I recorded the interviews (with permission) using a small, unobtrusive hard disc recorder and made hard copy transcriptions myself from these recordings.

I felt it necessary to utilise several methodological approaches to interviews including active listening, collaborative interviewing and interactional forms to create rapport and interaction leading to what Rapley (2004) calls 'thick descriptions' (p.15). I also explored what Gillham (2005) describes as open-ended inquiry (p.47) to produce interview data as topic as defined by Rapley (2004). Rapley identifies two major traditions of interviews. One is 'interview data as resource-data collected is seen as reflecting the interviewees' reality outside the interview' (p.16).The other is 'interview data as topic-data collected is seen as reflecting a reality jointly constructed by the interviewee and interviewer' (p.16). Raune (2005) suggests active listening should 'provide a verbal mirror' (p.153) and he also suggests interviewers need to be aware of respondent silences which may be instances of thoughtful punctuation (p. 153). I was informed by Rapley's (2004) suggestions that 'contemporary literature on research interview technique argues for an engaged, active or

collaborative format of interviewing' (p.22). He references Denzin (2002) who suggests 'in the collaborative or active format, interviewer and respondent tell a story together' (Denzin, p.839). Rapley also discusses interactional forms of interviewing (p.20) suggesting this form of interviewing can be facilitating and lead to co-operative work to create 'rapport and the establishing of a relaxed and encouraging relationship' where trust and reassurance can lead interviewees to produce 'thick descriptions (p.15) which contain elaborated and detailed answers. In open-ended inquiry and narrative inquiry, the researcher is concerned with discovery and a loosely structured interview may yield unexpected material. The researcher, by being non-directive, is 'getting the story as constructed by the interviewee' (p.48). Gillham describes the 'narrative interview' as one where the interviewee has responsibility for determining structure and 'leading the way' (p.45). The concern here is with the construction of stories (p.48) and Gillham references Polkinghorne (1988) who suggests 'narrative is the primary form by which human experience is made meaningful' (Polkinghorne p.1). Gillham (2005) also discusses narrative interview as a technique, suggesting it was developed as a critical alternative to the 'presumed convention of the question and answer interview' (p.48). He references Jochelovitch and Bauer (2000) who describe the narrative interview as 'using a specific type of everyday communication, namely storytelling and listening' (J & B p.61).

AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT STUDIES/ METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Writing on ideas around locality explored in my literature review was particularly relevant in the research working with archive film with local audiences. In both studies the institutions and organisations involved assumed the need for and requested very local film as a norm for screenings and the choice of films and curation of programmes was not always under my control. An assumption was made by organisers that the audience would relate best to local material and in fact would really want only to see this. Part of my challenge in both studies was to interrogate whether it was possible to know/find out if this was the case. I had also wanted to challenge a passive screening model while being aware that audiences are not passive even if passively watching films since they

bring their own prejudices, attitudes and beliefs to all aspects of engagement. I had observed and implemented this screening model myself over many years during my own career and practice often for reasons of expediency. I had begun to question this model of practice before I began the project as it seemed to offer no empowerment to the audience.

The interviews laid the groundwork for this strand of the research which consisted of studies of audience engagement with archive film material. An important part of these studies was to give space and privilege to the voices of the audience (though this would always be through an interpretive lens) in the form of discussions and evaluations where they were able to articulate the value of what they had seen and experienced. Audience voices developed the research to show an investment in the views of the non-professional since the first aspect of research foregrounded professional views and ideas about the use of archive film. The question of audience/participant also signalled a potential to move beyond the instrumental metrics used to satisfy outreach project outcomes. Audience voices also allowed an exploration of what Miles & Gibson (2016) call 'everyday participation' (p.151). In terms of ethical matters, I explained my project to all audience members and interested parties after assuring all of complete anonymity. All audience participation and contributions to research were completely anonymised.

Discussing the findings of the AHRC project 'Understanding Everyday Participation-Articulating Cultural Value' (UEP) they note in particular the importance of place in participation and access (p.151). They also note the need to explore cultural participation outside of state cultural support and situated locally in the everyday realm and reference Taylor (2016) whose interrogation on the cultural participation survey *Taking Part* found that only 8.7% of the UK population was highly engaged with state-supported forms of culture.[1]The audience engagement studies located in specific locations on the periphery of London allowed me to explore ideas of everyday participation as a situated process. Writing on the UEP project, Ebrey (2016) notes the possibility of a shift in

---

[1] https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/takingpartsurvey

orientation from 'instrumental economic arguments' (p.158) about participation to 'lived experiences, informal economies' (p. 159). The audience engagement studies were rooted in the everyday experiences of participants and audiences. The studies also explored the possibilities of creative practice and radical intervention with archive film in terms of place and locality, enabling an examination of how this material might play a role in public history and in exploration of memory in peripheral spaces and places.

Various aspects of reception theory proved particularly relevant to the audience studies. These include the work of Abercrombie & Longhurst (1998) on the three forms of audience experience and Baron (2012) on archival footage as experience of reception. Also useful is Livingstone's (1998) discussion of how the ethnographic turn in the 1980s led to analyses of the 'culture of the everyday' (p.3) making visible an audience hitherto devalued or marginalised (p. 4) thus making possible the construction of a narrative through audience voices. The work of Gunning (2004) and Goffman (1959) also informed aspects of the work with audiences. The definition of the audience in the Oxford English Dictionary is 'the persons within hearing' and in terms of film and archive film, I expand this to also mean 'the person within seeing'. With this definition in mind, Abercombie & Longhurst (1998) explore in some detail what it means to be a member of an audience. They foreground the idea of performance where this involves a relationship between performer and audience which opens up a liminal space. Within this space there are rules governing the different types of performance event. Since archive film engagement can take place in a variety of spaces including cinemas, community venues private houses and online, Abercrombie & Longhurst's exploration of three different forms of audience experience is useful here. The three forms are simple, mass and diffused and since I argue that all these forms can apply to audience engagement with archive film I explore them in some detail here.

Simple audiences as defined by Abercrombie & Longhurst attend concerts, plays and films in public and 'take part in a social contract where they do not participate except in certain ways which may

include applauding or buying a ticket. The latter promises a seat to passively watch the action' (p.51). Audiences may see archive film programmes in community venues which may be considered as being in public and what I have noted both in my previous practice and my audience studies is that archive film audiences have expectations as to what behaviour is acceptable. Audiences appear to expect to be quiet and passive and watch even silent film in total silence. Abercrombie & Longhurst suggest that simple audiences 'concentrate on the spectacle and cannot carry on other activities at the same time, as the spectacle demands high attention' (p.54). The main features of the simple audience are : the performance event takes place at a designated local place; the performance is public; audience attention is high (p.57). This definition was most relevant to my studies but I explore the other forms because audiences bring a variety of other experiences to engagement with archive film.

Mass audiences are defined by Abercrombie & Longhurst as typically receiving performances in private rather than public and here performances are elongated in time and space and fragmented creating communication without the direct co-presence of performers. This includes performances from the past captured in 'some recording medium that can be replayed in the present' (p.62). This creates what they call a 'constructed aesthetic' (p.63) meaning here that aesthetic pleasure is no longer authorial but derives from 'unseen heads and hands who, usually unrecognised, piece together the whole from fragments' (p.63). In terms of archive film, the 'heads and hands' are often both unseen and unknown since material may have no provenance and the audience may never be able to know or find out who made what they are watching unlike mainstream cinema. Questions of what is private and what is public space also arise here. Archive film screenings such as the Eastcote House Gardens event are ostensibly in public as the audience in this case was self-selected members of what can be described as the general public. However if the audience is invited or the event is for a focussed community audience (such as a day care centre) then the space involved could be seen as private. Also if archive film screenings are free thus incurring no cost to the audience, the social contract may be changed and expectations and behaviour may also change.

The third form defined by Abercrombie & Longhurst is the diffused audience where social and cultural changes particularly around the consumption of mass media in the home produce another type of audience experience. Since 1998 this has extended even further with the use of the Internet and social media. Abercrombie & Longhurst suggest that 'everyone becomes an audience all the time' (p.68) and 'Life is a constant performance; we are audience and performer at the same time. Performance is not a discrete event' (p. 73). Archive film can be viewed online through YouTube and other platforms and audiences can become prosumers by which I mean here both consumers and producers/performers. An example of this can be seen in projects where people use archive film to make new films incorporating archive material and while doing so acquire new skills. One example of this is the London Recut project which was funded by Film London in 2010 through the UK Film Council's Digital Film Archive Fund. This project gave access to a wealth of archive material from across the city for Londoners to remix into short films online.

Baron (2012) in her writing about how archive film is used and reused in documentaries describes the transformation of the archive through 'a proliferation of indexical documents outside of official archives' (p. 102). She suggests that archive film evokes a particular consciousness in the viewer and that this material is not just an object but a mode of reception (p.104) and that lack of provenance is less important than the viewer's experience (p.105). Baron also suggests the idea of 'temporal disparity' (p. 106) experienced by the viewer of archive film who perceives a 'then' and 'now' generated within a single text (p.106) raising questions about when and where lines between past and present may be drawn. This also raises questions about how the past becomes history. Baron suggests that images of places through time can bring about a sense of history for an audience showing changes in the rural or urban landscape over years or decades. This was the case in both audience studies where local audience members engaged with their personal histories.

PUBLIC SCREENING AND WORKSHOP AT EASTCOTE HOUSE GARDENS, LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

The Hillingdon study consisted of a screening of a programme of local archive film, curated by myself from material from the LSSC. This collection has been under-exploited and much of the footage was new to audiences, both scholars and members of the general public. As much of this material is local film the study provided insights into issues around local archive film as explored by Shand (2014), Roberts (2010) and Christie (2015). For the workshop planned to follow the public screening I had intended to use the co-operative inquiry model as expounded by Reason (1988). Reason defines the paradigm of co-operative experiential inquiry as research *with* and *for* people rather than *on* people (p.1). Drawing on my own experience as a practitioner using archive film for public history practice, I had intended the workshop to break down barriers between the 'archivist' and the 'audience' by developing what Reason (1988) calls a learning community (p.2)which can be 'self-directed and contribute to creative thinking and to the research action' (p.4). All participants could contribute to creative thinking and planning and work in genuine collaboration. Data from the Hillingdon audience study screening and workshop was collected through audience evaluation questionnaires, discussion after the public screening and feedback from the group. The audience for the screening and workshop in Hillingdon were members of the general public who had chosen to come to a free screening.

NEW TOWNS, OUR TOWN-STORIES ON SCREEN

The second audience study came about through an opportunity to deliver a training programme for the 'New Towns, Our Town-Stories on Screen' Independent Cinema Office (ICO) archive film project. The ICO had received a substantial Heritage Lottery Grant for this project, which took place in the first four of the UK's New Towns which are Stevenage, Crawley, Hemel Hempstead and Harlow. The stated aim of the project was to use rare archive footage to explore the shared experiences of residents thus increasing the visibility of the New Town movement and involving screenings, engagement activities and volunteering opportunities. The project was a valuable addition and

enhancement to research dealing as it did with the relations of the centre to the periphery in London, in the archive and between the archivist/practitioner and the community. Eight volunteers were recruited in each New Town and I was asked to run a training day in each location on the topic 'Using archive film as reminiscence tool'. This linked closely to my previous practice with archive film and my earlier work on the 'Screening Our Memories' project in 2011 which was a year-long project funded by the Regional Screen Agency in London. This project had provided one and two day training courses for age care sector workers and film industry and education workers on using archive film for reminiscence.

The ICO project was challenging methodologically for various reasons. I did not have control over most aspects of the project and this included selection of film material which was done by the project manager, venues and the general remit of the training. I was however able to design the training days and materials using previous models of practice from my career and experience which enabled exploration of my ideas on how to innovate/challenge that practice as well as further examination of constraints and barriers to successful outcomes. It was more difficult for me to take on an interventionist role as I was working within specific parameters. My audience were volunteers/trainees who would later take on a different role so a question raised was how audience members might become trainers and transmit values associated with the archive, preservation and access and how does the filmic event frame the relation of people to place both for trainees and a wider audience. This was a challenge for me as trainer and for them as trainees as was dealing with prejudices, attitudes, beliefs and ideas on their role in the project, some of which addressed issues in my own practice around models of using archive film. This material has been used widely as a tool for reminiscence with older people and there is a perception that this is a normative practice for this material. Allied to this is a perception that reminiscence is always 'nice 'and 'positive'. Some trainees in every venue on the ICO project held these views. It was a challenge for my practice and my examination of my practice to both deliver the project remit and find ways of addressing these ideas.

There is merit in using archive material for social interaction and to understand it as embedded in the everyday leading to an understanding that what transpires in community events can be banal and ephemeral as well as enjoyable for participants. However I had throughout this project and the research in general interrogated what other uses and innovations might be possible with this material. Thus the ICO project enabled me to think again about my repertoire of practice (Hill &Lloyd 2018) and to illuminate specific processes at work (Dallow 2003).Volunteers on the ICO project were self-selecting and there was a wide range of age, experience and abilities. It was difficult within the context of both projects to interrogate why people had chosen to have these experiences and what their commitment and participation might mean for them. This was free culture and not compulsory culture.

CONCLUSION

In a final consideration of accessibility issues, both audience studies raised issues of technological mediation access to material that impinged on methodology. This is not a minor issue and I had written about the need to plan carefully as part of the toolkit I co-wrote for the Screening Our Memories project. Working with archive film material outside of a cinema setting demands ingenuity and always needs careful planning. Without this, and if you are unable to screen material, the *raison d'etre* for doing the work vanishes and there is no useful substitute. The two audience studies raised different issues allied to technological mediation. In Hillingdon I received little technical assistance and needed to provide my own equipment. Issues with sound meant silent film was best for the screening and I arrived three hours before the public screening in order to set up the screen, laptop and projector and check through all the material. There were no access issues concerning material as I had brought all the rights-cleared films from the London Screen Study Collection so Prelinger's' 'sticky door' did not apply here. The ICO project had certain access issues which were not my direct concern though they affected how it was possible to work with the archive material. Difficult negotiations with regional film archives led to a restriction in the amount of New Towns material

available and it was often only fragments of already fragmented footage. Under those circumstances, contextualisation for trainees often proved difficult despite their local knowledge. Technical issues were less problematic as I was not responsible for equipment which was made available at each venue by the project manager.

As I have described above, an exploration of different models and modes of practice with archive film has not been undertaken to date particularly in terms of outcome. This part of the research provides this and adds to and enhances current knowledge about the use of archive film, collating information that will be of use to organisations in the field in future planning and funding. Both the interviews and the audience studies illuminate some of the real-world issues surrounding using archive film for audience engagement particularly some of the barriers and constraints that might prevent certain outcomes, as well as practical issues. As an example, I had planned for the practice review to include ethnographic observation of archive film events and projects. This involved participant observation and I had intended to gain access to events through interview respondents. This did not prove fruitful as most organisations were undergoing financial crises or struggling to find funding for legacy to projects or to fund new projects. This strand of the research proved unworkable but this outcome was instrumental in providing an understanding of the distance between theory and practice and illuminating of real-world issues.

The data gathered by primary research provides insights into how archive film might play a role in public history practice thus addressing a core research question. It provides a review of current use of archive film for public history and memory engagement, what models are being employed and what role is played by film archivists/practitioners; relates these insights to the wider context of use of archive film; adds to current knowledge about the use of local archive film. This data and insights gained are explored and analysed in detail in Chapter 4 and Chapter 6. In Chapter 3 which follows I give context to these findings by offering insights into the national and local institutions that have led and structured the film archive sector, with particular emphasis on issues and contexts that have

impacted upon the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with local film archives.

Chapter 3 Institutions of the Film Archive

INTRODUCTION

I argue for the value of archive film in the creation of affective experiences of cultural and personal memory thus addressing one of the core research questions. In this chapter I discuss some of the institutions and institutional issues that have led and structured the film archive sector in order to answer the question: why are things the way they are? Institutional contexts aid in consideration the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with local film archives. The work of these archivist/practitioners takes place largely within the parameters and influences of these institutions and their practice is linked to wider issues, which they flag up during the interviews. The chapter is not a detailed history of why and how certain institutions were set up or how they functioned over time. It rather brings together fact-based narrative history and subjective insider experiential history to create an overview as to why and how organisations across the sector have interacted to bring us to the current situation particularly around perceptions of value, funding and access.

One purpose of this chapter is to examine the relationship between the centre and the periphery of the sector, the centre here meaning the British Film Institute (BFI) and the now defunct UK Film Council (UKFC) and the periphery meaning the regional screen agencies and regional film archives. The centre is focused mainly but not always on London where national arts institutions have traditionally been located and the periphery tends to be the regions of the UK but also other urban areas. Also on the periphery are 'unofficial' film archives which form an unmapped, unknown and sometimes unknowable part of the sector. The London Screen Study Collection (LSSC) falls to a certain extent within this category and I explore this collection fully in a later chapter. However I discuss other 'unofficial' film archives both known and undiscovered in this chapter. A key question for exploration is how does the relationship between the centre and the periphery as defined above affect funding and access for local archive film material? The chapter gives historical and personal

perspectives from interviewees with exemplar quotes and draws from my own working experience in the sector. I also reflect on cultural heritage and value in a time of austerity and cuts to the arts where a target setting culture and the effects of neoliberalism mean an ongoing struggle within the sector to prove the worth of archive film.

THE CENTRE

It is not my intention to write a complete history of the two major institutions that have been at the centre of the film archive sector or to comment extensively on other arts institutions in the UK. The former would mean devoting a large proportion of the thesis to exploration and analysis done elsewhere, work undertaken notably by Dupin (2006), Burrows (1995) and Miller (2008) to name but three. Thinking about arts institutions, Hewison (2014) in his study of UK arts policy between 1997-2012 notes the institutional weaknesses of the three key organisations responsible for delivering government objectives for the arts - the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), the Arts Council (ACE) and Museums, Libraries and Archives(MLA).He suggests they all suffered from poor leadership and having to deliver a social and economic agenda that fitted uneasily with the creative independence of the arts. (p. 118) Hewison also notes the 'inherent tensions between the centre and the periphery' (p.118) meaning between London and the regions which had their own strong local identities and cultural resources. This can be applied to the film archive sector with the BFI at the centre in London and the regional film archives with their own resources.

What follows is a brief overview and background to the UKFC and the BFI drawn from the websites and mission statements of the organizations, the work of Hewison (2014), Dupin (2006) and Burrows (1995) and also my own personal knowledge and working experience of both organizations. I add some personal historical perspectives offered by respondents from the interviews, with exemplar quotes from them where appropriate. This will be followed by some observations made in 2008 by academics, former senior staff and other interested parties engaged and working within the sector

and at the BFI from a dossier edited by Miller and entitled 'In Focus: The British Film Institute'. This dossier gives another set of views and opinions about the roles played by the BFI and the UKFC.

The UKFC was a non-departmental public body set up in 2000 to develop and promote the film industry in the UK. It was constituted as a private company limited by guarantee, owned by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, and governed by a board of fifteen directors. The UKFC was appointed by the then Labour government's Department of Media, Culture and Sport to be the central agency for film and to create a sustainable UK film industry. It took over the BFI's film production and regional distribution functions. Its focus was on production and exhibition and not wider moving image culture and education. It was funded from various sources including the National Lottery and distributed more than £160m of lottery money to over nine hundred films.[1]

During 2009 the UKFC persuaded the then government that there should only be one main public-funded body for film, and suggested that the body should be the UKFC while the BFI should be abolished. During 2010 the government announced that there would be a single body for film. Despite intensive lobbying (including controversially using public funding to pay public relations agencies to put its case) the UKFC failed to persuade the government that it should have that role and on 26 July 2010, the government announced that the council would be abolished. Hewison (2014) describes the 'bonfire of the quangos' (p.163) in 2010 as an 'abolition or merger of more than 400 public bodies' (p.163) and this included the UKFC which closed on 31 March 2011, with many of its functions reverting back to the BFI.

The BFI was founded in 1933. Despite its foundation resulting from a recommendation in a report on Film in National Life published in 1932[2] at that time the institute was a private company though it has received public money throughout its history from the Privy Council and Treasury until 1965 and various culture departments since then. The institute was restructured following the Radcliffe Report of 1948 which recommended that it should concentrate on developing the appreciation of

---

[1] **https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/uk-film-council**
[2] **https://spectator.co.uk/article/11th-june-1932/9/the-film-in-national-life**

filmic art rather than creating film itself. Thus control of educational film production passed to the National Committee for Visual Aids in Education and the British Film Academy assumed control for promoting production. From 1952–2000, the BFI provided funding for new and experimental filmmakers via the BFI Production Board. The Institute received a Royal Charter in 1983. This was updated in 2000, and in the same year the newly established UK Film Council took responsibility for providing the BFI's annual grant-in-aid (government subsidy).

As an independent registered charity, the BFI is regulated by the Charity Commission and the Privy Council. In 1988 the BFI opened the London Museum of the Moving Image (MOMI) on the South Bank. I discuss the MOMI later in this chapter[3]. The BFI operates with three sources of income. The largest is public money allocated by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. As an example, in 2011–12, this funding amounted to approximately £20m. The second largest source is commercial activity such as receipts from ticket sales at BFI Southbank or the BFI London IMAX theatre (£5m in 2007) and sales of DVDs and publications. Thirdly, grants and sponsorship of around £5m are obtained from various sources including funding grants, private sponsors and through donations. The delayed redevelopment of the National Film Theatre finally took place in 2007, creating the rebranded 'BFI Southbank' with new education spaces, a gallery, and a pioneering mediatheque which for the first time enabled the public to gain access free of charge to some of the otherwise inaccessible treasures in the National Film & Television Archive. The mediatheque has proved to be the most successful element of this redevelopment and there are plans to roll out a network of them across the UK. An announcement of a £25 million capital investment in the Strategy for UK Screen Heritage was made by the then Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport at the opening night of the 2007 London Film Festival. The bulk of this money paid for long overdue development of the BFI National Archive facilities in Hertfordshire and Warwickshire. More recently, the BFI in their five year strategy document as laid out in their website is investing almost £500 million from 2017-2022. This is made up of government grant-in-aid, BFI earned income and National Lottery funding. The

---

[3] https://www.bfi.org.uk

BFI2022[4] document outlines how the BFI will 'continue to focus on audiences and culture, supporting film education and skills development and backing exciting new filmmaking'.

Several of my interview respondents with wide experience of working within the sector held strong and not always positive views about the role of the BFI and the now-defunct UKFC in the sector and how these roles had evolved over time. JP is now retired but had worked for twenty years at the BFI and had held a senior position as Keeper of Documentary Collections for ten of those years. The latter part of his career was in a senior position in a regional film archive. Thus JP's four decades working in both the BFI and the local archive film sector informs his personal understanding of a UK wide historical overview of a variety of issues. It also explains why he believes core funding for the sector has not been a priority and in his view this is at the heart of ongoing issues within the sector. While this is his narrative, as an overview it adds to comprehension of the current situation. JP's understanding was that funding for the BFI has never been on a par with other national collections of importance such as the National Gallery or the British Library and he believed that the reason for lack of core funding at this level was 'the historical failure of the BFI to deliver the mission they were given in the 1930s'. He believes that this mission was to advance the art of the film and to make the case that film is as important an art form and medium of record as the printed word or the fine arts. JP felt that the BFI had simply failed to make that case. Another funding issue he raised is that successive governments do not see the difference between film as an industry and film as a cultural activity and as tax breaks are given for production, governments will refuse funding for other aspects of film with the perception it has already been given.

 IC had worked at the BFI for some years and felt that the BFI could head up the sector in an ideal world, but had always been subject to a lot of constraints. He believed the BFI has never been considered a very important institution and never gets enough funding –'the BFI is pretty badly off on the international league table in terms of funding'. IC also flagged up that the changing nature of expectations placed on the BFI, particularly around the setting up of the UKFC and its subsequent

---

[4] http://www.bfi.org.uk/news-opinion/news-bfi/announcements/bfi2022-five-year-strategy-uk-film

disbanding, has caused changes in agenda setting. IC noted that the founding charter of the BFI had talked about film as a medium of record but that this idea 'got rather twisted towards that it should be about 'good' films. That was never the thought that lay behind its foundation'. IC noted different attitudes to film archives in other countries as he travels widely to advise and engage with international archives. He felt that 'it's a very unequal world. Some countries are 'super-saturated' with archive film, America would be the obvious example and there are others that aren't'. He used the example of Turkey where the world of archiving historic film is just beginning to open up. He also made the case that in France there is more funding for the infrastructure of film because film is seen as nationally important whereas he felt this was not the case in the UK.

I endorse the views of both IC and JP that the complex relationship between the BFI and the UKFC as well as frequent structural changes and confusing agendas at the BFI has not been positive for the film archive sector. My own working experience within the BFI was in the Education Department where I experienced firsthand the deleterious effect of institutional changes of agenda and focus where restructuring and internal changes caused reductions in staff and other cutbacks. I was Head of the Education Projects Development Unit which created and delivered an education programme across all Key Stages and for adult learners. A changing agenda around the use of the National Film Theatre where we held most education events coupled with internal politics and the perceived need to restructure departments led to the decimation of the Unit. Film education was not considered as important as other aspects of the institute's work when I was at the BFI from 2000-2003. In consideration of JP's view that the BFI failed to make a case for the importance of film as an art form, it is worth noting the approach to film education adopted by the BFI when I worked there. This illuminated a particular attitude to film in general and was characterized by the idea that film should be used as an educational tool to enrich teaching in National Curriculum programmes of study such as history, media studies and citizenship. The focus was on producing curriculum linked teaching materials and giving teachers the resources and expertise to introduce film into their teaching, rather than lobbying for film to be a standalone subject. Nevertheless, while I was at the BFI,

debates on the desirability of young people becoming cineliterate had been ongoing in the Institute for some years. Cineliteracy means an understanding of the grammar of the moving image so that one can read and critically assess what is seen on screen. Moving image education could be considered something of a core skill and an important part of being an informed citizen, though this was not a priority when I was at the BFI. The government framework for the National Curriculum show that in 2019 Film and Media Studies are now on the National Curriculum at secondary level and BFI Education offer study days for GCSE and A level. At primary level there is still an emphasis on film as an educational tool for other curriculum areas notable English, Maths and Science[5]. The BFI currently charges a fee of £10 per secondary pupil and £6 per primary pupil for their education events which in a climate of school cutbacks will be difficult for some schools.

I joined the BFI in 2000, one year after the closure of the Museum of the Moving Image (MOMI) at the National Film Theatre. MOMI set new standards for education through entertainment, but subsequently it did not receive the high levels of continuing investment that might have enabled it to keep pace with technological developments and ever-rising audience expectations. The Museum was temporarily closed in 1999 and that closure became permanent in 2002 when it was decided to redevelop the South Bank site. Some staff from MOMI had been transferred to the Education Projects Development Unit and I experienced their distress and concern about the demise of the museum and the sudden end to the work they had created there. Domankiewicz, writing in the Guardian (19/8/19) describes how this museum 'offered visitors an opportunity to learn about and experience the development of the moving image in a way that had never existed before - and hasn't since'. He describes lectures and demonstrations at MOMI about early film history and the historical and social aspects of the moving image but after its abrupt closure in 1999 it never re-opened. Domankiewicz suggests that in other countries have 'fabulous film museums-Turin, Frankfurt, Amsterdam and Paris. But in Britain it is as if we let the roof of St Paul's fall in, gave away or packed up the art works and let the cathedral go to rack and ruin'.

---

[5] **https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-curriculum**

The 'In Focus: the British Film Institute' dossier published in 2008 offers a series of personal views and opinions on the state of the institute at a moment in time, two years before the disbanding of the UKFC and the changing of priorities and agendas that resulted. Miller suggests at the outset that the BFI had been 'an enviable model of cultural policy' but was in 2008 widely regarded as 'an awful example of political vandalism' (p.121). He believes this is as a result of a triumph of neo-liberalism and an asset-stripping of the BFI to 'remake it under the spell of the private sector' (p.121). By neoliberalism I mean here the late 20th century resurgence of ideas associated with free market capitalism. As discussed by JP and IC, the constant crises of finance, governance and direction that beset the BFI since its inception had led by 2008 to what Miller believes was an institution which was a 'hand servant to the movie industry' (p. 124) putting screen culture at the mercy of market forces. Nowell-Smith notes that the BFI was riven with ideological disputes almost from its inception. A locus of these disputes was the Education Department, one of the more problematic areas of the institution as I have described above. Nowell-Smith describes the debates between the BFI Archive and Education about the prioritizing of preservation over access. McArthur describes in great detail his trials in the BFI Education Department in the 1960s as a Teacher Adviser, attempting to provide five to ten minute extracts from feature films for use by teachers in the classroom. Issues of rights clearance, what films were considered appropriate and the writing of a new catalogue led to what McArthur describes as 'profound suspicion and some open hostility from the wider film culture, from some parts of the BFI and from some members of the governing body' (p.150). These debates around preservation, access and education are still ongoing with the addition of issues around the digital. Nowell-Smith asks two questions around the purpose of the BFI that still resonate today, both for the institution and for the wider sector. These are: who is the archive for and what is it for? (p.130) He suggest these questions cannot be answered through a culture of target setting and outputs, which seem far removed from the ostensible purpose of the BFI in the early 1930s which was 'to encourage the art of the film'. (p.130) Alvarado and Buscombe also comment on the ostensible purpose of the BFI at its foundation, echoing JP, IC and Nowell-Smith in suggesting that

encouraging the art of the film was 'always going to be an uphill struggle in a country that has traditionally valued other cultural forms such as the theatre and literature above the cinema' (p. 135).

There are many opinions, viewpoints, critiques and criticisms of the BFI and the UKFC and in 2017 and 2018 none of my interviewees were indifferent to the BFI in particular. They all had stories to tell, criticisms to make and frustrations to share. While most understood and were grateful for the input of the BFI to their projects, and understood the political and financial constraints in operation, they wished the BFI would head up the sector more proactively. Some felt that the BFI could play a vital role in securing archive film assets in terms of preservation and access and yet this was not happening. As I have explored above the BFI has not seen film education as a priority nor has it seen fit to preserve UK film history and make it accessible. So I concur with and endorse the opinions and viewpoints of respondents and colleagues as discussed in this chapter. The UK archive film sector is home to valuable and vulnerable film resources that can be easily destroyed by neglect, lack of funding and inaccessibility. These resources should be considered as an important part of our communal history and legacy and what they offer, if lost, would be irreplaceable. I share with my respondents a great belief that archive film has an important role to play in public history practice and in enabling groups and individuals to connect with personal and collective memories and identities. In the next section of this chapter, I will explore the periphery of the sector and how it has been affected by some of the issues discussed above.

THE PERIPHERY

JP and IC's stories and evidence give background to the growth of regional film archives from 1979 onwards when there were only three such archives - Manchester, East Anglia and Scotland. This number grew over some years to include a variety of regions JP pointed out that the BFI had funded regional arts boards and in the 1990s extended archiving as a requirement to the regional arts boards for funding of regional archives. Regional arts boards helped set up regional film archives but

when the UKFC took over funding, things became more difficult as there was a splintering of responsibility for film archives. This led to the UKFC having funding responsibility but no archive policy and the BFI having no funding role but an ostensible responsibility for archive policy. The Film Archive Forum was then created as a place where regional film archives could meet and discuss issues with each other and the BFI. When I was Research & Development Officer for the London Screen Study Collection, I attended these meetings regularly. As a professional working with archive film, I found these meetings a useful forum for facilitating communication and discussion on relevant issues as well as planning funding and projects and getting input from the BFI. However, as JP notes, the BFI walked away from the Film Archive Forum due to restructuring and a change of direction within the BFI led to a lack of engagement with regional film archives. To quote JP 'The Institute was sliced in a different direction and this did not involve regional film archives in the same way as previously'. While this is JP's narrative, as an overview it adds to an understanding of the current situation, where film archives have no statutory funding for their work on preservation, access and public engagement and thus the need to find sources of income becomes paramount. This has effects on the type of practice that organisations are enabled to carry out. Two of my respondents commented on these issues from differing perspectives.

CW as current CEO of the Media Archive for Central England (MACE) felt everything is contingent on funding and also that there was always a 'need to start from zero' and for regional film archives to identify stakeholders and understand what support they could bring in either cash or kind. This was a continual task - to manage funders and stakeholders and explore potential opportunities. A lack of core funding means regional film archives cannot start from need but are always project driven and must fit into what funders require, thus having to match the aims of the funder to planned projects. JB noted the issues with funding applications she had experienced as a practitioner working at the Independent Cinema Office (ICO) with community groups and schools. She felt that getting funding for any film project is difficult unless it is through the BFI. JB also raised the issue of the relationship between practitioners and archivists in terms of the cost of obtaining rights cleared material for use

in projects. She noted her personal experience of and frustration with the complex negotiations needed with regional film archives to get material. I explore how these issues affect projects and working practices within the sector in more detail in Chapter 4 Voices from the Film Archive Sector: Interviews.

In 2019 there are ten regional film archives (RFAs) covering England, Wales and Scotland. All are listed on the BFI website as partner archives[6]. Six of the RFAs are located in universities within their region: East Anglian Film Archive (EAFA) at the University of East Anglia; North East Film Archive (NEFA) at Teesside University; North West Film Archive (NWFA) at Manchester Metropolitan University; Screen Archive South East (SASE) at the University of Brighton; Media Archive for Central England (MACE) at the University of Lincoln; Yorkshire Film Archive (YFA) at York St. John University. The Scottish Screen Archive is located at the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh and the National Screen and Sound Archive of Wales at the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth. Wessex Film and Sound Archive (WFSA) is located in the Hampshire Record Office.

The Northern Ireland Screen Digital Film Archive (DFA) was launched in November 2000, as part of the BFI's Millennium Project and is a free public access resource containing over eighty hours of film footage spanning a hundred years of Northern Irish history from 1897 to 2014. IC noted that Northern Ireland was a different case from the rest of the UK. As he put it:

> The problem with the Northern Irish archive was that the very concept of Northern Ireland was contested long term. What would a Northern Irish archive look like? Well the answer turned out to be to create a kind of provisional digital archive and that's what it still is. There isn't an actual physical archive, there's a digitized collection relating to Northern Ireland which comes from all sorts of sources.

There are also nine regional screen agencies (RSAs) across the UK, originally set up by the UKFC to enable film making, exhibition and related media activity. In 2019, some of these have been taken over by Creative England (for example Screen West Midlands) but their film-related work continues

---

[6] **https://www.bfi.org.uk/.../national-regional-film-agencies**

in different ways. I worked for some years with Film London, the capital's screen agency, and will use them as a case study though not all RSAs function in this way. Film London's stated mission expressed on their website is 'to connect ideas, talent and finance to develop a pioneering creative culture in the city that delivers success in film, television, animation, games and beyond. We aim to ensure the capital is a thriving centre for creative industries sector that enrich the city's businesses and its people'[7].

Among Film London's roles are: talent development and production; production support and business development; film exhibition; film promotion and tourism. Most importantly for the film archive sector is the existence of London's Screen Archives (LSA) a network led by Film London that seeks to address the issue that London has many different collections and archives of film material but no one archive that dealt exclusively and widely with London film. For example the film material at London Metropolitan Archives covers the City of London and other important areas of London but is not definitive. The BFI and Imperial War Museum (IWM) have inevitably much London material in their collections, but the remit of these institutions is national not local. London's Screen Archives is a network of over seventy organisations with a shared vision which is to preserve and share London's history on film. London's Screen Archives work to preserve and share the city's film heritage. The team supports over a hundred archives, museums and libraries in the capital, helping to collaborate on projects, make their moving image collections more accessible and bring screen heritage alive for Londoners. The London Screen Study Collection was part of the LSA network and the LSSC project was funded by Film London at some stages[8].

In terms of the state of the periphery as I define it the picture painted above seems quite comforting and positive for the future of the sector. However things are not quite what they seem perhaps and the voices of my respondents coming from the sector express distress and frustration at lack of financial support and opportunities for legacy for their work. Lack of funding, changing agendas and

---

[7] **http://www.filmlondon.org.uk**
[8] **https://www.londonsscreenarchives.org.ukhttp://www.communityarchives.org.uk**

a particular attitude to the arts is encapsulated by JP who also notes the effect of neo-liberalism on

many aspects of the current cultural world in terms of funding. This applies to the arts especially and

he sums this up as 'you want something, you pay for it yourself' which means that organisations that

deliver collectively and in the public sphere suffer from chronic lack of funding. It is notable that LSA

forms a very small part of Film London's work and while their website enables one to view some

London archive film online, collections like the LSSC once funded by them languish unfunded and

neglected. One of my respondents SM has over forty years' experience in the sector working at the

BBC as Head of Broadcast Archives, as Chair of FOCAL (the Federation of Commercial Audiovisual

Libraries) and as Chair of MACE. She also works as a media archive consultant offering advice on

archive management. Her views on the importance of archive film material and the attitude of the

BFI towards RFAs echoed the frustrations expressed by other respondents. 'It frustrates me so much

that this content is the main source of information and knowledge for at least three or four

generations and yet as a society we treat it as ephemera'. SM felt that the BFI should play a bigger

role in helping regional archives suggesting 'it seems to be quite wrong to expect archives to be

maintaining these collections, spending money on their preservation and restoration, creating

websites to make it accessible or databases and employing staff to manage it. Those are all fairly

high capital and revenue investment costs but how are you supposed to find the money to pay for

that?' While it could be argued that the state should pay as these films are national assets the

current climate is not conducive and there are a lot of valuable collections with organisations that

may have no other source of income than monetising their films in whatever way they can.

THE UNKNOWN, THE UNMAPPED AND THE MYSTERIOUS

If I want to paint a rounded picture of the film archive sector, I cannot neglect the unknown and

unmapped, what IC calls 'the whole question of informal collections and amateur film, personal film

and so forth. Again, archives have started collections and conferences have been held for family film,

home movies. There's no stable way of preserving this, they tend to be randomly stored, largely

uncatalogued and quite mysterious.' These collections and archives exist in a space between the private and public spheres and Zimmerman (1995) discusses this relationship with particular reference to the emotional importance of amateur film and home movies which 'harness subjectivity, imagination and spontaneity within the privatised contexts of leisure and family life' (p.4). This suggests a type of value and status for this material in creating a repository outside of 'official' archives but discovering, mapping and defining this material remains problematic.

One such collection was the LSSC. The LSSC is a case study in the difficulties in creating stable definitions for this type of collection. The kind of archive we were creating (if we were) was difficult to pin down. One starting point was to consider the LSSC as a community archive. Flinn (2007) points out that defining community archives is not easy and that definitions are complex and capable of multiple interpretations (p.152). The LSSC was not a community archive even by Flinn's flexible definitions as it was not part of or run by a community group, heritage project or local history society. Flinn et al (2009*)* give the definition of a community archive as 'collections of material gathered primarily by members of a given community' (p.73). But neither was the LSSC a professional archive or part of a heritage service. The LSSC could be defined as an unofficial archive within an institution and did perform some of the functions of an archive as suggested by Flinn(2007) in that we 'expanded interest into the history of the communities, streets, workplaces, places of worship in which family members lived their lives' (p.159).

One example of the generally unknown and unmapped is the Barry Gray Archive. Evans (2015) describes how Gray (the composer for Gerry Anderson's TV science fiction series including *Thunderbirds, UFO* and *Space 1999)* had relocated to Guernsey, setting up a studio in a nearby German wartime bunker. Gray died in 1984. In 1993 his adoptive son brought Gray's archive of materials to a lockup in Chelsea where they were collected by Ralph Titterton, who was involved with *Fanderson*, the Gerry Anderson appreciation society. He and his partner Cathy Ford have looked after the archive materials in their own home ever since. Evans notes the distinction between owning and possessing an archive as the Independent Television Company own the rights to the

archive but do not want to keep or care for it. Evans describes the archive as comprising of 'hundreds of beautiful and sometimes illuminated hand written manuscripts; over six hundred reels of audio tape; notebooks, letters and receipts' (p.2). The archive also contains home movies. Work has been done producing study scores and a website was set up in 2008 and Evans notes that 'with funding and support the Barry Gray archive can give future generations an understanding of early British electroacoustic musical production' (p.6). However, in 2019 Gray's work is still under documented and his archive is still located in a private house twenty six years after its discovery. Examples of the unknown and unmapped outside of the UK can include what IC describes as 'non-territorial or de-territorialised collections like the Palestinian archive' which document disputed territories and may have no infrastructure. Another example is the archive at INCA Guinea-Bissau which consists of audio tapes and video copies of Guinean film makers' work. Lund (2018) describes her attempts to document this material which is fragmented in the extreme. These examples barely scratch the surface of this aspect of the sector. They give a sense of an unknown, unmapped and unexplored periphery both inside and outside the UK. There is no totalising way to find out what is out there and no way of knowing what you can get access to since material may be preserved for personal reasons in the first place.

IC calls working with this material 'visual archaeology' and this has been my own experience over twenty years. Fee and Fee (2012) argue that visual archaeology is a method to understand the past through the analysis and interpretations of visual images. But here I also mean the act of 'digging out' actual film material that is inaccessible as I found in my trips around London to collect film from different boroughs and institutions for the London Screen Study Collection. I travelled to Woolwich or Haringey with a rucksack to be handed cans of film, boxes of unseen videos and mysterious collections of 8mm film by archivists and curators who had no equipment with which to view their unknown potential treasures. Doing this work brought to mind Zimmerman's (1995) comments about retrieving amateur film from the 'garbage dump of film and cultural studies' (p.xv) though in this case I was also retrieving film material from an actual garbage dump as archivists expressed

their desire to get rid of material that seemed irrelevant to them because it was unknown and unreachable. The real and vulnerable materiality of the archive was brought home to me here in the act of packing up these rusty cans and dusty boxes which had been probably destined for the scrap heap.

The Mitchell & Kenyon Collection is an example of a buried archive that moved into the light. The discovery of these 800 films has been described as film's equivalent of Tutankhamen's tomb. It was one of the most important finds in the field of early British film studies. The films, the output of Messrs Mitchell & Kenyon's company and consisting of actualities dating from the 1890s onwards, were found crammed into three metal drums in a cellar in Blackburn. The films were donated to the BFI for preservation and were the subject of a BBC TV series. The films provide a unique social record of everyday life in early 20th century Britain through street and transport scenes, factory gate films, sporting events and public entertainment and leisure[9].

The BFI publication *The Lost World of Mitchell & Kenyon* provides an in-depth analysis of this Collection and Patrick Russell, at that time Keeper of Non-Fiction at the BFI, vividly describes the arrival of the films. 'On a warm afternoon in July 2000, a van pulls into the BFI's J. Paul Getty Conservation Centre in Berkhamsted. Inside are 17 ice cream tubs, unlikely receptacles for the BFI's most exciting recent acquisition. On arrival they and their contents - 826 uncored rolls of nitrate film - are transferred to a holding vault which is then padlocked shut' (p. 12). Russell calls this 'a mundane starting point' and notes that four years later the public is exposed to this 'lost world' through screenings, DVDs and the TV series. The vulnerability and fragility of this newly discovered archive is brought to life and Russell reminds us that 'our film heritage relies on a complex interaction of individual and institutional behaviour with sheer luck' (p.13). The Mitchell & Kenyon films came into the light though in recent years there has been less heard about them. There must be other such collections hidden waiting to be discovered though money, time and resources may mean they will never be found. IC suggests that Mitchell & Kenyon is an example of collections that

---

[9] **www.screenonline.org.uk/film/id/1084507**

have come down and developed their own history creating a corpus through a discovery. As he says 'it's not a linear matter, it's not a hierarchical matter. It's a matter of who has the passion and the ability to research these collections and trace them.'

REFLECTIONS ON CULTURAL HERITAGE AND VALUE

I have commented in this chapter on how changing policies, agendas and constraints at the central institutions for film in the UK have impinged on organisations at the periphery. In this section I will reflect on some issues around cultural heritage and value bearing in mind the view voiced by all of my respondents and endorsed by myself that the film archive sector in the UK is viewed as a second class citizen in terms of resources and possibilities.

Vecco's (2010) writing on the concept of cultural heritage through the lens of directives, charters and resolutions across Europe is useful as she flags up the concept of cultural property used in various countries to mean heritage (p.322). The idea of heritage as personal and common belonging to individuals and nations is easy to grasp when thinking about buildings or paintings but less so when considering film archives which can be intangible and are often inaccessible. Vecco does suggest a less restrictive approach in which heritage is no longer defined on the basis of its material aspect and in which 'intangible cultural heritage can be protected and safeguarded' (p. 321). This could apply to film archives and provides one starting point to think about cultural heritage as it applies to this sector.

Hewison (2014) writing on cultural capital and the fall of creative Britain under New Labour provides a useful framework to look at what is meant by cultural heritage and value. Culture in its traditional sense means arts and heritage and Hewison suggests three strands or viewpoints for defining the value of projects. He labels these as instrumental, intrinsic and institutional. By instrumental he means 'the measurable economic and social benefits that they bring' (p. 136). Such benefits are hard to measure and several of my respondents have talked about the nearly impossible task of

demonstrating this for archive film. By intrinsic value Hewison means the aesthetic experience offered and the historical, social and symbolic meaning that people find in arts projects (p.136).

 A third term coined by Holden in a series of Demos pamphlets published between 2004 and 2008 and referenced by Hewison was institutional value, meaning a way of expressing the public value that cultural organisations generate by making arts and heritage available to their audiences. However the effects of neoliberalism and a target based culture has had negative effects on the film archive sector. These ideas include economic liberalisation policies such as privatisation, austerity, deregulation, free trade and reductions in government spending in order to increase the role of the private sector in the economy and society. Hewison suggests that 'triumphant neoliberalism had become so all pervasive and all-encompassing that other ideologies were silenced' (p.6) and he believes that neoliberalism has brought about a pursuit of redundant novelty and greed (p. 5). Writing in 1999, McRobbie describes the 'sheer frustration at the endless rounds of cuts to the arts, culture and the media' (p.23) and notes 'these cuts remind us of our own marginality, requiring of us at the same time that we step inside a sponsorship or lottery culture' (p. 23).

From 1997 onwards under New Labour and successive governments a culture of targets and measurements has meant that Key Performance Indicators, meaning here quantifiable measures to evaluate the success of an organization in meeting objectives, have become a method of deciding value for projects. These are usually numerical metrics. This is problematic as imposing targets in the cultural field is difficult due to the lack of an agreed methodology for assessing their achievement and demonstrating the impact of cultural projects. So while it is possible to calculate outputs in numbers, outcomes and the effect of actions are much harder to measure. As CW had said organisations cannot start from need but are always project driven and must fit into what funders require, thus having to match the aims of the funder with what they want to do. CW discussed as a case study the project 'London: A Bigger Picture', which she managed for three years, in terms of funding and the relationship with funders. This project received £1 million in funding with the Heritage Lottery Fund providing a grant of £498,500 and the rest in match funding from partners,

either in cash or kind[10]. (This is a common funding model for projects - the London Screen Study Collection project was funded this way several times during its ten year existence.) In terms of 'London: A Bigger Picture' CW noted that the funders demanded large outputs in numerical terms such as hours of film donated, numbers of people/groups engaged with and hours of film screened and it was necessary to negotiate with funders as some of these numerical outputs proved very difficult to achieve.

CONCLUSION

However I choose to articulate value and impact in institutional terms, local archive film can offer a space to explore cultural participation which can be outside of state cultural support and situated locally in the everyday realm. This is one of the strengths but also possible weaknesses of the sector. Voices from the audience allow an exploration of what Miles & Gibson (2016) call 'everyday participation' (p. 151). Discussing the findings of the AHRC project 'Understanding Everyday Participation - Articulating Cultural Value', they note in particular the importance of place in participation and access. They also stress that place can be regarded as a situated process since 'everyday culture is fundamentally rooted in the experiences and relations of place' (p. 1.) They also note the need to further explore cultural participation outside of state cultural support and situated locally in the everyday realm and reference Taylor (2016) whose interrogation of the cultural participation survey *Taking Part* found that only 8.7% of the UK population was highly engaged with state-supported forms of culture[11]. While this finding has significance for archive film projects, Belfiore (2016) adds a note of caution suggesting that 'in its travels through journalistic writing, the blogosphere, policy reports and conversations amongst professionals, the 8% statistic was on occasion misrepresented, misunderstood and even completely turned on its head' (p. 212).

The relationship between the centre and the periphery of the film archive sector remains complex and troubled. London is still a powerful centripetal force with BFI Southbank and Film London

---

[10] **www.filmlondon.org.uk/london-a-bigger-picture**
[11] **https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/takingpartsurvey**

operating from the capital. But at a time of austerity and heavy cuts particularly to the arts it is difficult to envisage a rosy future for the sector. Voices from the sector suggest that a target setting culture and the effects of neoliberalism mean an ongoing struggle to prove the worth of archive film. This is coupled with the removal of arts subjects from the National Curriculum and the general downgrading of music, art and drama. In any case, film has never featured strongly in early education and it seems unlikely this will occur in the current climate. Projects get funding and take place, audiences view archive film in community centres and village halls, regional film archives create lively and interesting programmes and collections and the work of the sector continues. This is due a great deal to the hard work and labour of those in the sector. IC said of unmapped archives 'it's a matter of who has the passion and the ability to research these collections and trace them' and I argue that that same passion and ability on the part of many individuals allows this work to go on.

Chapter 4 Voices from the Film Archive Sector 1: Interviews

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The next three chapters open up a cohort of professional and non- professional voices from the film archive sector and here I give an outline of how these chapters relate to one another and contribute to the overall thesis. As I describe in the main thesis introduction I first laid out theoretical frameworks for debate that addressed my research questions through an extensive literature review, fitting the film archive into academic discourse. The methodology chapter discussed ways I might interrogate these debates and design research to illuminate archival practice with film material. Since the work of archivist/practitioners takes place largely within the parameters and influences of institutions in the film archive sector and this practice is linked to wider issues, I analysed the current condition of the sector in terms of history and relationships in Chapter 3. Chapters 4-6 are focussed on voices from the sector, firstly archivists/practitioners and their role, then an autoethnographical examination of my own role and career and finally the voices of the audience. The relationship between the archivist/practitioner the audience is interrogated in these chapters.

This chapter addresses the research question: what is the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history practice with film archives? These individuals function as cultural intermediaries and the interviews teased out their roles in the enactment of different archival projects. The starting point and conceptualisation of the interviews with archivists/practitioners was rooted in my own career and experiences in the sector. In a long career in arts and education, I had worked at the British Film Institute (BFI) creating and delivering education events and programmes, as a lecturer in film and media at Birkbeck College and as Research and Development Officer for the London Screen Study Collection (LSSC) at Birkbeck. During nine years with the LSSC, I had worked with many colleagues in the sector as partners and collaborators in different projects and initiatives. The human dimensions and emotional labour of enabling and delivering work with this material is reflected here

in respondent testimonies and also in Chapter 5, where my own experience within the sector and with the LSSC is offered as an autoethnographical case study.

Public engagement with archive film has been ongoing for some years in various organisations, nationally and locally. However, a systematic critique of what is actually happening in the world of the film archive sector has not been undertaken to date particularly in terms of understanding the hopes, fears, opinions and modes of practice engaging archivists and practitioners. These practices have not been systematically examined or analysed in detail epistemologically outside of individual project evaluations. The interviews illuminate some of the practices that archivists and practitioners employ in making meaning from moving image material. I have collated information that is of use to organisations in the field in future planning and funding as well as providing new insights into the use of archive film for public history engagement and memory work. The interviews also provide insights into issues around cultural policy and engagement and the value and function of public history as filtered through the experience of those in the field.

One respondent, a film archivist with forty years' experience, felt that this examination of practice was 'needed as a way of interrogating what we do and it has not been done before'. He also noted that 'the film archive world is too enclosed and too self-obsessed in the sense it doesn't look beyond its own practice and material and talks only to itself'. This world has in some ways remained invisible one reason being that pre-digital local archive film can be perceived by some as irrelevant in a digital era. Film archives can also be perceived as labour intensive and difficult to fund with a sense that mainstream cinema may be more important and deserving of attention. This mapping of a relatively unknown landscape has been created through a series of voices including my own, revealing models and modes of practice. I have uncovered a discursive set of materials- testimonies, insights and barriers-through the collective narratives, experiences and repertoires of respondents. I have also opened up a series of debates to a wider audience beyond the film archive world which foregrounds concerns and offers challenges for the sector as to long-held assumptions about what makes good practice. For illustration, one example of a very common mode of practice mentioned by all

respondents has been the use of this material in various forms for memory work with older people. This is generally seen as a safe way of working and one which has appealed to funding bodies. This model of 'let's watch some nice old film and then have a cup of tea' has merit for social interaction but I have observed it lead to some lazy and bizarre practice such as screening archive film material about World War 2 and expecting a group of older people to reminiscence about their experiences in a war which ended before they were born.

I carried out the interviews from October 2017-July 2018, in London, Nottingham, Leicester and Sheffield. Half of the respondents were London-based and others had worked in London before moving elsewhere. I carried out ten individual interviews, one group interview with five respondents and a small group interview with two respondents. The total number of respondents was thirteen as four participants were interviewed individually and then again as part of a group. This was because of their extensive experience and knowledge of the sector which merited more than one interview. Some respondents were archivists, one retired after forty years in the sector; some were practitioners working at various organisations in the UK; two had been archivists but now worked in the film archive sector in different roles; one was the former director of the LSSC project at Birkbeck College, University of London. The data captured from these interviews was collected by means of field notes written in concretely descriptive terms as well as verbatim transcripts from qualitative interviews with archivists and practitioners. Interviews were recorded with audio only and I transcribed the tapes to hard copy myself.

PLANNING THE INTERVIEWS

I describe interview planning in detail in Chapter 2 Methodology. The interviews were informed by what Hill and Lloyd (2018) label as practitioner research and first-person action research. Hill and Lloyd suggest that 'practice-led inquiry is distinguished from other forms of practitioner research by its starting or initiating point within the inquirer's own practice' (p.1). Hill and Lloyd expand the concept and definition of Provenance as a strategy or process to enable practitioners to recognise

knowledge arising from their own experience and to use that knowledge in research and theory building. Provenance creates 'a starting point and scaffold for practice-led inquiry, enabling a professional to interrogate their practice' (Hill and Lloyd, p.1). Anderson suggests that an opportunistic CMR which I define myself to be has acquired familiarity with a group through occupational, recreational or lifestyle participation (p.379), where in this case the group membership precedes the decision to conduct research on the group. These methodological approaches in particular informed my interviews with former colleagues and experienced archivists and practitioners to map current practice models and topics of concern. The interviews helped to create a hierarchy of what seemed important to them in their work and in the sector as well as personal feelings about the work they had done over time. In planning the interviews, I prepared a short list of possible questions and potential themes/topics to cover and sent these to respondents in advance. Initial topics suggested by me for discussion included: the creative possibilities of archive film; the cultural impact and value of archive film; funding; the value and status of archive film; locality; personal reflections on working with archive film; subjective appraisals of the archivist's role; nostalgia; memory. These were not definitive as I wanted there to be maximum flexibility for respondents to create their own topics. Key to this was developing what Rappley (2004) calls 'a relaxed and encouraging relationship' (p. 19) with the respondents and creating what Denzin (2002) notes as a 'collaborative or active format where interviewer and respondent tell a story together' (p. 839) so that in this format a conversation occurs and interviewer and respondent collaborate in telling a conjoint story.

BACKGROUND TO RESPONDENTS - ORIGIN, AUTHORITY, STATUS

I knew most of my respondents as former colleagues and had worked with them or had met them professionally. Some I knew by reputation as they were high profile individuals in the sector. They represented a huge repository of experience within the sector as archivists, practitioners and archivists/practitioners. The respondents also represented a number of organisations both

nationally and locally across the UK. The organisations included: British Film Institute (BFI)Research Statistics Unit; Age Exchange, London; National Fairground and Circus Archive (NFCA) ,Sheffield; Media Archive for Central England (MACE); Learning on Screen, London formerly the British Universities Film and Video Council (BUFVC); Broadway Cinema, Nottingham; Boots Archive, Nottingham; Independent Cinema Office (ICO),London. However all respondents had worked at many other organisations over their careers. I chose this cohort of respondents because of their status within the sector and the profession, so that they might create an authoritative narrative of current practice. All had held or were currently in senior leadership roles, had worked extensively on major funded projects within the community and were individually and collectively very knowledgeable about issues surrounding moving image archives. Two had retired after long careers, but the others were active in the sector and in the community working with archive film.

Two respondents were lecturers at De Montfort University (DMU), Leicester and one was Professor of Film History at Birkbeck College, University of London. These three had moved into academia after long careers in the sector. LP, now a senior lecturer at DMU, had been the Director of the Broadway, an art-house independent cinema in Nottingham. SP, a lecturer at DMU had been an education officer at the Broadway and also at the independent Phoenix Cinema, Leicester and had worked with the BFI and MACE on community projects. IC had been the director of the LSSC project, and is a renowned senior academic with an international profile in the film archive sector and beyond. He has published widely and is a world authority on the subject of archives and film.

Three of my respondents had connections with MACE - JP was the former CEO and CW the current CEO, while SM has been the Chair of the Board since 2014. To give some background and context, MACE is the specialist regional film archive for the East and West Midlands. Their aim is to make film, video and digital materials of the region as accessible as possible. To do this they collect, preserve and document moving images of the region as well as those filmed by people from the region, so there can be better understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the history and culture of the Midlands. MACE is one of nine English regional film archives and has links with the UK's

national film archives at the British Film Institute, the Imperial War Museum (IWM) and the National Libraries of Wales and Scotland. They were one of the first archives in the UK to be accredited under the National Archives Accreditation Scheme[1].

CW the current CEO of MACE is an experienced archivist with a PhD in archiving. She has taught film archiving at post-graduate level and has delivered training programmes to new entrants and professionals. Before taking up the post at MACE, she managed London's Screen Archives (LSA) at Film London, the regional screen agency for London. CW joined MACE as CEO in early 2017.

JP was CEO of MACE from 2000-2017 and is now retired. Previously, he had worked at the BFI for twenty years spending five years as a cataloguer, five years as Assistant Documentary Films Officer and ten years as Keeper of Documentary Collections. He was closely involved in the establishment of regional archives in the UK, especially the Yorkshire Film Archive and the North-East and South-West Archives. In 1999 he carried out a study on whether London should have its own regional archive. It was thought not necessary but this study led to the formation of London's Screen Archives in 2006. I asked JP what his most important concern in his forty year career in the sector had been and he replied 'I think across my entire career my most important concern was the establishment of film archives in the regions'. JP was one of three extremely experienced respondents with long careers in the sector, the others being IC and SM. JP had a broad overview of organisational structures and historical background and held very strong opinions about what had happened and was happening in the film archive sector as well as holding some controversial views about national and local organisations. I explore these in more detail both in this chapter and in Chapter 3: Institutions of the Film Archive. JP was an archivist by profession though he was closely involved in practice over many years.

Other archivist respondents were SC, Archive Manager of the Boots Archive Nottingham for ten years which was the only corporate archive included in the study and AH, Head of the National

---

[1] **https://www.macearchive.org**

Fairground and Circus Archive (NFCA), Sheffield. AH has had a varied career, beginning as an artist in technical illustration with a degree in fine art and then going on to teach art and design before moving into film production. He then worked on community engagement projects around media and cultural heritage, spending time at Screen West Midlands (the regional screen agency) and as a consultant for large scale film and media projects. He was on a short term contract as Head of the NFCA at the time of the interview.

To give some background and context, the NFCA came about due to the PhD research and lifetime commitment of Professor Vanessa Toulmin, Director of the NFCA from its inception until 2016. The Archive is part of the Special Collections and Archive Division of the University of Sheffield Library and embodies the history of popular entertainment in the United Kingdom from the seventeenth century onwards, covering every aspect of the travelling fair, circus and allied entertainments as well as the culture, business and life of travelling show people. The NFCA provides a primary source of research and teaching material concerning a wealth of popular culture and history from the unique view point of the travelling entertainment industry. The Archive collects material from the fairground, circus and the allied industries that found a place in the early travelling fair, including early film, circus, sideshows, magic, boxing, variety and amusement parks. Some of the key collections are the Shufflebottom and Smart Family Collections, the library and archive of the Circus Friends Association of Great Britain, the John Bramwell Taylor Collection, the Malcolm Airey Collection, the John Turner Collection, the maps, plans and charts of British amusement parks, the World's Fairs and Expositions Collection and the World's Fair Newspaper collection. They also hold thousands of posters, handbills, programmes, periodicals and photographs[2]. I note that the NFCA has impressive collections and credentials, however my personal experience of visiting and engaging with the Archive was not positive and I will expand on this later in this chapter.

One other respondent SA is currently Head of Membership Services and Information at Learning on Screen but an archivist by profession. Learning on Screen is a charity and membership organisation,

---

[2] **https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/nfca**

which has been in existence since 1948. They are experts in the use of moving image in education, delivering online academic databases, on demand video resources, training, information and advice. Their work is developed through communication with members and through the findings of their specialist research unit, providing the higher and further education sector with trusted and scholarly audio-visual services. Formerly the British Universities Film and Video Council (BUFVC) they are currently transitioning into their new name and branding. Services offered include an on-demand TV and radio service for education. Their academically-focused system allows staff and students at subscribing institutions to record programmes from over 65 free-to-air channels, and also to search an archive of over 2 million broadcasts. This creates a modern and engaging learning experience that meets the expectations of students, with a reliable and academically focused archive of programmes. BUFVC also offers TRILT, the Television and Radio Index for Learning and Teaching which an online source for UK television is and radio broadcast data. Learning on Screen has future plans which centre on opening up their wealth of moving image assets even further and engaging with members to put user-experience at the heart of their services. In 2017, they unified all online services into a single responsive domain, providing a user-led scholarly experience. BUFVC/Learning on Screen's commitment to access to materials is exemplary and at the core of their mission[3]. I offer this detailed background to BUFVC here because no other organisation in the UK works quite in this way and SA had particular insights based on his work at BUFVC. BUFVC is a unique organisation in some ways and SA was able to offer some unique insights. His take on how to use archive film and how to deal with some of the issues surrounding working with this material differed from other respondents as I explore later.

Other respondents also offered unique perspectives on the sector, for example, SM whose career had mainly been at the BBC for 30 years. She had held senior posts as Head of Broadcast Archives and Head of Marketing for BBC Archive Content. SM is also chair of the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) and conference and content director for the Federation Internationale des

---

[3] **https://learningonscreen.ac.uk**

Archives de Television/International Federation of Television Archives (FIAT/IFTA). Since leaving the BBC in 2001, she has been an independent media archive consultant offering advice on archive management, research and training. As Chair of MACE she was also a useful link with other respondents at this organisation. SM, IC and JP in particular represented decades of experience in the sector and their willingness to share their insights and opinions was very valuable.

I interviewed practitioners working in community settings as well as archivists in order to obtain viewpoints from different perspectives. While archivists are often engaged with practice, I explored how the concerns of archivists and practitioners might converge, overlap or differ. MJ from Age Exchange works extensively with reminiscence and older people and since archive film has been used across the UK over some years for public history and memory work in a variety of settings, his viewpoint and experience of this was invaluable. Age Exchange was founded in 1983 by Pam Schweitzer MBE, in recognition of the growing understanding of the value of reminiscence to older people. For over 30 years, Age Exchange has developed new ways of working to reduce loneliness and isolation. Within the trend of an aging population they also identified the need to help people to live well with dementia both in the community and in care settings. They pass on expertise through providing specialist reminiscence training for other professionals from libraries, care homes and museums[4].

MJ has worked as the Arts and Education Co-ordinator at Age Exchange London since 2006. He has a theatre background, was formerly a professional actor and has worked in arts and drama in educational settings. I had met MJ several times at film-related events and knew his reputation as a trainer and highly experienced facilitator, using archive film alongside other resources for memory work.

JB was another practitioner that I had worked with previously. She had worked in the BFI Development Department, as Education Officer at the Rio Cinema, Brixton and as Deaf Heritage

---

[4] **https://www.age-exchange.org.uk**

Project Manager for the British Deaf Association (BDA) for a major Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) funded project to enable preservation of their film and video collection and to make it accessible to the Deaf community and beyond. I had worked on this project offering training on the use of archive film as a reminiscence tool and knew JB personally as well as professionally. Since 2016, JB has been Partnerships Manager at ICO, London. ICO is the UK's national body that supports independent cinemas, film festivals and exhibitors. They programme a network of over twenty cinemas and mixed arts venues, offering a wide range of films, training, consultancy and archive screening days. They distribute films that make a contribution to the diversity of cinema culture in the UK[5].

PG was the only respondent I had not known previously and I had met him through LP. He was part of the East Midlands group interview and I was unable to interview him individually due to his commitments, which was unfortunate as more detail on his work in rural communities would have added additional insights into modes of practice. PG provides community archive film shows in the East Midlands, Leicestershire and Rutland, often using film donated by local people as well as film accessed through MACE. He visits village halls and his focus is very much on locality and local history. PG was well known throughout the East Midlands and LP later mentioned in her interview similar individuals doing work outside of the formality of archives and institutions of the sector, though I was not able to contact them during the project. PG spoke about his work in the East Midlands group interview and explained how members of the public give him their home movies and other amateur films which he then screens in venues such as community centres and church halls.

It was apparent during interviews with these respondents that there was a blurring of roles between archivists and practitioners since many archivists were involved in practice. There is a group of people who were working outside of the constraints of organisational structures. However the roles blurred less in terms of practitioners as these respondents were not qualified archivists and had not

---

[5] **https://www.independentcinemaoffice.org.uk**

worked professionally in that role. Issues around perception of roles will be explored further in the next section of this chapter.

MAPPING THE LANDSCAPE FROM RESPONDENT TESTIMONIES

My interviewees consisted of seven women and six men, of which five people were aged over fifty and eight aged between thirty and fifty. In my anecdotal experience there are more women working in the sector than men. However my choice of interviewees was largely based on personal knowledge from my own work and practice and while this group may not represent the diversity within the sector, they represent a rich array of experience. A number of common themes and concerns had emerged from my research questions and literature review and I carried these forward into the interviews enabling a structure and framework for planning. These are: funding including the impact and well-being agendas, value/cultural value and access to material as it impacts upon the use of film for projects. These themes were not definitive as I wanted there to be maximum flexibility for respondents to create their own topics and narratives using an unstructured interview style as defined by Raune (2005). Respondents wanted to talk and be listened to and most of the interviews evolved into a shared professional dialogue and discourse. I was conscious throughout the interviews of my own role and that I was investigating a world that I could not view only through my own interpretive lens but that I needed to ask what really mattered to these professionals. What follows is a synthesis of ideas, testimonies and exposition on major areas concerning archive film and its use which arose as core issues of concern for all respondents and echoed my own in many cases. Where appropriate, exemplar quotes from respondents are included.

Funding and Impact Agenda

JP's four decades working in both the BFI and the archive film sector enables his personal understanding and interpretation of a UK wide historical overview of funding issues and also explains why he believes core funding for the sector has not been a priority. This lack of core funding has affected funding for individual projects and initiatives. While this is his narrative, as an overview

it adds to an understanding of the current funding situation, where film archives have no statutory

funding for their work on preservation, access and public engagement and thus the need to find

sources of income becomes paramount. This has effects on the type of practice that organisations

are able to do and I explore this further later in the chapter. IC had also worked in the sector and at

the BFI for many years, so I include some of his ideas in this overview. JP and IC's stories and

evidence make clear the impact of changing agendas in the sector, as does a tracing of the growth of

regional film archives from 1979 onwards when there were only three such archives- Manchester,

East Anglia and Scotland. This number grew over some years to include a variety of regions.

The BFI funded regional arts boards and in the 1990s extended archiving as a requirement to the

regional arts boards for funding of regional archives. Regional arts boards helped set up regional film

archives but when the Film Council took over funding, things became more difficult as there was a

splintering of responsibility for film archives. This led to the Film Council having funding

responsibility but no archive policy and the BFI having no funding responsibility but an ostensible

responsibility for archive policy. The Film Archive Forum was a place where regional film archives

could meet and discuss issues with each other and the BFI. As Research & Development Officer for

the London Screen Study Collection, I attended these meetings regularly. As a professional working

with archive film, I found these undoubtedly a useful meeting place for discussion on relevant issues

as well as planning funding and projects and getting input from the BFI*.* However changing priorities

over time have meant that in recent years archives in general and film archives in particular have

experienced increasingly difficult funding issues in the current political climate, as austerity and cuts

affect local authorities, voluntary sector organisations and charities.

 The BFI in their five year strategy, as laid out in their website, is investing almost £500 million from

2017-2022. BFI2022 outlines how the 'BFI will continue to focus on audiences and culture,

supporting film education and skills development and backing exciting new filmmaking.'[6] This is

made up of Government grant-in-aid, BFI earned income and National Lottery funding. However

---

[6] **http://www.bfi.org.uk/news-opinion/news-bfi/announcements/bfi2022-five-year-strategy-uk-film**

regional film archives and community organisations continue to struggle to find funding in an era of austerity and cuts to the arts. This was flagged up by all interview respondents. Asking the general public to donate funding is increasingly common. One such example from MACE is from their donations page which states:

> The process of preparing, copying and cataloguing moving image materials is a time consuming and expensive business. Whilst we receive some public funding an increasingly large proportion of the money that supports our work has to be self-generating. And, so far, we haven't been able to raise enough money to begin a process of systematic copying. For that we need more skilled staff time and specialist equipment and for that we need more money![7]

JP also used the example of county record offices to illuminate these issues. They often have strong connections to local archives, as in the case of MACE which has close links with the county record offices across the Midlands for whom they act as the specialist repository for moving images held on film, video and digital formats. JP noted that Herefordshire had built a new archive for the county which the council then announced would have to be self-funding. To quote JP: 'You cannot self-fund an archive; it's not a commercial activity. You can generate some income on the side... years ago I described... the archive world as the Cinderella of the cultural world and film archives are kind of the Cinderella of Cinderellas'. This view was echoed in different ways by other respondents as discussed below.

For example, CW discussed funding mainly in terms of her involvement with LSA at Film London, the regional screen agency for London particularly a major project that she managed there called 'London: A Bigger Picture'. She also offered insights into her role as CEO of MACE. She felt that from her experience everything is contingent on funding and also that there was always a 'need to start from zero' and for regional film archives to identify stakeholders and understand what support they could bring in either cash or kind. This was a continual task which she identified as the need to manage funders and stakeholders and explore potential opportunities. A lack of core funding often means archivists and practitioners are as CW put it 'chasing their tail all the time and cannot start

---

[7] **https://www.macearchive.org**

from need but are always project driven and must fit into what funders require, thus having to match the aims of the funder with what you want to do'. CW discussed as a case study 'London: A Bigger Picture', which she managed for three years, giving insights in terms of funding and the relationship with funders. This project received £1 million in funding with the Heritage Lottery Fund providing a grant of £498,500 and the rest in match funding from partners, either in cash or kind. (This is a common funding model for projects and the LSSC project was funded this way several times during its nine year existence.) In terms of 'London: A Bigger Picture' CW noted that the funders demanded large outputs in numerical metrics such as hours of film donated, numbers of people/groups engaged with and hours of film screened and it was necessary to negotiate with funders as some of these numerical outputs were so large they proved very difficult to achieve.[8]

The interview with SC at the Boots Archive was a useful addition demonstrating that funding is not always just about money but about priorities as seen by organisations. She was the only archivist from a corporate archive included in the interviews. This was because my focus was mainly on regional film archives and public sector organisations but I met SC at a funder event and wanted to get her different perspectives on issues. The archive was funded by Boots but it was notable that their moving image material was under exploited and SC said in her interview that the company does not have the expertise or equipment to view some films though some key films have been transferred onto digital formats and DVD .These films are 'predominantly for internal uses- training, staff conferences, information on organisational changes'. SC had brokered collaboration with MACE to deposit originals of Boots films there and to help exploit this archive film material. I was given a tour of the archive by SC and noted there was a considerable amount of film material in cans on rolling stack shelves with different formats including 16mm. During the tour, SC reiterated her earlier statement about expertise and equipment and also said that digitising material seemed a slow process.

---

[8] **www.filmlondon.org.uk/london-a-bigger-picture**

In talking to practitioners, it became apparent that attempts to get funding for projects was very time-consuming and a source of huge frustration and in some cases unhappiness, which manifested itself in interviews in emotional statements and expressions of frustration. The practitioners felt that the struggles to get adequate funding for their work often took precedence over the actual work. MJ of Age Exchange discussed funding from the perspective of a practitioner in a small charity engaged in specific activities and projects around audience engagement. He noted that funding for creative arts in general currently tends to consist of small pockets of money for time-limited projects. This affects his organisation's work in that they need to constantly be fund-raising in order to carry even small projects forward. Age Exchange focuses on memory work often with older people and there is currently funding available for work with dementia clients but not for other types of projects pointing up the tendency for different types of projects to become fashionable at specific points in time. This changing funding agenda was a source of frustration.

MJ described an Age Exchange project 'Meeting in No Man's Land' as an example of funder demands. This was a major project about WW1 in which German and British older people exchanged family histories. The education strand of the project involved school children working with film and Age Exchange formed a partnership with the London Borough of Merton, making use of their 'Carved in Stone 'archive which is a unique collection of material charting the history of Merton during WW1 and contains some local archive film which was used in the project in its specific locality. I asked MJ if any local Lewisham film (Age Exchange is in Lewisham) was used on the project and he said 'there was no scope for archive film specific to this borough, as the HLF as funders had asked for a London-wide remit.' He felt this could be seen as an example of funders driving a project in a particular way and also an example of funding issues. The HLF funded 'Meeting in No Man's Land' for fifteen months with a sum of £83,900 and the project ended in April 2017.The project was highly successful in terms of impact and outcome yet attempts by Age Exchange to get funding for a legacy have been unsuccessful.

Changing agendas were a concern for LP and SP who both had been practitioners working with audiences in community and cinema settings. Both had experienced what MJ described where ostensibly successful projects would have funding withdrawn when another set of priorities appeared. Both LP and SP were vociferous about the impact and well-being agendas which they felt had been a barrier to their work with audiences in Nottingham and Leicester. LP noted 'everything now has to be quantified in terms of impact ... I find it really difficult ... you can't always put a quantifiable value... because it can't be measured.' Belfiore (2016) in discussing the 'impact agenda' suggests that research is now expected to 'deliver demonstrable public benefits in the form of economic, cultural and social impacts' (p.206) in order to be seen as a worthy and legitimate area of spending. This is also true of projects working with clients and audiences, particularly around the discourse about a wellbeing and health agenda. The National Well-Being Programme was launched in 2010 under the UK coalition government. A measurement framework was developed comprising 10 domains and 38 measures of wellbeing which addressed issues of quality of life such as life expectancy, health, social and economic conditions, education and crime. The Wellbeing and Policy Analysis document from 2013 examines progress in the aims of this agenda and of particular interest is the section on the impact of community learning (Wellbeing Policy and Analysis p. 2) which states 'Adult learning has a substantial impact on life satisfaction, wellbeing and health' and 'Learners aged between 50-69 also benefit from learning in terms of increased wellbeing- learning can offset the natural decline seen in wellbeing as we age'[9].

Many archive film projects fall into the category of adult/community learning and respondents spoke about the need to make projects fit within the wellbeing agenda and to show 'impact' in order to receive funding. Belfiore (2016) suggests that one definition of impact is 'the effect on an individual, a community, and the development of policy or the creation of a new product of service' (p.207).

---

[9] **https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/2249 10/Wellbeing_Policy_and_Analysis_FINAL.PDF**

LP and SP had both experienced the need to prove to different funders, including the BFI and Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) that their projects were worthy of funding through demonstration of impact. They described what they called the reductive nature of making funding contingent on certain impact agendas. The endless cycles of funding applications, marketing strategies and monitoring impact leads to situations, which as LP described 'There's so many impediments to just getting on with it now and it's bureaucratic overload. So much of the grant you will get goes into... reporting, administration, the follow-up, compliance and KPIs'. She felt strongly that this was a barrier to doing the work and that people working at what she called 'the chalk face' really wanted to get film material out to audiences as their main priority.

SP described as an example an education project in rural Lincolnshire in which she had been given funding to show archive film to disadvantaged teenagers and then was expected to show impact in terms of how many young people had been deterred from taking drugs by watching the films. She felt as a result of this and other experiences that this was a frustrating field to work in, with not enough time or money to run projects effectively. Obtaining funding for project sustainability and legacy was also virtually impossible in a climate of cuts and austerity. IC also felt that sustainability was an issue: 'I mean cyberspace... is awash with abandoned projects and that's very annoying... and depressing in a way'. He felt that to have to speculate about impact was not necessarily a bad thing but that it was important that archivists/practitioners took control of how it was measured, though this is not always easy or even possible. Nevertheless IC felt those in the sector should make attempts to engage with and if necessary rewrite criteria for assessing impact.

JB of the ICO also noted the issues with funding applications she experienced as a practitioner working with community groups and schools. She felt that getting funding for any film project is difficult unless it is through the BFI. The need to focus on what film can do and how it can help achieve aims and objectives rather than the actual material itself and the emphasis on metrics as a way of both proving value and gaining funding were two issues that JB foregrounded. 'I get to the point with education where I think… I'm going to have to up the numbers...I'm asking for this

amount of money per head and must prove value for money'. JB also raised the issue of the relationship between practitioners and archivists in terms of the cost of obtaining rights cleared material for use which also affects issues of value and access which I will explore later. JB described her personal experience of and frustration with the complex negotiations needed with regional film archives to get material.

The experience of respondents was inextricably linked with political changes in attitudes to the arts over a twenty year period. Their work had been affected by what Hewison (2014) describes as the commodification of culture and the way that target-obsessed managerialism has stifled creativity. He suggests that under New Labour there grew up a culture of KPIs, evaluation and assessment for arts projects, leading to what he describes as 'a shifting undergrowth of targets, measures and inspections' (p.127). This has impact directly on current projects with archive film which often sit within the realm of community arts. This political climate had impact on practice with archive film in terms of making it very clear how institutionally limited the field has become and how projects are driven by financial necessity. Hewison's description of how cultural policy became part of economic policy (p.6) and an all-pervasive 'triumphant neoliberalism' (p.3) silenced other ideologies was echoed by respondents. Neoliberalism has continued under successive governments and Hewison references Matarasso (1997) who suggested that the result of this is that 'the arts are being sold into bonded labour to a social policy master' (p.91). Hewison's suggestion of the difficulty of demonstrating impact of cultural projects (p. 74) was borne out by the experience of practitioners.

Hewison also suggests 'the problem with imposing targets in the cultural field is the lack of an agreed methodology for assessing their achievement' (p.124). Metrics are a default position with KPIs and quantitative numerical targets taking precedence over more nuanced possibilities for measuring the performance of projects. Hewison notes that this can lead to 'evaluation fatigue' (p. 69) which was echoed by some respondents particularly in terms of what Hewison describes as 'perennial tensions between the centre and the periphery' (p.116) with the centre being the funders and the periphery the recipient of funding.

The interviews also demonstrated issues specific to the film archive sector that are inextricably linked to attitudes towards film in general and archive material in particular. These issues are connected with the value, status and accessibility of this material as I expand on in the next section of this chapter.

Value and Status

A second major area of concern for archivists and practitioners consisted of issues around the value, cultural value and resultant status of archive film. One starting point for consideration of value and status can be defined as the relationship of archive film to mainstream cinema. The latter can be considered as intrinsically having value for entertainment, educational and artistic reasons. As AH suggested: 'People have a different attitude towards commercial theatrical releases... it's a feature film, therefore it must be worth more culturally than a little clip of some guy farming his field in rural Hertfordshire'. The value of archive film is difficult to articulate and define as I have explored in previous chapters. Audiences may see archive footage on TV often as part of documentaries on World War 1 and World War 2 and the recent discussions and writing about the Peter Jackson World War 1 film *They Shall Not Grow Old* (2018) articulated a particular view of archive film as old, jerky, monochrome, incomprehensible and boring suggesting it might have more value if a well-known film director colourises it and brings it to life for us. The description of the film on the BBC website suggests that Jackson has 'transformed archive footage, enabling these soldiers to walk and talk amongst us'[10] possibly suggesting that that the original footage from the Imperial War Museum in some way had less value or impact or was certainly less accessible.

Given these constraints, conflicts and difficulties in reaching a clear definition for this material how do we measure value and how is it created, perceived and judged? Metrics, KPIs and marketability are often seen as safe ways to make this judgement. Hewison (2014) references Holden's (2004) definitions of value (p.136) suggesting that culture has an 'intrinsic' value meaning its historic, social

---

[10] **https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b0brzkzx**

and symbolic meaning that precedes its 'instrumental' value. The idea of a third 'institutional' value-
the public value that cultural organisations generate by making the arts and heritage available to
their audiences has resonance for this practice since most of it, though not all, takes place as a result
of institutions and organisations getting funding to do projects with archive film. Two possible
inflections for cultural value of archive film are metrics as ways of measuring value and/or
commitment to the principles of the historical and social value of moving image material, which are
not mutually exclusive.

All of the respondents had experienced the tensions and issues inherent in these inflections,
particularly in terms of funder demands and the need to be project driven. In the current political
climate value must be proved to get funding for preservation and access projects. Defining value for
moving image archive material seemed problematic for some respondents. All felt this that material
has historical and social value, but found it difficult to articulate exactly what form this might take.
Value seemed defined by an absence and this appeared to be a stumbling block in their discourse.
This leads to further questions on the discursive nature of value and how this might relate to the
political economy of the archive. So what is the wall blocking a clear articulation of the value of
archive film material? Having knowledge that it is valuable through practice and experience and
proving and articulating it seem different things. Respondents all discussed their experiences with
audiences who wanted to watch this material and engaged with it especially where it was
inextricably linked with their own lives/experiences. This was my own experience in practice and I
explore this further in Chapters 5 and 6.

Respondents also mentioned as part of the wall a perception of certain kinds of archive film material
as rubbish or at best ephemera. As CEO of a regional film archive CW felt there was a perception
from more commercial organisations that material held by regional film archives is 'rubbish that no-
one wants' though she and others in the sector believe these collections are of historical and social
value. CW mentioned her experiences during the project 'London: A Bigger Picture' which she
managed for Film London, where one strand of the project involved asking audiences to donate their

home movies to add to London's Screen Archives' holdings. There was audience engagement at local film screening events and project staff had conversations with attendees. CW noted that while people might have home movies to donate they would say their material had 'no value' and one phrase she noted them saying was 'oh you don't want my films- they're no good'. This implies a particular standard that archive film must achieve to be 'good' which seems connected to ideas that old grainy film is incomprehensible and boring. CW notes that people had to be encouraged on a one-to-one basis by project staff to donate their material which often turned out to have historical and social value in terms of bringing to light locations and aspects of everyday life in the project locations. CW went on to talk about the marketability/saleability of archive film and how monetary value has been used as one way of judging value. She also talked about KPIs and other metrics as performance of relevance as another way of judging value, particularly in terms of projects like 'London: A Bigger Picture' where funders were very concerned with numerical KPIs – number of screenings, hours of footage collected, audience numbers. This was similarly the case in my experience with various LSSC projects where KPIs set by external funders were sometimes not achievable and the need to negotiate with funders to get KPIs and other metrics changed became paramount and often affected how the project was carried out.

SM felt strongly that in terms of value 'it frustrates me so much that this content...this moving image... is the main source of information for at least the last three or four generations now …something that shows us ordinary people's history, their culture and the reality of everyday life should be valuable but as a society we seem to treat it as ephemera'. She felt the lack of a law of deposit for the moving image might contribute to this. Legal deposit of UK publications is part of English law that means a copy of every UK publication must be given to the British Library. No such system has ever operated for film. IC felt that archive film had value in 'giving a live sense of what used to draw the masses... film as a medium of record , taking on new meanings because of the passage of time'. IC also felt that archive film has value as 'visual archaeology and a way to find out

and discover the past' and in principle film should not be any different in value to other historical documents and yet it has been seen as different partly because of the difficulty of preserving it.

JP felt that a definition of what was meant by the term 'archive film' might be a way to help encapsulate what value such material might have although this was a personal view not echoed by other respondents. Reviewing a wide range of scholarship, it becomes apparent that writers use the descriptive terms 'archive', 'local' 'amateur' and 'home movie' fairly interchangeably and that definitions are not always easy to access. For example, Fox (2004) makes the point that a concrete definition of amateur film is hard to achieve with an emphasis placed on constructing a meaning of what 'amateur' is *not*- not sophisticated, not technically adept, not of popular interest (p.5). He also points out a negative approach to positioning amateur film, where it is defined perhaps most frequently, and most opaquely as 'not professional' (p.5). JP's own definition of archive film was as follows:

...nothing more than film that has been produced and has been privileged by being selected and put into a collection...however serendipitous that selection process might have been. There is nothing special about an archive film...it could be something very old, it could be something which was produced yesterday. The only thing that makes it an archive film is that it is in a collection of some sort... the fact that it's in a collection privileges it because it then has probably some better chance of survival. It might be that it sits in a tin on a shelf and it never gets looked at but it might mean that it gets a lot of use in different contexts.

This definition, which I have reproduced in some detail, is interesting because it reveals one archivist's mind set with emphasis on collecting, selection and survival but also contains within it acknowledgement that is important that archive film is used in different contexts to benefit audiences. The idea of archive film as both something very old or something which was produced yesterday is one that we used in the LSSC project both as a working definition and a guiding principle. JP noted that 'people in the mid-noughties went through a process of looking for collections of significance in the region... which led me to think for a long time about what we mean by 'significance' in archive film.'

He described a scenario he used with students at the University of Lincoln, where he worked as a lecturer. He asked them which film was more significant –*Bugsy Malone* or *We Chose Skegness* which was a promotional film for Skegness made in the 1960s by the town council. The students all responded that *Bugsy Malone* was more significant and had more value. However JP argued that if *We Chose Skegness* and *Bugsy Malone* were screened on the same night in a two screen cinema on the east coast of Lincolnshire the larger audience would be for the Skegness film. JP believes that the value and significance of a film 'does not reside in the film itself, it resides in the people who go to watch it, about the context in which the film exists... and it's about what that film says to the person who is seeing it, what their cultural understanding and background is going to bring.' Films in regional film archives may thus for JP at least to be said to have cultural significance and value according to what they say about the culture of a region.

JP's ideas on definition and significance engage with film and locality, local meaning here archive film about specific geographical locations and what value might mean in this context. Szczelkun (2000) suggests many of the images in archive film can be dismissed as having little value once they have left the localised context. Similarly Bottomore (2004) suggests local film is only 'local' if there is considerable overlap between the people appearing in the film and those who watch it or are intended to watch it. In some ways, this is seen as a given in practice with archive film in terms of audience as it can be assumed by some practitioners and organisations that screening locally based archive film outside of its locality will be of little interest. The project 'London: A Bigger Picture', as described by CW, very much focussed on this model of locality with fifteen outer London boroughs involved as partners. Archive film of those specific localities was both screened and collected in those localities. The use in this project of the Kinovan which was a re-creation of the travelling outdoor cinema of the 1930s meant that archive film was being screened more innovatively in terms of venue in shopping areas, festivals and schools and footage local to that area would always be shown.

Returning to JP's scenario, when asked what would happen if *We Chose Skegness* was screened a long way from Skegness, JP felt that no-one would go to see it but he was clear that this was one of the challenges for practitioners programming archive film and that 'how you develop cultural significance in a film is about thinking about the context in which you are going to screen it'. Marketing may help if the film is described in a way that makes a connection with audiences but JP felt that 'part of the problem of local film and local archive film is that people don't see beyond the locality of it'. Programming film thematically may be one way to counter this but the evidence to back up this approach as a model is anecdotal at best. Screening local film in the appropriate 'local' setting works in terms of audience engagement on one level. As JP noted 'it's very easy to attract that audience segment... that's kind of a given and I'm very happy that archive film is used to satisfy that market. The challenge ... is for anybody who like me thinks local archive film is much more interesting and much more important that just that...' In some regional film archives, an approach to the use of local film is the model characterised as curating a programme especially for a particular place and taking it out and screening it in that place. By contrast, JP mentioned the example of Flatpack Cinema based in Birmingham who are experimenting with screening quirky film in unusual venues such as pubs and are seeking new contexts in which to show archive film.

Both SA and AH were also concerned with value and SA suggested various aspects to the value of film, which he listed as 'commercial value, cultural value, the evanescence of film leading to a need to show its value'. SA was the only respondent to mention value in terms of the aesthetics of archive film and its links to art, design and music. This topic did not seem of concern to other respondents and much of the literature on archive film sees this material as having little aesthetic value. Gunning (2004) is one of the few writers on archive film who has stressed aesthetic value suggesting these films 'address us directly in their humanity and spontaneity, and beauty' (p.53) and that they are 'invaluable works of art as well as documents of history' (p.53). Such films he argues are 'fragments of history, containing the contingencies of the everyday' (p.53). AH's concerns about value were, like others, mainly linked to access and impact: 'I suppose value for me is intrinsically linked with this

notion of impact. …it's the choices of how we engage with culture full stop whether it's archive film or something else'. And again 'My perspective is always driven by the audience... what do people want... they want to see the stuff.'

In further consideration of what value might mean, I will now briefly explore public engagement with archive film for memory work as this is a very common model and has been seen in the sector as a way of creating value and enabling funding. One model that I am familiar with and was mentioned by respondents is using film for memory work with older people, focusing on personal reminiscence and nostalgia. Dames (2010) suggests that nostalgia offers 'solace and pleasure' (p.269) but also 'a longing for the vanished past, a registration of loss' (p.271). Niemeyer (2014) defines nostalgia as 'a bittersweet longing for former times and spaces' (p.1). Nostalgia can also be defined as a longing for an idealised space and time that never was. My respondents generally agreed that archive moving image material allows an emotional engagement with the past so that using archive film in this way is valuable although some practitioners challenge the usefulness of working only with older people. This model has been seen as an easy and unproblematic way to attract audiences and JP noted: 'it's easy to put on a film of Nottingham in the 1960s in the Broadway (cinema in Nottingham) on a Sunday afternoon… the auditorium will be full but it will be full of people who lived in Nottingham in the 1960s... it's very easy to attract that audience segment which from their mid-50s onwards begins to develop a nostalgia back to how things were. That's kind of a given... and I'm very happy that archive film is used to satisfy that market'. However as IC noted 'it would be unfortunate if archive film got marked down as being essentially of nostalgic value. We need to demonstrate value to younger generations'.

In her discussion of 'London: A Bigger Picture' CW spent some time talking about work with memory and nostalgia which had been part of the project. Screenings in the various London boroughs involved with the project often had a strong reminiscence element though this would be defined by which member of staff was leading it. CW noted that 'the idea that film that reflects people's sense of place was felt to be a way to create rich engagement'. Since one of the current issues for memory

work with film is the increase in clients and audience members with dementia, CW described how training on arts and reminiscence at Age Exchange by MJ and training at the Alzheimer's Society led to a revision of the curation of the programme for dementia clients. CW felt strongly that research, understanding of best practice and creation of structure must underpin this type of reminiscence screening programme aimed at dementia clients. This model is more rigorous in its approach than the 'screening and tea' model and one result was that in 'London: A Bigger Picture' film material was focussed on thematic screenings rather than borough or location- specific footage because of the audiences' possible memory issues. There was also use of clips, use of close up and no use of feature films which were considered too long. MJ had worked extensively with dementia clients and noted that film is useful for work with lower-level dementia but needs to be allied to music for clients with advanced dementia. In his experience, people with advanced dementia respond better to music with images rather than images alone. He expanded on this anecdotally with the example of a client with advanced dementia who had not responded to a photograph of Doris Day, but on seeing a musical film of her singing, was able to recognize her and talk about her films. MJ also suggested that an individual approach to such clients is needed to find out what they have cared about previously in their lives- if film was a special interest, it can be used to stimulate conversation.

One model being funded and rolled out across UK cinema venues is dementia screenings which consist of a feature screening and tea. The audiences are usually made up of dementia clients who are brought in from care home settings by staff. The features are usually musicals or light entertainment. Having attended several of these sessions, I asked some respondents for their opinions of this model. CW felt this was 'a sloppy model and perhaps not useful for dementia clients'. MJ felt that the 'idea was good in itself but that the films did not always have to be bright with lots of dancing and that the features did not always have to be 'safe' films'. He felt that people with dementia should be allowed to watch a wide variety of films if possible as this would reflect their experiences with film in the past. Both CW and MJ used archive film clips for work with clients and thought this was more useful than full length features. This model of dementia screenings was

not familiar to JP but he did note that dementia clients were 'a growing audience' and he was aware of other RFAs who were doing dementia work very much based around nostalgia.

IC, CW and SM all held specific perspectives as to why archive film might be seen as less valuable in the UK than other countries due to attitudes around the importance and significance of film. IC suggested that 'it is demonstrably the case in France that there is more funding for the infrastructure of film because film is seen as nationally important.' SM felt that 'France and the Netherlands are more innovative in uses of archive film than the UK' and CW compared the UK to France, which she felt had a more *cineaste* culture whereas in the UK the film industry at all levels has always striven to find value and this is often linked to monetary value. Respondents in general felt that there are no definitive answers to disentangling complex issues around what value and cultural value for this material might mean. They grappled with trying to define value tying it to issues of locality, models of practice, historical precedents and problems and national attitudes. They had difficulty defining value for this material in a definitive way despite many years of working with it and extensive knowledge about it. There are barriers and obstacles which appear to negate the hard work and emotional labour of archivists/practitioners in getting the 'stuff' out there. One major issue is access to material which I will explore in the next part of this chapter.

Access

All respondents felt that a high degree of unfettered access to material was necessary if practice was to be successful. By access I mean here the ability of practitioners to use, screen and work with archive film material freely without too many legal and financial constraints, though some constraints will always exist, given the complexity of provenance/ownership and the need to preserve extremely vulnerable film material . Archivists especially identified the tension between preservation and access as a major issue which was difficult to address.

Having discussed Cook's key archival paradigms in Chapter 1, I note here that ideas around the changing roles of the archivist /practitioner impinged on in JP's thoughts and reflections about his

forty years as an archivist. He recognised and acknowledged these changes throughout his own career, particularly in terms of the archivist moving from a custodian of material to a community practitioner. He suggested: 'That's something that has changed in the forty or so years I've been working in the sector... I think there was a point where the archivist was seen as the person who provided the material, who preserved the material, who arranged the material... when I went to the BFI that was what it was... and it was done behind a fairly closed door... the banner that never hung above the door might have said 'better dead than access'. JP noted that the role of the archivist changed from being just a custodian to being the exhibitor and 'that has been driven by the fact that the funders don't fund you to do any of the archive work, they fund you to engage people… what worried me over the years was that the archivist was being pushed into being **the** curator and **the** exhibitor *(his emphasis)'.* JP felt that the archivist's fundamental role was about the assessment of the potential value of something at the moment you negotiate to bring it into the collection and the business of looking after it, preserving it and facilitating access to it. Debates about the core function of the archivist and what constitutes an archive are still ongoing.

An emphasis on access as an important function of archives and the archivist raises some complex issues for moving image archives, as expressed by Prelinger (2007) among others**.** Prelinger calls access to moving image archives 'a sticky door' (p.114) and also suggests 'many institutions sequester their holdings behind walls of copyright maximalism, policy or indifference, rendering them inaccessible to many' (p.114). Enabling access can be expensive in terms of staffing, budgets and equipment and calls into question issues of preservation versus access. Prelinger suggests that 'overzealous application of the precautionary principle' can create 'sequestered collections' (p.114). An example of the 'sticky door' and the notion of 'difficulty' as attached to accessing archive film can be illustrated by a short case study of my experience at the NFCA.

I had interviewed AH at the NFCA and requested to visit the archive at a later date to view some of their moving image material. I was first informed that 'you can't view anything because it's all in inaccessible formats'. On further enquiry I received the following email reply from an archive

assistant at NFCA: 'Your area of interest happens to be a bit tricky... our film collections are subject to many individual copyright stipulations and access is quite restricted based on inaccessible archaic formats such as 8mm'. Copyright and formats can be barriers to access and I will discuss this further in this section. However the overzealous application of the precautionary principle was in evidence at NFCA. When I finally visited the Archive, I was allowed to view a few minutes of NFCA footage that had been digitised onto MP3. My visit to the NFCA Archive was cut short because the assistant would not answer even the most basic questions about the Archive's work and I was encouraged to leave quickly. This experience shows that access is not always about the actual material but also about the people that work with it and their commitment, disillusion and possible exhaustion in what may be a difficult working environment.

Archive film has been called an 'incomplete object' by Shand (2014) and 'an orphaned text' by Czach (2014). Shand notes that amateur footage can be fragmentary and often without explanatory intertitles or soundtrack. This fragmentation and lack of provenance coupled with issues around accessibility such the need for technological mediation and the complexities of rights clearance has the effect of making archive film seem inaccessible, too difficult to deal with and in any case not worth dealing with. Respondents all had clear ideas about what routes to greater access might be and the two major routes flagged up were legal issues such as Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and copyright and issues of digitisation. Digital platforms such as YouTube have made some archive material more accessible in some ways but JP pointed out the inadequacies inherent in this as he suggested YouTube is 'too random' meaning here that material on digital platforms is not systematically organised and catalogued. By contrast he suggested 'archives are not random – they are coherent, collected and organised. Digitising archive film as a route to greater access both in terms of online platforms and transfers to DVD and other formats is ongoing, but some respondents sounded cautionary notes.

AH suggested the notion of a double preservation where the need to provide access leads to a rush to digitise material. This then can lead to as AH suggested 'digital collections that become obsolete

and decompose and become corrupted at a far greater rate than the original item'. The need to then preserve both the original and the digital archive becomes a burden on archivists. AH noted 'you find that only three years later you can't even play the file you digitised it on... cos the player doesn't work anymore or the disc... so you end up with two archives... an original archive and a digital archive'. IC echoed this and suggested: 'The actual material supports for those digital formats is constantly being updated and revised and so most of us have got digital materials we can't play and nobody knows how to play'.

 AH also noted that in the projects he was involved in the driving principle was often 'we must digitise because we need to get it out there'. He felt that 'organisations need to ask better questions before they take on a piece of digital work'. He also suggested that the music industry's digitisation of content provided a model for collections of archive film but that archivists 'didn't quite understand that when they put something online someone was going to rip it. So you get another strand which is... you open Pandora's box for cultural benefit but then you don't like the fact that people are interacting with it because it's taking away from your economic model'. Thus the drive to put archive film content onto portals and apps often backfires when users either do not engage or respond by 'stealing' the material. AH was the only respondent to talk about issues around the 'stealing' of archive footage which may be a result of online and digital access. He suggested 'I don't necessarily think that the idea of theft is driven by a sort of notion of whether or not there's a social, moral code around access to film ... it's more driven by how do we use it without getting ourselves into trouble'. Since access to original archive film material can be fraught with difficulty, it may seem easier and quicker to just download from the Internet which most people consider free to access.

Since BUFVC/ LoS put user-experience at the heart of their services and are engaged in creating a user-led environment, SA considered access to content of primary importance in his work. He suggested that digitisation enables access, though he was aware as a former archivist that tension between preservation and access has existed for many years. SA was also very aware of the shortcomings of digitisation, suggesting that a digital copy does not have as much information as a

film print and that data storage is very expensive. He also flagged up issues with YouTube such as the poor metadata and the inability to search properly – however he did feel YouTube was useful as a shortcut to accessing material. He also pointed out some positive examples of digitisation such as 'Communities talking together through the digital- Grenfell, the recent bad weather and the Leicester explosion are examples of this'.

IC and SM raised important points about digitisation from their long experience in the sector and I foreground their voices here with direct quotes here to illustrate this. SM raised the issue of digitisation in terms of commercial archives needing to make money out of the licencing of their footage which 'makes them much more proactive in cataloguing of their stuff in detail, creating a very easy user-friendly website and also digitising their content. So that's three steps in the way of making stuff more accessible'. She felt digitisation was necessary for access : 'If the content isn't even digitised or catalogued then no one's got a cat in hell's chance of getting at it so I feel there's a responsibility for archives to try and make their content as accessible as possible'. SM also felt that a primary responsibility of archives was to protect unique and vulnerable film material and not loan it out. 'It's not worth anything if you've got tramlines all down it or it doesn't come back or gets scratched to pieces'. For this reason, SM was positive about digitisation although she did not see it as a means for preservation. 'I don't think it's wise to think oh we've digitised it, we don't need to keep the original copy anymore. The digital in my view is not really a substitute for the original...but of course the original is not very accessible... but I think it needs to be kept... so that's another worry'. However SM felt the digital era was not the solution to everything and noted issues with low-res meaning poor quality material on the Internet.

IC was positive about digitisation: 'An affordance of the digital archive today is that you can access a huge range of stuff that you could never access before... which will have arrived there in all sorts of random ways. It's a fantastic opportunity'. He used the example of Northern Ireland where creating a physical film archive was problematic because of the contestation of the very concept of Northern Ireland. Instead a digital archive was created relating to Northern Ireland which came from all sorts

of sources. However IC also made the caveat that 'digital is wonderful in many ways, but it can be seen as a kind of shortcut, a cheap way of storing stuff and we shouldn't take for granted that the structures we've become familiar with are going to last.' Both SM and IC felt that safety nets were needed to ensure that when platforms become obsolete material can still be preserved. IC felt the reality was that film material would be lost: 'Storage systems and access systems for digitised material are fragile. Actually much more fragile than books in libraries and on shelves...we still have books that are over 500, 600,700 years old... we're not going to have film in 500 years'.

Returning to Prelinger's 'sticky door' respondents varied in their opinions about access in terms of copyright and IPR. Anxiety about legal repercussions resulting from copyright infringements and IPR issues has led to risk aversion within collections and the sector and what Prelinger characterises as copyright maximalism. My experience at the NFCA reflects this mind set where perceived difficulties about rights clearance lead to inaction and a sense that it is just too difficult to bother, so material will be preserved but no access takes place. Because we understood this and wanted to facilitate access, we were committed at the LSSC to producing compilation DVDs of London film in which all footage would be rights-cleared meaning they could be used for educational purposes with no legal constraints. These DVDs once produced were made widely available to organisations, schools and institutions across London. However production of DVDs such as these is very expensive and labour intensive.

Three respondents offered perspectives on copyright issues from an archivist's point of view. SA is an expert on rights clearance and IPR issues. He offers professional advice to organisations and his approach to this aspect of access was robust, his opinion being 'People in academia are behind the times and so are other practitioners in terms of using the audio visual. Rights issues can be a problem but are not insurmountable'. SM views on this subject were pragmatic. She felt that with archive film: 'there's a lot of people who say we can't do anything with it because we haven't got the copyright... and it's not difficult with a bit of research to find out who owns it'.SA and SM both felt that barriers were being created needlessly and that a negative fear existed which might be

challenged if more and better information and training were available for people working with this material. AH felt that risk aversion had an effect on community engagement.

Two respondents offered perspectives on copyright issues from a practitioners' point of view. MJ described his use of YouTube as his major source for access to film for his work with older clients. He perceived this material as a short-cut and a tool for reminiscence and creativity and found online platforms were sufficient for his requirements. MJ took a pragmatic approach to access to material and his attitude was very much that whatever worked empirically was fine for him. JB however described her frustrations at attempting to gain access to material for community projects. She felt it was difficult to negotiate fees with RFAs and other organisations holding film as there was no fixed rate of charges sector wide. She also suggested that in her experience some organisations act as gatekeepers to the material. She described her work as 'getting the archive material to audiences... that's all I've ever done…you are trying...to increase and highlight the value of the archive material...and the actual people working in the archive aren't supportive of this...'. JB felt that brokering partnerships with RFAs and other organisations potentially would solve some of these issues. She also felt positive about digitisation : 'In the last ten years maybe because of this big digitisation drive a lot of material is more accessible…but there are still gatekeepers to that material'. JB had not worked as an archivist and agreed she had not had the experience of having to make budgets balance in that context. In her interview she made a plea for more co-operation and partnership working between practitioners and archivists.

The five perspectives on copyright and IPR issues are not definitive but highlight some of the complexities that those working in the sector face day to day. For practitioners, a need to access archive film material for their projects seems paramount and for archivists, there is a tension between perceptions of their role as custodians and a commitment to making material available. Driven by financial issues around funding and pressure to make projects work, archivists/practitioners often have little time for reflection on the value or impact of their work.

CONCLUSION

I had set out to explore a particular world and its functioning as I had spent many years working with archive film and rarely if ever discussed my practice with anyone. The notion was 'get on with doing it, apply for funding, do the project, move on'. This part of the research offered a chance to reflect and talk to people about what their creative practice meant to them. The interviews illuminate the practices that archivists and practitioners employ in making meaning from moving image material. I have collated information that is of use to organisations in the field in future planning and funding as well as providing some views on the use of archive film for public history engagement and memory work. The interviews highlight the ongoing complexity of issues in this sector that affect practice. Respondents expressed distress at barriers and obstacles to their work and all formulated opinions and ideas through their common belief expressed in interviews that the work they were doing had great value and importance. All had demonstrated willingness to be interviewed, and were open and honest about their work. Allowing these voices from the sector to be clearly heard has uncovered a set of narratives which illuminate the emotional labour and relationship to the archive of a particular cohort of people who have dedicated themselves to this practice. A final quote from IC encapsulates an attitude, commitment to practice and understanding of challenges that was common to all respondents: 'You just have to keep beavering away... offer it up for people to relate to and find their own significance. All film archival researchers have got to be prepared for the long haul.'

Chapter 5 Voices from the Film Archive Sector 2: The London Screen Study Collection: an autoethnographical case study

In Chapter 3 I analyse how institutions of the film archive sector function and in Chapters 3 and 4 interview respondents reveal how their work with archive film material is affected by ongoing institutional and organisational issues that impinge on practice. This chapter continues this by considering one project- the London Screen Study Collection- in depth and adding my own voice and experience to other professional voices.

The narrative of the London Screen Study Collection (LSSC) project is to some extent my narrative- a story of nine years in my life which shaped and informed what I am doing today. It is a narrative about success followed by failure and obscurity and it is impossible to separate the project from wider social and political issues and events of the years 2006-2015 that contributed to that failure. To give some brief background, the LSSC was officially launched at Birkbeck College, University of London in the new Centre for Film and Visual Media Research in April 2007. The Collection emerged from Birkbeck's London Project study of early cinema in the city and from a vision to create a similar resource for London as the *Forum des Images* in Paris which is a collection of film material made in and about that city. That collection was created in 1988 as an audiovisual memory bank of Paris[1].

The vision for the LSSC was to create an accessible reference library of viewing copies of moving image material made in or about London, with this remit expressed in the widest possible terms. The LSSC project blossomed over the first five years of its life when it was adequately funded for research, development and outreach work. As funding dwindled, the focus of the project changed as did my role and involvement. This chapter allows a space for this narrative to be added to those captured by the interviews and for my voice to be among those emerging from this research into the film archive sector.

Muncey (2005) suggests that individual identity is worthy of research (p.69) and that autoethnography 'celebrates rather than demonises the individual story' (p.78). Her four approaches

---

[1] **http://forumdesimages.fr/**

to creating the representation of an individual's story have informed this case study. She suggests a multi-faceted approach under four headings: the snapshot, the metaphor, the journey and artefacts. Thus she uses actual photographs of herself and appropriate artefacts to illuminate her autoethnographical studies of her own life as a nurse, teenage mother and academic. She uses these snapshots as a way of encapsulating memories and interrogating her own struggles. By artefacts she means actual documentation of her journey such as school reports, using these and photographs as metaphors for what she calls 'the changing nature of truth' (p. 78).I have interpreted this in a more metaphorical way and use two of Muncey's approaches to provide snapshots of the project at particular points in time and a description and discussion of the journey I have undertaken with the project. Muncey suggests that 'snapshots, metaphors, artefacts and journeys make up a patchwork of feelings, experiences, emotions and behaviours' (p. 84).

 The LSSC can be represented as a literal and metaphorical journey. Literal as in the stages of the project and my role in it and metaphorical as in what the LSSC might represent both as a project and a part of my life. Muncey asks the questions 'What is truth? Whose truth is valuable? Can truth vary?' (p.78). These questions influenced the writing of this case study. Ideas from Anderson (2006) were also influential particularly the idea of self-narrative and explicitly personal anecdotes (p.376) and the incorporation of my own feelings and experiences into the story in order to develop forms of research that acknowledge and utilize subjective experience. Anderson also suggests that his idea of analytical autoethnography involves 'sustained reflexive attention to one's position in the web of field discourse and relations' (p. 385) and also 'textual visibility of the self in ethnographic narratives' (p. 385).

The story begins in June 2006 when I was appointed to the post of Research & Development Officer to the embryonic LSSC project. I had had a long career in public libraries latterly as a senior manager and in 2000 did an MA in Film and TV History at Birkbeck College. I then took on administrative and teaching roles at Birkbeck before the LSSC post arose. I was appointed to the LSSC because I had a skillset that fitted with the needs of the project. Among the early stated aims was the idea to build a

library of London material that would not necessarily be an archive but would be an accessible viewing collection. The story moves on to when the London Screen Study Collection was officially launched at Birkbeck College, University of London in the new Centre for Film and Visual Media Research in April 2007. In what follows I will describe and explore various phases of the project while discussing my personal and professional involvement over time. The LSSC project ran over a nine year period. Since encapsulating its entire history would lead to a very lengthy and discursive case study what follows takes the form of snapshots of various aspects which link to areas explored in my PhD research. These include consideration of how local archive film has been employed as a tool in public history practice and in exploration of collective and personal memory.

In the early phases, the project was funded by Museums, Libraries and Archives London (MLA) and Film London (the regional screen agency for London) and my Research & Development post was four days per week. We were at that time part of London's Screen Archives (LSA), a group of London – based organisations led by Film London that sought to address the issue that London had various collections and archives of film material but no one archive that dealt exclusively and widely with London film. For example, the film material at London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) covered the City of London and the British Film Institute (BFI) and the Imperial War Museum (IWM) inevitably had much London material in their collections but the remit of the latter two institutions was national not local. So for the first few years of the project I was part of a larger Steering Group and part of my role was to act as a secretary for that group. I worked at the offices of MLA and also at Birkbeck College starting to build the LSSC. From the start it was obvious that a major issue for the actual collection was a lack of funding for purchasing material. We were reliant on donations from groups, individuals and organisations and could not create a coherent accessions policy as we had no funding to carry it out, but instead had to take what was on offer. Coming from a public library background where budgeting and clear accessions policies were vital, I understood that this *ad hoc* approach would lead to a rather unbalanced collection of material and this is what happened. Relying on donations meant that certain aspects of London life were not represented and this

particularly related to material recording ethnic diversity in the city. The collection grew nonetheless due to various donations of London feature films from individuals and organisations and archive material from local authority collections. One of my responsibilities was to organise, catalogue and classify this material and find ways to do this efficiently.

In terms of the actual films, their content was varied in subject matter, format, location, date and quality because we were not able to create an overarching plan or enact any standards for acquisition. In the early part of the project, there was a focus on World War 2 and the Home Front with films from 1941-1951 though there were other films added to the collection. We had footage about post war rebuilding (including a film about the rebuilding of St Paul's Cathedral), rationing, the introduction of the NHS and the Festival of London. This was because of our involvement with the 'Their Past Your Future' (TPYF) project as described below when we received funding that enabled us to acquire the rights and digitize onto DVD a number of Pathe newsreels and public information films. From the compilation DVD created using these films, I was able to curate programmes for outreach screenings and events with partners across London. One example of this kind of outreach was the 'London Living' screening I curated and delivered as part of the Canary Wharf Film Festival in 2009. This was a short programme of extracts of film from the LSSC exploring five decades of social housing, using the TPYF DVD and other films from the collection. The films ranged in date from 1945-1993 and included amateur film footage from the filmmaker Matthew Nathan showing the construction of prefabricated housing in Poplar, silent colour footage of new housing in Hackney and an educational public information film entitled' Let's Keep Wapping Cockroach Free' which described insect infestation gruesomely in vivid colour. Later in the LSSC project, the films we acquired and worked with changed as we received films from Screen Heritage UK as described later in the chapter. These films were varied in content but mainly focused on outer London boroughs showing local responses to events such as the Coronation. Local festivals, carnivals, housing and social development were showcased and this film material varied in length and quality.

Part of the thinking during the entire project was focussed on trying to find ways to define the kind of archive we were creating if that is what we were actually doing. This proved a difficult task throughout the project. One starting point was to consider the LSSC as a community archive though as Flinn (2007) points out, defining community archives is not easy and definitions are complex and capable of multiple interpretations (p.152). The LSSC was not a community archive even by Flinn's flexible definitions as it was not a part of or run by a community group, heritage project or local history society. Flinn et al (2009) give the definition of a community archive as 'collections of material gathered primarily by members of a given community' (p.73) But the LSSC was not a professional archive or part of a heritage service and there were no trained archivists directly involved. In fact the word archive was resisted by members of the LSA Steering Group possibly because some professional archivists in the group felt we might trespass on their hard won expertise. While this was certainly not the case, during the early years of the project I was repeatedly told by archivists in quite strong terms not to call the LSSC an archive. We did not give priority to preservation or acquisition and always stressed the library function of the LSSC. Accessibility was a core element and we were not custodians or records managers. Public programming and outreach were key elements and I was very much a practitioner with an emphasis on the development part of my job description. To quote from our publicity material for the launch event on 17th April 2007:

The LSSC is an accessible reference library of viewing copies of moving image material made in or about London, with this remit expressed in the widest possible terms. The formats are DVD and VHS. The range of material is wide- feature films, TV programmes, and a vast amount of footage from local authority archives including amateur films, home movies, film societies' outputs, public information films and records of civic events. Most material has been donated. [2]

The LSSC could be defined as an unofficial archive within an institution and did perform some of the functions of an archive as suggested by Flinn(2007) in that we 'expanded interest into the history of

---

the communities, streets, workplaces, places of worship in which family members lived their lives' (p.159).

From 2007-2010 the project was funded adequately enough to maintain my role in the LSSC and this was for me a very productive time. I was the only dedicated member of staff for the LSSC as the Director was Professor of Film History at Birkbeck with many other calls on his time. I felt very much in the forefront of creating something new and exciting that would benefit Londoners. I was working with other professionals outside of Birkbeck and with a wide range of community groups and organisations. From 2007-9 the LSSC was called the 'London Screen Archives Network Development Project' and as well as building the collection, the remit was to raise the LSA profile, carry out community events using LSSC film material and also tour the Moving Pictures pop-up exhibition to various London boroughs. This exhibition was the output of an earlier project which was a study of early cinema in the city. We also were committed to producing a compilation DVD of London film 1941-1951 in which all footage would be rights-cleared, meaning it could be used for educational purposes with no legal constraints. This DVD was partly a response to the need for unfettered access to material for organisations since perceived difficulties about rights clearance led to a sense that it is just too difficult to bother to try and obtain material. It was also part of a longer term plan to create what the Director of the project envisioned as a series of DVDs chronicling London on film through the decades up to the present day. In the event, this ambitious idea was never realised due to lack of funding. This DVD once produced was made widely available to organisations, schools and institutions across London and there was much interest and demand. We distributed three hundred DVDs to London borough local studies departments, colleges, museums, reminiscence groups and school library services. During this three year period, I also carried out a wide variety and large number of community projects, screenings and events with organisations across London mainly using film from this DVD compilation which was created as part of a wider project about World War 2 called 'Their Past, Your Future' (TPYF) alongside other material from the collection. I brokered partnerships with organisations across London and carried out screenings and events at the Museum

of London, Elders Voice a charity for the frail elderly in Brent, Westminster Reminiscence Group and The Building Exploratory, a charity concerned with London housing. I also worked with the Strokes Project Self Help Group, the Geffrye Museum, Bethnal Green community groups, Hampstead Museum and the Ritzy Cinema, Brixton. At All Hallows Church near the Tower of London I worked with 'Firemen Remembered' a charity devoted to remembering firefighters who served in London in WW2.

The emphasis in these projects varied. Some were screenings for invited audiences or the general public where I introduced the project, screened London films and held discussions or question and answer sessions. Some were reminiscence sessions involving older people such as the three events at day centres in partnership with the Geffrye Museum. Here I visited the centres, screened a short programme of film and then led sessions where clients could talk about the memories the footage evoked for them. I also did intergenerational work in partnership with Elders Voice for various events including the South Kilburn Over 50s Festival where I ran workshops for people of all ages, screening film and leading discussions on memory. These events and visits were received enthusiastically by clients and staff at different organisations. One example of the potential value of this material occurred at a day centre where I showed some film for clients with dementia. The clients here were very frail elders, some with little speech. One woman began commenting about the films and one film about the London smog of 1948 led her to talk about her earlier life as a nurse. Later a member of the staff told me privately that this client had never spoken before in all the months she had attended the centre. At events such as this I saw how this film material can awaken memories and have a positive effect in small but significant ways and this understanding has informed much of my work on the PhD.

The University of London Screen Studies Group Symposium in March 2008 focussed on London Screen History and the work of the LSSC. At this day - long event we had speakers on early London film, history of London cinemas, housing films and children's cinema going. I gave a paper on using the TPYF DVD to work with London community groups with an overview of the various partnerships

and London-wide events. I was also able to talk about a project where we collaborated with an artist and sculptor to create an installation called 'Fireweed' incorporating archive footage of WW2 in the form of frame grabs and film loops embedded within an artwork. This installation symbolised the ruined city after the Blitz in WW2 and was a response to the TPYF DVD. This was one of the most innovative uses of archive footage during the first few years of the LSSC project. The installation was on display at Birkbeck for some weeks and members of the public were free to attend. This project represented the zenith of innovative outreach work with the collection.

From 2009 MLA was unable to support us financially anymore and this organisation was abolished in 2010. Until 2011 we were supported by Film London through various project funding streams. During this phase I set up a YouTube channel for London film, which showcased forty films online and facilitated access to this material on a wider platform. The channel received half a million hits in 2011. The films were a selection of material from 1896-2009 and were accessed by users across Europe. One of the most popular films was 'The Open Road' (1927) with material from the World War 2 compilation rating highly. The channel drew many positive comments from users: 'stunning colour footage of a bygone age'; 'I think the footage is amazing- so nice to see it here free to access'; 'what a great collection. Keep up the good work'. Although it would have been nice to keep up the good work, when the funding for that aspect of the project ended so did the LSSC's involvement. The YouTube channel was taken back in-house by Film London.

I was also involved in creating a second compilation DVD of London film from 1951-1959 called 'London Rediscovered' with funding from the Big Lottery and the UK Film Council Digital Film Archive Fund. This compilation featured film from London boroughs and as with TPYF, we distributed it widely. Meanwhile the Collection grew during this time and received a considerable boost later in 2011 with the receipt of a very large number of viewing copies on DVD of films from local authorities digitised as part of Screen Heritage UK, a major project overseen by Film London. In this part of the project, I extended the user side of the LSSC, opening the Collection to scholars and members of the public by appointment though very few people availed themselves of this service, possibly due to

lack of publicity and the staff time to open the collection for longer hours. The main use of material was still for community events and screenings that I curated and delivered. This was still a productive and busy time although my working hours were cut back with the demise of MLA.

I was project manager for the pilot project 'Screening Our Memories' which ran for one year from February 2010-February 2011, focussing on the use of archive film for reminiscence and memory work, both for clients and age-care sector workers. This project sat alongside the LSSC, though with separate funding, and used its materials and infrastructure. There was crossover between the two projects as all of the film material used was from the two DVD compilations. By the time the 'Screening Our Memories' project began, the LSSC project had been running for four years and I had amassed considerable experience in practice with local archive film. The project had several strands: in-cinema archive screenings and reminiscence events for the general public; intergenerational events using archive film for a public audience; a training programme for age care sector workers and film industry and education workers on using archive film for reminiscence. The project was grounded in theories of gerontology, reminiscence and identity as expounded by Butler (1963), Gutman (1987) and Lewis (1971). Butler's (1963) concept of the 'life review' as a natural process that all people undergo to reach resolution in their lives was especially relevant to this aspect of reminiscence work. Lewis was concerned with identity maintenance for older people and how accessing their pasts could bring meaning. Gutman wrote extensively on the re-evaluation of old age and how perceptions of ageing are often intrinsically negative. All these theories informed the planning and delivering of the project. My involvement was mainly with the training programme which was the core of the project. This programme had a clear focus on investigating and carrying into practice innovative ways for trainees to use archive film with clients with an aim to trial and test ideas and working practices that could be used in the future. We wanted trainees to reflect on perceptions of ageing and to consider reminiscence and memory work as formal activities.

Replicability and sustainability were aims built into our original funding application for Screening Our Memories to Film London which is ironic given that after the year long pilot project was complete

with some success we were informed that no further funding would be available to carry the project forward. Personal issues in 2011 which resulted in my having to move 150 miles from London meant I had no time or space to search for further funding. However, as a result of the experience and insight gained while delivering the training, a colleague and I wrote a toolkit which was a practical guide to working with archive film and reminiscence. The aim of the toolkit was to enhance practice with archive film and be a resource for practitioners, providing session plans and exercises for working with clients and groups. It also provided useful background to working with groups, technical issues around screening archive film in community settings, theoretical issues around working with older people and issues around reminiscence work and its place in the theory of memory. During the pilot project we were able to give trainees this resource as part of the training experience. The toolkit is still available online though few hard copies remain and I used it for training during the New Towns audience study which formed part of my PhD research in 2018.

'Screening Our Memories' used archive film to illuminate everyday experiences and awaken cultural and communal memories seeking to connect individuals to their own life course and identity. Our aims were to stress the benefits of memory work in terms of social interaction, increased creativity and the value of individuals' unique experience of life. The project and the toolkit also intentionally challenged the notion of reminiscence as a cosy activity for older people that is unthreatening, pleasant and nostalgic. I had observed during observations and visits to groups during the LSSC project that some practitioners foregrounded persuading older people that their memories were always happy. An example of this was a group where participants, many over 80 years old, were virtually forced to share their collective 'happy memories' of meeting Winston Churchill in World War 2 when he visited their area of London. In fact none of them had met him and despite their insistence that this was the case, the practitioner continued to say they had done so. Challenging this type of practice which removes individual power and experience was an important part of 'Screening Our Memories'. Reminiscence and memory work can be undertaken at any stage of life and do not always mean only exploring the past. Ashton & Kean (2008) ask 'how do people use the

past to make sense of their lives, to negotiate the present and to navigate the future?' (p.4) and as a practitioner I have always sought to present reminiscence and memory work with archive film as formal activities which should encourage communication and understanding. I have carried this forward into my PhD research with audiences, foregrounding the idea that memory work is educative across all ages and generations. However I note that eight years after the project ended, there is no evaluation documentation in existence from Screening Our Memories. This was a project on memory with no legacy except the toolkit discussed above and which left no lasting mark and created no memories, except in the minds of those who took part. Huyssen (1995) suggests a 'double problematic' (p.3) querying the status of memory in contemporary culture. An obsession with memory versus what he describes as 'amnesia' seems relevant to projects like Screening Our Memories which feel vital and worthwhile in conception and delivery but which disappear leaving no legacy.

After 2011, funding the LSSC project became increasingly problematic. We had been funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and then in-house by Birkbeck College but this funding dwindled year on year. This very much mirrored cuts to local authority archives and services in general and the abolition of organisations and funding streams which I explore in detail in Chapters 3 and 4. During this time my job title was changed to Research Assistant which reflected the fact that there was not much development work taking place. My working hours were gradually reduced so that I ended up working one and a half days per week. It was during this time (2012-2015, when the project ended officially) that my relationship with the LSSC changed. My role in the LSSC for these years was primarily about developing cataloguing methods for the large number of films received from Screen Heritage UK. We received hundreds of viewing copies of films on DVD with some cataloguing already done but my job was to streamline this so that we had short records for each film. Almost all my working time was taken up with this and I became the effective custodian of LSSC material. I was the only person who really knew what was in these films, what boroughs they represented and how they might be classified, catalogued and housed at Birkbeck.

Much of my work involved writing catalogue records from real-time viewing of the footage so it was both isolating and office-based. I felt at this time that I was working at a sort of archive film coal face to wrestle the eight hundred plus films that formed the Screen Heritage UK donation into a meaningful shape. The LSSC was at this time housed in the office I shared with the project director so I literally sat with the physical films (all on DVD) all day long as well as viewing the footage for several hours a day. Events and screenings dwindled till they were non-existent as staff time was limited and the need to catalogue film material took precedence. We held one last event with input from academics at Birkbeck in July 2014 entitled 'Celebrating the London Screen Study Collection: Archive Film and Its Uses' which was a screening and a symposium on engagement with archive film. I screened a compilation of LSSC films about women's lives in post- World War 2 London and there were academic papers on art film, public engagement and reminiscence. However, far from being a celebration, this was the LSSC's swansong. In the last few months of the project, I set up a website and began to work towards creating an online catalogue that would be accessible to the public but before this could be achieved all funding to the project ceased, no new funding was available and my employment was terminated in July 2015.

I had been an Associate Lecturer in the Department of Media and Cultural Studies at Birkbeck College since 2003 and a sessional lecturer for three years before that and I continued in this role. I also continued to work on the LSSC on a voluntary basis for a short while but that proved problematic in terms of time and financial issues and in late 2015, I decided to fulfil a long cherished ambition to do a PhD. The LSSC forms the core of my PhD research. I spent nine years of my life on this project and I am still processing what it has meant to me as an individual even after a hiatus of five years. I cannot escape from the conclusion that a project which began hopefully and positively was a failure though no one individual or organisation carries any blame. While to a certain extent the LSSC feels like my creation, I cannot take ownership of it and the question 'who owns the LSSC?' is still to a large extent unanswerable. Early on in my PhD I suggested to Birkbeck that the LSSC might be better housed physically as a loan collection at Birmingham City University (BCU) where there

was space and willingness to exploit this unique resource. My supervisors supported this and were prepared for discussions with Birkbeck on a formal basis. There was some concern as this material was crucial to my PhD research and I needed unfettered access to it. Loaning the collection to BCU was strongly resisted by Birkbeck for reasons that were never explained and while I was given access to the LSSC it was made clear it would remain at Birkbeck for the foreseeable future.

In 2017 the Collection was housed in what had been my office (shared with the Director of the project) at 43 Gordon Square, one of the sites of Birkbeck College. However this site had always had space issues and one day I arrived to view some LSSC material to find the collection had disappeared from the office. Some phone calls later, I found out that it had been removed to make space as the office had to house another academic. This had been exacerbated by the collapse of some ceilings in the building making some offices unusable. After some negotiation it was agreed that the collection would be housed in a large metal lockable cabinet in a corridor. I was told I could not have a personal key to the cabinet but could access the key from the site reception. I was told I could not have the use of any office to view material. I was told that there was no-one who could do the actual moving of the collection into the cabinet (it was at that time in a number of plastic crates). In the end I moved fourteen hundred DVDs and assorted material including an archive of papers about the launch/work/planning/events of the LSSC into the cabinet over a period of days working voluntarily.

In 2020 the LSSC remains locked in a metal cabinet in a basement corridor in Birkbeck College. To my knowledge it has not been used or exploited in any real way since I left the project in 2015. Some academics at Birkbeck have said to me that this is an important resource but there seems little will or ability to use it. This raises questions about unofficial archives, accessibility and value which have informed much of my thinking throughout my PhD. Birkbeck seems determined to retain ownership of a resource that is now largely inaccessible. It is unlikely that anyone in Birkbeck except for a handful of people even know that the LSSC exists or where it is. A concern here is that it will be thrown out for space reasons or junked because it just appears to be a pile of DVDs. There is no way

of accessing it online as the website and online catalogue plans were abandoned when funding for the project ceased. In terms of value it appears that the LSSC has none currently.

Reflecting on the LSSC project, funding issues, austerity, Higher Education financial constraints and other issues all had an impact. Sustainability had been an issue for the LSSC from its inception. As Flinn et al (2009) note 'achieving sustainable resources means accessing public funds' (p. 80) and there are always trade-offs. If funding is largely or wholly short-term project funding costs to sustainability will be high and this was the case with the LSSC. In Chapters 3 and 4 archivists and practitioners raised issues that challenged their work with archive film material and its sustainability. Funding, value and access were central to their concerns and this case study of the LSSC argues in some detail that these issues remain paramount. From the inception of the LSSC, the funding allowed for only one dedicated staff member and the need to keep applying for grants through various funding streams took up an increasing amount of my time. This echoes interview respondents in Chapter 4 who talked about the continual task of managing funders and stakeholders and exploring potential opportunities. Archivists and practitioners found attempts to get funding for projects very time consuming and frustrating and projects were often funder led with the need to fit in with demands for outputs, outcomes and evaluations taking precedence. This was very much the case for the LSSC and the struggles to get adequate funding often took precedence over the actual work, while managing funders' agendas and expectations was often problematic. For example, Film London funded the LSSC for some years, and they demanded high numbers of attendees at events and a complex evaluation procedure after events, stretching limited staff resources to breaking point.

Different funders had different agendas and as most funding lasted only one year, the LSSC was subject to the need to change direction to accommodate changing agendas. For example, the YouTube channel described earlier which was a way of providing access on a wide scale to archive material from the collection was only funded for one year after which the LSSC had no more involvement or influence. Following different agendas did take away from a sense of autonomy for

the LSSC and created a sense of the project being buffeted around different organisations. This was alleviated to some extent when the project was funded in-house by Birkbeck College but the amount of funding available was limited due to Higher Education financial constraints so staff time for outreach was not available. Access to film material had been a core concern with a commitment to public programming and outreach as well as the creation of rights cleared DVDs so the loss of this aspect of the LSSC later in the project was very unfortunate.

In writing this case study, I use personal experience to illustrate facets of cultural experience as well as evoking the emotional labour underpinning work in the film archive as expressed through my own journey with the LSSC and linked to the journeys of others as described in previous chapters. I share with the respondents in the interviews a great belief that archive film has an important role to play in public history practice and in enabling groups and individuals to connect with personal and collective memories and identities. I cannot avoid reaching the conclusion that the LSSC would be in a different place in 2020 and still a viable resource for the work described above, had adequate funding and staffing been possible from the start, though political and other changes over the decade rendered this impossible.

Chapter 6 The Audience follows on from the three preceding chapters which have opened up a cohort of professional voices from the film archive sector. Here voices from the audience revealed through training sessions, screenings and workshops show another aspect of the film archive sector

Chapter 6 Voices from the Periphery: The Audience

INTRODUCTION

This chapter follows on and links with the previous three chapters which opened up a cohort of voices from the film archive sector through an exploration of the sector and relationships within it, interviews with professionals about creative practice and my own career and experiences. These four chapters together address the core research questions of the thesis.   I argue for the value of archive film in the creation of affective experiences of cultural and personal memory throughout the thesis by firstly exploring institutional issues and considering the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with film archives. I turn to the audience in this chapter to create a space for non-professional voices, views and opinions through engagement with local archive film. These voices from the audience revealed through training sessions, screenings and workshops expand arguments about value and access in the film archive sector through audience contribution of contextual material.

The audience studies took place in the outer London Borough of Hillingdon at a historic house and gardens and in four New Towns around London - Harlow, Hemel Hempstead, Crawley and Stevenage. This research into local archive film thus took place in real and metaphorical borders and hinterlands on the geographical edges of London and Miles & Ebrey (2017) note what they describe as the 'urban-rural division which prioritises city centres before suburbs and urban sites above their rural hinterlands' (p58). The audience study locations are places on the periphery where boundaries are significant and the idea of the 'village imaginary set against a background of complex interdependencies between town and country' (Miles & Ebrey p. 59) informed this aspect of the research. The idea of the periphery also applies to both the material used and the potential audience for it. This film material may be perceived by professionals and audiences as low value and potentially dull, boring, grainy and old. The lack of core funding for regional film archives discussed in Chapter 3 Institutions of the Film Archive often leaves these organisations unable to fully preserve

and exploit their holdings and dependent on external funders and their demands. Despite these constraints, audiences who want to engage find ways to access archive material including watching TV documentaries, attending community screenings, projects and workshops and using online and digital platforms such as YouTube or other websites where this material is available.

In Chapter 2 Methodology I explored in detail aspects of reception theory that informed my thinking and underpinned this research with audiences, providing me with starting points to plan and negotiate a series of community events where my focus was on audience expectations and behaviour. The definition of the audience in the Oxford English Dictionary is 'the persons within hearing' and in terms of film and archive film, I expand this to also mean 'the persons within seeing'. With this definition in mind I consider where this involves a relationship between performer and audience. The spaces where archive film engagement can take place include cinemas, private houses and online although the audience studies all took place in community venues and Abercrombie & Longhurst's definition of the simple audience was most relevant here. Simple audiences as defined by Abercrombie & Longhurst attend concerts, plays and films in public and 'take part in a social contract where they do not participate except in certain ways which may include applauding or buying a ticket. The latter promises a seat to passively watch the action' (p.51). Audiences attending archive film programmes in community venues may be considered as being in public. What I have noted both in my previous practice and my audience studies is that archive film audiences have expectations as to what behaviour is acceptable. Audiences appear to expect to be quiet and passive and watch even silent film in total silence. Later in the chapter I describe radical interventions I undertook at the screenings that challenged these expectations.

COMMUNITY

The audience studies in this chapter were carried out in community settings and I have noted in previous chapters the difficulty in establishing a common understanding of terms employed in this area. Definitions of what a 'community' might be are especially complex and fluid and may focus on

locality or on ideas of shared beliefs or shared values. Some terms and definitions commonly used for this type of work might include: local history group; oral history project; community history project; community memory project. Flinn's definition of community archives is 'the grassroots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, control and ownership is essential' (2007 p.153). In his discussion of the collections of material that might form the content of community archives, he mentions audio-visual material and film (p.153) as part of the 'broadest and most inclusive definition possible' (p.153). Flinn goes on to suggest that photographs, film and oral material contribute to 'bringing to life individuals and communities that otherwise lie rather lifeless or without colour in the paper record' (p.153).

Some literature on community archives and public history has focussed on positive developments and their impacts. However, much of the literature I have reviewed has little specific discourse on moving image archives and public history practice. Moving image archives appear to sit outside a traditional archival discourse and are often mentioned only in passing. This foregrounds a need to ask crucial questions about archive film and home movies which include their historiographic significance. How does this film material function as a counterpoise to public history and how might it construct historical knowledge? Zimmerman (writing in 2008) suggests that a movement towards a different formation of 'film history from below' (p.2) would 'permit us to see the unseen to deconstruct and then reconstruct the human through the ephemeral and the microhistorial' (p.2). The nature of amateur film and home movies has affected my work with local film and audiences, as the film material can be fragmentary and have no provenance, no genre, no narrative and no corpus of contextual information available. Zimmerman (2008) suggests that 'home movies constitute an imaginary archive that is never completed, always fragmentary, vast, infinite' (p.18).This imaginary archive is 'transnational in character '(p. 18) and links nations, communities, identities and families (p.18). Thus amateur film and local film can be envisioned as a 'cinema of recovery' (p.22) locating records as incomplete, fragmentary articulations of difference in locale, ethnicity, sexual identity,

gender, region and nation (p.22).The film archive can function as evidence of events and can retrieve the past for audiences.

Nicholson (in Ishizuka & Zimmerman 2008) discusses in detail the home moviemakers who made films in the industrial north of England in the 1930s and 1940s (p. 214) and her focus on specific communities and filmmakers was useful in thinking about the audience studies. The films she discusses feature people at work in factories and industrial locations and Nicholson's detailed examination of three specific films from the Yorkshire Film Archive provides a useful insight into amateur film and public history. This film material offer visions of everyday work experience that are underrepresented (p.215) and Nicholson suggests that home movie making 'offers a valuable means to tap into and explore how people gave meaning to everyday life' (p.225) which is why it is an important resource for exploring public history. However, she argues that there are complex reasons why this resource cannot be taken at face value and that home movies have been underused in historical analysis, but that they cannot be used as a means simply to reclaim marginalised memories and past experiences (p.217). What is seen in such material is always filtered through the eyes of those with access to camera equipment (p.215) and the filmmaker assumes the voice and vision of authority (p.221). Nicholson argues that this authority would often rest with 'individuals who had economic, ideological and social dominance' (p.217) so such visions would be socially selective (p.226). Filmmakers were middle class enthusiasts who saw industrial topics as 'a means to combine filmmaking with philanthropic or local commercial interests' (p.215). She stresses the need to consider *how* as well as *what* we see in these visions of working people (p.217) in order to create interpretative possibilities. Nicholson is focused on a particular time frame and on a particular type of home movie making as public history but she raises issues specific to amateur and local film over time. One issue is the relationship between the film maker and the technology available at any specific time. Another is what Nicholson calls 'the triangular relation between spectator, subject and filmmaker' (p.216) which can be a power relationship reflecting ideological differences. Another issue is the use of intertitles in silent home movies. Since silent home movies privilege eye over ear

as an aide-memoire and a means to knowing the world (p.223), the questions of who wrote film intertitles and why silent stock was used are crucial. In the films she analyses, she suggests this was employed by the filmmaker who was in a position of authority over those he filmed.

Nicholson analyses the films of Charles Joseph Chislett (1904-1990) a Yorkshire filmmaker, bank manager and active Christian who produced home movies over a period of forty years which he presented to thousands of people (p. 216). These include *Hands of the Potter* (1948) and *Men of Steel* (1949) which record working practices by manual workers in factories (the latter was made at Park Gate Iron and Steel Works in Yorkshire). Chislett's many projects spanned decades during which amateur sound film gained widespread use, but he continued to use silent film stock. He also used scripted commentaries voiced by himself which accompanied his film screenings. Nicholson suggests that 'nowhere is there any hint of a perspective other than his own' (p.223). However Nicholson notes that Chislett's voiceovers and his own written intertitles were 'part of evolving film practice' (p.223) and recognisable as one of numerous vocal strategies that filmmakers tried out as they adapted old ways to new technologies in the 1930s and 1940s (p.223). She also suggests that amateur filmmakers like Chislett might privilege the image over sound, echoing the controversy among some professional documentary makers before WW2 that sound was 'interfering with the real art of filmmaking which was cutting and silence' (p.223). Nicholson's analysis suggests that amateur film has an important role in 'history from below' and, unlike other archive material, is able to reveal 'the microgeographies of everyday life, showing how people occupy and move through socially defined spaces' (p.218). She notes the 'problematic distinction between amateur and professional filmmakers' (p.225) but calls the 1930s and 1940s a time of innovation when considerations of technology, consumerism and aesthetics affected all practitioners in varying ways (p.226). This historical perspective is useful in tracing the use of amateur film for public history purposes, as 'mining this rich seam of visual memory' (p.228) can illuminate modern practices.

MICROHISTORY

Exploring microhistorical theory and practice was not part of my original research design but it proved a useful tool for working with audiences. The project is not about the microhistory of the sites of exhibition but rather about the way film prompts activity in specific local areas. Specifically, the audience studies at EHG and in the four New Towns opened up a potential space to consider community investment in archives which document the history and experience of groups. Here I use Szijarto's (2002) definition of microhistory as 'the intensive historical investigation of a small area' (p.209). He makes four arguments for the use of the micro-historical approach. These are: it is appealing to the general public; it is realistic; it conveys personal experience; and the lines branching out from it reach very far (p.209). I would add that this is a way to give space and privilege to the voices of the audience so they can articulate the value of what they have seen and experienced. Szijarto also suggests that microhistory places lived experience at its centre (p. 212) and Lury (2014) suggests 'amateur film has narrative and symbolic potency - a historic potency' (p.110) and references Kracauer (1969) in discussion of the film as artefact (p.113) where this material can conceptualize microhistories suggesting 'an amateur film can reflect an unusual proximity to the actual events and people it pictures' (p.115).

AUDIENCE VOICES

The audience at EHG was self-selecting and the audience in the New Towns was made up of volunteers and was self-selecting. This aspect of the project, like other aspects described later, was not under my control and posed various challenges. These included coming in 'cold' to working with groups with a wide range of age, experience and abilities and needing within the context of my project to interrogate why people had chosen to have these experiences and what their commitment and participation might mean for them in terms of locality, identity and microhistory of their 'place'. I will first offer some brief comments on the planning for the studies, which is supplied in more detail in Chapter 2 Methodology and will then go on to discuss each study. For Eastcote

House Gardens (EHG) in Hillingdon I analyse audience data collected by questionnaires at a public screening of local archive film and a workshop following the screening. For the New Towns project I give some general information and observations and then focus on Stevenage as a case study.

Planning the Studies

In Chapter 2 Methodology I offer a detailed description of how I planned the audience studies. I offer some comments here both in general terms and focussing on some details of access issues. The interviews and autoethnographical case study laid the groundwork for this part of the research which consisted of studies of audience engagement with archive film material taking a public history approach. A crucial part of the studies was to give space and privilege to the voices of the audience (though this would always be through an interpretive lens) in the form of discussions and evaluations where they might be able to articulate the value of what they had seen and experienced. Audience voices addressed the research questions about public history engagement and the role of archive film in exploration of collective and personal memory. The work with audiences developed the research to show an investment in the views of non-professionals who were the beneficiaries of presentation since the interviews and my own experience in the sector had foregrounded professional views and ideas about the use of archive film. Audience voices also added to the conjoint narrative mapping the sector which encompassed the professional, the non-professional, heavily invested or tangentially engaged. The question of audience/participant also signalled a potential to move beyond the instrumental 'metrics' that satisfy outreach project outcomes.

Access to material was an issue for the audience studies both in planning and delivery. Working with archive film particularly rare and fragmented material creates challenges for practitioners and raises some complex issues for moving image archives. Enabling access can be expensive in terms of staffing, budgets and equipment and issues around technological mediation have always affected planning and delivery of events. Working with archive film material outside of a cinema setting and with little equipment available demands ingenuity and always needs careful planning. Without this,

and if you are unable to screen material, the *raison d'etre* for doing the work vanishes and there is no useful substitute.

In Hillingdon my experience was similar to other screening events in community venues I had undertaken in my career. I received no technical assistance and there was little working equipment on site and I therefore needed to provide everything myself. I made two visits to the venue prior to the screening and it was apparent that there were no means of showing sound film so I chose silent film for the screening. I arrived three hours before the screening on the actual day in order to set up the screen, my own laptop and projector and check through all the material. It was interesting to note that the on-site caretaker refused on every visit to help with any aspect of the event displaying an emotional attachment to the venue that manifested itself in wanting tidiness and cleanliness not to be disrupted. This type of personal and institutional investment in a public space was not new to me as I had encountered it in my former practice and it creates another barrier to access that has to be negotiated. There were no access issues around Intellectual Property Rights or ownership as I had brought all the necessary rights-cleared film material from the London Screen Study Collection.

In the New Towns study I had less control over many aspects including selection of film material, venues and the general remit of the training. I was however able to design the training days and materials using previous models of practice from my career and experience, which enabled exploration of my ideas on how to innovate/challenge that practice as well as further examination of constraints and barriers to successful outcomes. The New Towns project had certain access issues which were not my direct concern though they affected how it was possible to work with the archive material. I understood from the project manager that difficult negotiations with regional film archives led to a restriction in the amount of New Towns material available and it was often only fragments of already fragmented footage. Under those circumstances, contextualisation for trainees often proved difficult despite their local knowledge. Technical issues were less problematic as I was not responsible for equipment which was made available at each venue by the project manager, though this did not always work as well as expected.

Audience voices in both Hillingdon and the New Towns allowed an exploration of what Miles &
Gibson (2016) call 'everyday participation' (p. 151). Miles & Gibson stress the importance of place in
everyday participation as a situated process and these audience engagement studies located in
specific locations on the periphery of London enabled me to explore that process. Discussing the
findings of the AHRC project 'Understanding Everyday Participation - Articulating Cultural Value'
(UEP) they note in particular the importance of place in participation and access. They note the need
to explore cultural participation outside of state cultural support and situated locally in the everyday
realm and reference Taylor (2016) whose interrogation on the cultural participation survey *Taking
Part* found that only 8.7% of the UK population was highly engaged with state-supported forms of
culture. Writing on the UEP project, Ebrey (2016) notes the possibility of a shift in orientation from
'instrumental economic arguments' (p.158) about participation to 'lived experiences, informal
economies' (p. 159).The audience engagement studies were rooted in the everyday experiences of
participants and audiences. The studies also explored the possibilities of creative practice and radical
intervention with archive film in terms of place and locality, enabling an examination of how this
material might play a role in public history and in exploration of memory in peripheral spaces and
places.

Eastcote House Gardens –London Borough of Hillingdon

The following background to Hillingdon and to Eastcote House Gardens (EHG) gives context to the
screening and workshop that I delivered there. The London Borough of Hillingdon is the
westernmost borough in Greater London. It was formed in 1965 from four Urban District Councils in
the county of Middlesex. Hillingdon is home to Heathrow Airport and is the second largest of the
thirty two London boroughs by area. The borough's residential areas expanded in the early
twentieth century with the extension of the Metropolitan Railway, making it part of an area of
London known as 'Metroland'. In the 2011 census Hillingdon had a population of 273,936. 52.2% of
the borough identified as white British, with 13.4% Indian and 4.1% Black African. The population of

Eastcote in 2011 was 12,142 with 66% identifying as white British .The borough has over 200 green spaces and was in 2008 the least densely populated of all London boroughs.

EHG is an area of public parkland in Eastcote, situated to the east of Eastcote village in a conservation area. The site covers nine acres and incorporates the walled garden, dovecote and coach house of Eastcote House. The original house has been dated back to 1494. The opening of Eastcote station in 1906 stimulated the demand for building land and all the estate was gradually sold off. Eastcote House and its grounds were sold in 1930 for the development of the Eastcote Park Estate. However the proposed demolition of Eastcote House as part of the development caused such a public outcry that the Ruislip-Northwood Urban District Council was forced to purchase it along with 9.1 acres of the grounds for £10,500 in 1931. For the next thirty years the house acted as a community centre providing accommodation for many local groups and services. But in 1962, after a long period of neglect, it was declared unsafe for public use and finally demolished in 1964 by the Ruislip - Northwood Urban District Council, one of the predecessors of the London Borough of Hillingdon. The garden and outbuildings were retained and are now maintained by a group of volunteers, the Friends of EHG, in partnership with the local authority.

As can be seen in the brief history of the site above, EHG has been an integral and important part of Eastcote for many years, both in terms of strong community response to proposed changes as described above and use of the site as a community venue over a thirty year period. This was not a part of London I had ever visited previously and this westernmost borough felt very different from my own experience of working and living in north London, particularly in perceived distance from the centre. Eastcote is thirteen miles from Westminster as the crow flies, but seventeen miles driving distance and allowing for London traffic congestion, it can be a two hour drive. Travelling from Aldgate to Eastcote on the London Underground Metropolitan line takes fifty minutes and involves a trip through a large swathe of suburbia and Metroland. EHG is a ten minute bus ride from the tube station through suburban residential streets. The sense of being on the edge of the city is striking and Eastcote itself has a rural and peaceful aspect. The area presents a landscape

simultaneously suburban and rural, yet with wider connections to the rest of London. Farley and Symmons Roberts (2013) writing on the edgelands of urban spaces suggest that 'edgelands are the transitional, liminal areas of space to be found on the boundaries of country and town - with the spread of urbanisation, an increasingly important facet of the twenty-first century world' (p.1). Gilmore (2017) suggests that parks such as EHG facilitate an attachment to place and are 'productive spaces which confer value onto place with appeal over and above their immediate use (p. 38). She calls public parks 'vernacular spaces for everyday participation' (p.34).

The focus on outer London for this aspect of the project was partly in response to the availability of rights-cleared archive footage through the London Screen Study Collection (LSSC) but also in response to the fact I was brought up in outer London and lived there all my life until 2011. I wanted to explore peripheral aspects of the city and the creation of borders and peripheries and how identity was negotiated within them. I also wanted to explore issues around locality, emotional attachment and specificity of place. This suburban part of London has a relationship to the centre that is peripheral, both in geographical terms but also in terms of history and the perceived attitudes of participants.

Through personal recommendation from a committee member, I met with the Chair of the Friends of EHG early in 2018 to discuss a potential event. The Chair (a long-term resident of Eastcote) had a clear sense of what the Friends wanted and this was a local archive screening focusing on Hillingdon. EHG had received a Heritage Lottery Fund award and the Friends wanted an event which they felt would fit this award's remit for educational events. They also wanted an event which fit into the way they performed a strong sense of community identity, which manifested itself largely through events at the venue. In 2018 these events included a community picnic, a classic car show, a horticultural show and regular craft and yoga groups. At our meeting the Chair remarked that 'Eastcote is not really London. The Mayor of London does not care about us'. (It was unclear whether this was a personal view or that of the Friends in general). After some discussion and negotiation, it was agreed that the EHG event would consist of a film screening of Hillingdon archive footage dating from 1922

to 1960 for a self-selecting audience of what might be described as the general public. I suggested a workshop following the screening, also involving members of the public self-selected from the screening audience.

I curated the film programme for the screening from the LSSC at Birkbeck College, University of London. There is an emphasis on local film within the LSSC and a lot of material from outer London boroughs. Much of this material exists as viewing copies on DVD digitised in 2011 as part of Screen Heritage UK, a major project overseen by Film London, the regional screen agency. There are fifteen Hillingdon films in the collection and the emphasis is on the history of the four Urban District Councils that were formed into Hillingdon in 1965. The films in the EHG programme were all silent - this was necessary because of technical issues described earlier. The films also followed a chronological timeline to accommodate EHG's wishes for a 'panorama' of Hillingdon's development through time. The films available in the LSSC largely focussed on public and civic events such as carnivals, the Coronation and a town-twinning event and I chose these films from a fairly limited selection because they were the best in terms of content, quality and interest for what EHG wanted. Some of the Hillingdon films in the LSSC were so fragmented and poor quality that they would have been incomprehensible. I wanted to include Heathrow as an important landmark and influence in the borough and the footage of Heathrow Airport showed the building of one of the terminals.

Moving participants from passive audience to contributor of valuable contextual material was a major aim of the screening, challenging the model I have described as 'let's watch some nice archive film and then have a nice cup of tea'. This challenge involved screening silent film only (which had proved expedient due to technical issues at the venue) and then telling the audience they could talk to me or amongst themselves while the film was being shown. The way I collected data for both the screening and the workshop was through audience questionnaires and in designing the questionnaires, I wanted to interrogate audience opinions and views on the value of archive film. Since I was not constrained as I had been in previous practice by the need to collect numerical metrics or ask questions about age, gender or race I focussed instead on issues about the value and

importance of archive film, asking open ended questions which elucidated quite detailed responses. For both the screening and the workshop I asked participants to write comments and reactions to the film material anonymously on post-it notes which would then form a group 'post-it wall'. This was a way for the audience to feel free to comment as they chose creating a sense of group identity.

For the workshop I had intended use the co-operative inquiry model as expounded by Reason (1988). Reason defines the paradigm of co-operative experiential inquiry as research *with* and *for* people rather than *on* people (p.1). The workshop would potentially provide insight into different ways of working and also ways of doing evaluation, bearing in mind that the workshop was experimental in nature and might be challenging for volunteers (and for myself).Drawing on my own experience as a practitioner using archive film for public history practice, I intended the workshop to break down barriers between the 'archivist' and the 'audience' by developing what Reason (1988) calls a learning community (p.2)which can be 'self-directed and contribute to creative thinking and to the research action' (p.4). All participants can contribute to creative thinking and planning and work in genuine collaboration. However, running the workshop using the co-operative enquiry model was not tenable due to institutional and other issues. The time the organisation could allocate to the screening and workshop was very limited within their own programme of events and both elements of the event had to be accomplished on the same day making an extended planning session and co-curation unworkable. The perception the Friends of EHG was that the screening and workshop was part of the deliverables for their Heritage Lottery Fund grant while I had planned for something different and I could not easily force that difference upon them without offence.

On the day, the actual time available for the workshop was less than one hour due to the movement of the audience after the screening and getting refreshments. Participants seemed nervous of what might be expected of them and I had not been able to meet them before the event to discuss the parameters of the workshop. The actual workshop was quite disjointed as audience participants expressed the need to leave early to walk dogs or go shopping. In the end I asked the few remaining participants to discuss the three questions on the workshop questionnaire in pairs followed by a

group discussion led by me. This experience points up ways in which institutional issues impinge on archive film events and it is also notable that the workshop was affected by what Livingstone (1998) describes as 'the haphazard and contingent details of people's daily lives' (p.4) so that audiences can become fragmented making empirical observations subject to variation.

Archive film screening at Eastcote House Gardens 2nd October 2018

Below I have reproduced the film programme, audience questionnaires and responses for the EHG screening and workshop. (Figs 1-5).

Fig 1: Film Programme: Hillingdon Panorama

1	Uxbridge May Carnival 1922
2	Heston and Isleworth Charter Celebrations 3rd October 1932
3	Ruislip/Northwood Coronation Procession 1953
4	Heathrow Airport 1958
5	Town Twinning Newsreel (Hayes and Harlington)1959
6	Uxbridge Panorama (Uxbridge Past and Present) 1960s

Fig. 2: Audience Questionnaire (screening)

1	Have you ever watched archive film in a communal setting before?
2	Would you attend an archive screening again?
3	What do you think is the value of archive film?
4	Please write any other comments/ideas/thoughts on the post-it notes provided.

Fig 3: Audience Questionnaire (workshop)

In pairs please answer the following questions:

Why do we show archive film?
What would happen if we never saw it?

| What is the value of this film? |
| How can we encourage audience participation and ensure audiences get a positive experience? |

Responses to questionnaires

Fig. 4: EASTCOTE HOUSE GARDENS SCREENING
Responses to audience questionnaire

1   **In response to the question: have you ever watched archive film in a communal setting before?**

- 37 people (74%) of audience answered the question
- 23 had never watched archive film in a communal setting before
- 14 had seen archive film a communal setting before

2   **Would you attend an archive screening again?**

- 37 people (74%) of audience answered the question.
- 35 said they would attend a screening again
- 0 said they would not attend
- 2 said they would possibly attend again

1. What do you think is the value of archive film?

Interesting to different ages

A useful record

Educational – a valuable resource

To act as a permanent record of life - ordinary, daily life - in times past

As a record for current and future generations before it's too late.

Revisiting history

'Permanent' record.

For future generations on how we used to live.

A time capsule for future generations.

To see how the area has changed.

They record history on an everyday basis.

Find out more about the history of the local area.

Authentic visual memories for all time. Fulfils the need to know where one is coming from. Voiceover/cribsheet would have improved understanding of why event important enough to have been recorded, who organised (local council or voluntary bodies), costs etc. Loved seeing the clothes.

Historical record of places/people.

Brings history to life and sets context.

Learning about the history of your area is fascinating! Makes you look at your area with different eyes. Very essential knowledge.

It reminds us of our history and how we used to live. What our values were in the past.

A record of our past. History in the making. May have implications in the future which were not known at time filmed. Record of life, fashion, buildings which no longer exist.

Reflection on fashion, traffic, gender balance. These make perfect prompts for those suffering with dementia.

Pictorial history.

Links people with their roots. Also gives young generations idea of how their forebears lived.

Window to the past. Nostalgia. 'Real-world' view.

It brings things to life in a way that photos don't. Equally fascinating are details of clothes, hair, stance, behaviour.

Historical comparisons. Education.

Community engagement. Historical context.

Great history.

Help to develop an appreciation of our local past, to stud architectural changes, fashion, community and transport development. Good for children too.

Enables people to see how things looked in years gone by. Very interesting to those who enjoy history.

So interesting to see how the area has changed; modes of transport, advertising on floats, changes in fashion – much more relaxed now even for formal occasions.

Interesting in look back in time and how the area has changed.

Connecting all ages - gives the old and young a connection.

Good when you know the area. But historical context would make it more informative to later generations.

Good to see film of before I was born and to keep for future generations.

Fig. 5: EASTCOTE HOUSE GARDENS WORKSHOP

Responses to questions

1. **Why do we show this film?**

To show how we used to live –important to know our shared history.

Memories of our grandparents and parents lives.

To experience the difference between then and now.

To entertain, educate and inform-because we think it's important for people to know about life in earlier times.

It gives a historical perspective to our lives today. The dress, hats and outer clothing clearly suggests a cooler climate. I can well remember this on annual holidays to the sea in August when it always rained and was freezing cold and windy. Interesting to look at transport. I recognised the type of taxi my father used in the thirties. The high street has changed completely. Fewer little shops, no butchers, no market, no visible cinema. No horse-drawn vehicles. The rise of number of cars, lorries, planes, the loss of bicycles.

2. **What is the value of this film?**

Have record of important events and people in the local area.

Time capsule - near to living memory.

To see the way buildings have changed, the motor cars and the roads they were on. How children were educated.

Helps people to compare life now with life then.

It defines the era.

3. **What would happen if we never saw it?**

Lost an interpretation of history – books and photographs.

Would never know what life was like

We would be less well informed.

We'd be the poorer.

4. **How can we encourage audience participation and ensure audiences get a positive experience?**

There were no responses to this question.

THE AUDIENCE AT EHG

It proved difficult to clearly determine definitive audience demographics for EHG as they were self-selecting and I met them only for two hours on the day of the event. So any data gathered about demographics was anecdotal. All were Eastcote residents which I found out during the event and quite a number were members of the Friends of EHG. About half the audience appeared to be over fifty and apparently all were white. There were roughly equal numbers of men and women. It was not appropriate given the remit and time frame of the event to ask the audience more detailed questions about ethnicity or faith.

In an analysis of the audience questionnaires in the screening and the workshop, the question 'What do you think is the value of archive film?' elicited thirty three separate responses, the highest number. These responses and views resonated in some ways with those I have encountered in previous screening events during my practice and were grouped around three areas which were education, history and memory. There was a strong feeling in audience discussion as well as questionnaires that archive film can function as a window to the past especially for young people and that it should be an educational resource. Audience members felt this material brings history to life and especially the history of everyday and ordinary life, linking us with past and present values. Some responses focussed on locality: 'learning about the history of your area is fascinating!'; 'interesting to see how the area has changed'. There was also a set of responses that saw value in terms of 'a time capsule' and a 'permanent record' which should be 'kept for future generations' and could last 'for all time' but given the vulnerable nature of this material and issues of preservation and access this was perhaps a naïve or over optimistic view. They also noted the 'light bulb' moment when people recognised people they knew or familiar locations. In terms of memory, the audience recognised or suggested that this material could be used for memory work and nostalgia and might also be useful for people with dementia, helping to recover memories though visual details of life in the past. In response to the question 'What would happen if we never saw it?' the audience felt they would be less well informed and would lose an important interpretation of history. However the

question 'How can we encourage audience participation and ensure audiences get a positive experience?' elicited not a single response or idea. While there is a sense that audiences appreciate the value of archive film and feel it is important, they appeared in this case to have little investment or idea of how to move beyond that feeling. This may have been because their previous experiences with archive film did not involve any discussion on value or use of this material.

As a one-off experience the event was apparently enjoyable and valuable for them and provided a positive way to spend an afternoon. Individual and group pride in their locality and a desire to preserve this local history emerged from the responses. Miles & Ebrey (2017) discuss the mode of participation in what they call 'the village social imaginary' (p.59) a term that can be applied to Eastcote in its sense of community identity. This can be described as 'conservative and inconsequential' (p.63). However I argue that the possibly inconsequential and mundane nature of such events gives insights into how audiences perform their sense of locality and identity. For this audience a hierarchy emerged that echoed Baron's (2012) hypothesis on provenance and how lack of provenance is less important than the viewer's experience. Audiences were first engaged in their own emotional reactions to local footage, then wanted to identify places and people they knew or recognized but rarely wanted or needed to know the provenance of any piece of film by which I mean here who made it or who was the director.

When asked about previous engagement with archive film 74% of the audience responded to the question 'Have you ever watched archive film in a communal setting before?' More than half of respondents had not seen archive film in a communal setting before and everyone who responded to the question said they would attend or possibly attend a screening in a communal setting again. These findings (reproduced in Fig.4 above) are in line with audience information from the Britain on Film survey. Britain on Film is a BFI-led digitization project which showcases collections dedicated to specific regions and nations, curated in association with partner archives. The Britain on Film touring programmes were curated packages offering insights into Britain during the 20th century. The survey that was part of the BFI project noted that 50% of Britain on Film audiences had never watched

archive film in a communal setting before. 92% of these audiences said they were likely or very likely to attend a screening of archive film again.

Interventions

The EHG screening was composed entirely of silent film and enabled me to perform interventions which went beyond the need to capture metrics which as I have explored elsewhere is often expedient in practice where the ability to innovate can be limited by institutional paradigms. The interventions also interrogated Abercrombie & Longhurst's ideas on the social contract where audience members do not participate in performance except in certain ways which may include applauding or buying a ticket and where they passively watch the action. Abercrombie & Longhurst suggest that passivity is a historical development (p. 52) noting that 'gradually audiences became motionless, as they were all seated, more passive and more bourgeois' (p.51). In terms of film this can be traced back to the arrival of the talkies as during the silent era there is evidence that audiences would talk while watching. Gunning (2004) in his discussion of early actualities which he calls 'pictures of crowd splendour' (p.49) flags up the 'gasp of recognition and the naming of familiar faces or places characterized in local identity and the cry of 'Lor Bill that's me!' (p.52). Here the audience recognise themselves and their locality represented on film. At the start of the EHG screening I suggested to the audience that they could talk during the films either to each other or to me rather than watching in silence. Some of the audience looked surprised or pleased as if this had not occurred to them as a possibility before. During the screening I walked around the room rather than sitting down and engaged informally with the audience. There was lively and animated conversation as places and locations were recognised and changes noted. A 'gasp of recognition' moment occurred when an audience member recognised his former school teacher during one of the films, which was about a visit to a local school by some European teachers as part of town-twinning. He offered several memories including 'She was really strict, we were all scared of her'. Other audience members offered information to me from their local knowledge about locations and events shown in the films. The audience here was not passive but engaged in a joint exploration of

locality and identities and the creation of a joint narrative, though I felt I had given them permission

to do so and they would not have done it had I not allowed it. I had used this intervention before in

my practice with archive film with varying degrees of success. When I used it at the Birkbeck Cinema

in Birkbeck College, the audience were more reluctant to engage and this may have been because

certain behaviour is seen as appropriate in a designated venue where as Abercrombie & Longhurst

note 'The strong sense of propriety/ passivity is manifested' (p.51). The EHG venue was the Stables

(Fig 7) a space used by EHG for varied events and here audience members may have felt more at

home or that the space was more private, especially since many of them were local residents and

knew the venue well.

Fig.6: The Stables, EHG - set up for the screening 2/10/18

The venue at EHG as can be seen in Fig.6 was set out like a cinema or theatre with rows of seating

and a screen in front of the audience. Goffman's (1959) ideas about the front region 'where

performers are on stage in front of the audience' (p.19) were interrogated by this intervention. I was

a 'performer who appears to be of higher estate than his audience' (p.22) in terms of my knowledge

about the film material and I acted in a manner that was unexpectedly equalitarian (p.22) by

dispensing with the literal and metaphorical front region to be part of the audience or least attempt

to make this shift. While it can be argued that the screen at the front of the audience took on a role involving performance and authority, I was nevertheless identified as the knowledgeable professional who would contextualise the material for the audience while they watched silently and respectfully. My side-stepping of this role had the effect of putting the audience more in control than is usual in a film screening.

A second intervention was to ask the audience to make anonymous comments on post it notes with the aim of making a group wall reflecting their thoughts, feelings and comments. I had performed this intervention before and it had often worked well though in this case the audience did not engage much with the exercise perhaps because of time issues. I note this exercise works better when part of a training session when the post-it wall can be displayed at the end of the day.

COMMENTS FROM POST IT NOTES

- Great to see 'light bulb' moments where people recognised self or their own road
- Should be shown in local schools to give students a history of where they live.
- A sense of belonging.
- Also shown in old people's homes/clubs and get their memories before they're gone! Then the memories and stories could be shared with schoolchildren.

Reflections

The EHG event led me to consideration of the issues of the tension/distinction between what collaborators wanted to achieve which was task-based and the purpose of my research which allowed for a messy and suggestive outcome. A question I considered was should I allow the Friends to have what they wanted and use the film screening and related activities to empirically observe how these films are used to feed a sense of community or should I disrupt their social formation and make the session explorative? Another question raised was that if EHG were positioning themselves as consumers of the archive did that give them all the rights and powers that consumers assume? This had implications for the project beyond the EHG event as it raised the question of whether I would be tied to giving an audience what it wants, in terms of what the Friends of EHG asked for or wanted when it might be more useful to give them what they do not want, always assuming they

would accept this in their role as 'customer' and whether it would be ethically correct. By performing interventions I made the workshop and screening more explorative than they had expected but only within certain parameters. It was also interesting to speculate on the tensions/issues in working with a self-identified community where I was perceived as an outsider. This sense of community manifested itself through their verbally expressed strong commitment to the area. Gilmore (2017) discusses the creation of community infrastructure through Friends groups that are prepared to take on leading voluntary roles (p. 42) and this was evident at EHG.

NEW TOWNS

The second set of audience studies came about through an opportunity to deliver a training programme for the 'New Towns, Our Town - Stories on Screen' Independent Cinema Office, London (ICO) archive film project. The project was a valuable addition to research dealing as it did with the periphery of London and the relationship between the archivist/practitioner and the community. Volunteers were recruited in each New Town and I was asked to run a training day in every location on the topic 'Using archive film as a reminiscence tool'. This linked closely to my previous practice with archive film and my earlier work on the 'Screening Our Memories' project in 2011. For this project I had created and delivered training courses for age care sector workers and film industry and education workers on using archive film as a tool for reminiscence.

The ICO project took place in the first four of the UK's New Towns - Stevenage, Crawley, Hemel Hempstead and Harlow. The aim of the project was to focus on the heritage of New Towns and to explore stories and engage participants through the large amount of archive film of the towns which had been severely underused if used at all in previous heritage projects. The project would use rare archive footage to explore the shared experiences of residents, increasing the visibility of the New Town movement and involving screenings, engagement activities and volunteering opportunities. The project aimed to explore the unique social history and heritage of these towns, from the point of view of the New Town pioneers and subsequent generations. Identity and locality were issues

flagged as the ICO and local organisations involved in the four towns assumed the need for very local film as a norm for screenings and the choice of films and curation of programmes was not under my control. As I have stated, an assumption is often made by organisers that the audience relates best to local material and in fact only want to see this type of film, though this assumption is not generally grounded in any hard evidence. The volunteers in all four locations had a special investment in their town and the films and it was challenging in this context to consider the hypothesis that this film material would be interesting to audiences not related to their specific town. The aim of the training was to make a significant difference to volunteers' knowledge of their heritage with their increased understanding ultimately benefiting wider project participants.

My audience for the New Towns project were volunteers/trainees who would later take on a different role. Thus an important consideration was how might audience members become trainers and transmit values associated with the archive, preservation and access. This was a challenge for me as trainer and for them as trainees as was dealing with prejudices, attitudes, beliefs and ideas on their role in the project some of which addressed issues in my own practice around models of using archive film. This film material has been used widely as a tool for reminiscence with older people and there is a perception that this is a normative practice of presenting this material. Allied to this is a perception that reminiscence is always nice and positive. Trainees in every venue on the New Towns project held these views. Some examples of comments on this topic from trainees in response to the group exercise 'What is reminiscence?' were: 'nostalgia'; 'it gives you a good feeling'; 'it has positive connotations'; 'it's pleasant - everyone wants to do it'. It was a challenge for my practice and my examination of my practice to both deliver the project remit and find ways of addressing these ideas. Not all memory work is pleasant and comfortable. It is also true that there is merit in using archive material for social interaction and to understand it as embedded in the everyday, leading to an understanding that what transpires in community events can be banal and ephemeral, as well as enjoyable for participants. However, this is not the only method of using the

material and throughout this project and the research in general I explored what other uses and innovations might be possible with this material.

Another challenge was around the notion of the self-selected audience. Volunteers on the New Towns project were self-selecting and there was a wide range of age, experience and abilities. Some younger volunteers saw their involvement in the project as a route to possible employment in a situation where paid work was difficult to obtain. Several of these had undergraduate degrees in history and museum studies. In each location there were a number of retired volunteers who had a large amount of local knowledge and were active in their communities. In one location two of these volunteers expressed anxiety that their considerable local knowledge would be ignored or marginalised. This was as a result of being told by a trainer in an unrelated earlier training programme that they were 'stupid and knew nothing'. As a trainer I found that balancing the needs of disparate groups, validating their differing experiences and training them to fulfil community roles in a one day training session made for some complex challenges. Empowering people so that their contributions were meaningful and worthwhile was at the core of this. In the case study that follows, I explore some of these challenges as they manifested in Stevenage, one of the four locations.

Stevenage - a case study

Fig. 7: Stevenage (frame grab from *Stevenage: the 1st New Town 1971*)

What did it feel like to live in Stevenage, the UK's first New Town? Two local films provide us with different views. *Stevenage: the 1st New Town (1971)* is a celebratory and optimistic look at life in the

town as viewed by the Stevenage Development Corporation. This organisation wanted to attract residents so stressed the joys of life away from the 'bustle and overcrowding' of London emphasising 'a dream of a better future'. The frame grab (Fig. 7) offers an idyllic view of trees, flowers and a lake where a lone figure wanders away from crowds and noise rather than showing the busy roads and large concrete buildings that were part of the town. Through montage the film shows us work, education and social life while vox pops from residents including children extoll the virtues of Stevenage – 'a wonderful place'; 'clean and safe'; 'modern, up to date'; 'the kids are off the streets'. One resident suggests 'I've no complaints' but another does suggest 'I don't want to spend my whole life in Stevenage'.

Stevenage Comes of Age (1967) tells another story through the eyes of two young residents. In this short documentary made by Anglia TV to mark the 21st anniversary of the designation of the New Town, we follow Russell and David both aged 21 as they walk around the town giving their views as voice overs. Russell came to the town aged 7 and describes his nostalgic memories of a childhood where he had freedom to roam about fields and woods. He shares his resentment at the increased building of houses which he calls 'small boxes' and says there is no community feeling in the town and 'all efforts to bring people together have failed'. David who came to the town aged 9 and who has similar childhood memories of 'watching wild birds and picking wild flowers', expresses his disappointment in the 'soulless' building of houses, covering fields with concrete. He nevertheless admits his parents were pleased to start a new life in the town, away from what the introductory voiceover describes as the 'overcrowding of London'.

There were six volunteers in Stevenage and the main resource for the training was a toolkit I had co-written as part of the 'Screening Our Memories' project in 2011. This project had been particularly focused on training age care sector workers in the use of archive film for clients so the exercises and group work described in the toolkit were useful and relevant. The toolkit's aim was to foreground reminiscence as a formal activity and to encourage trainees to use the concept of active watching to work with archive film material. I had developed the idea of active watching from active listening

which can be defined as 'an intent to listen for meaning'. Active watching can be defined as 'an intent to watch for meaning' and involves the participant focussing intently on the content of archive material to consider ways of using it with groups or clients. Trainees were encouraged to look at film in as open minded and flexible a manner a possible and to focus on emerging themes that could work with groups.

We had four Stevenage films to work with on the day including the ones described above and none of the volunteers had seen the films before. They were excited about the work they were undertaking. They were enthusiastic about the group work where we thought about locality and history as seen through the films and they also joined in discussions about their personal reactions to the material as well as the memories that might be evoked. Group exercises were structured and involved close analysis of the film material through active watching, brainstorming themes gleaned from the films, discussion of what is meant when we say 'archive film' and 'reminiscence', thinking about memory and identity and planning and delivering a reminiscence exercise that they could deliver with future audiences.

One unexpected result of the training at Stevenage which emerged through audience reaction was the role of the soundscape in archive film in allowing the emergence of audience voices. Theory and practice around archive film has emphasised a dominant ocular-centric focus with visual images and content foregrounded. However the films I screened at Stevenage contained commentary, vox pops, ambient sound, diegetic music and found sound dubbed on to provide atmosphere. In *Stevenage: the 1ˢᵗ New Town (1971)* this created a collage of voices, images and music which suggested Thompson's (2004) definition of soundscape as 'an auditory or aural landscape' and Cavalcanti's suggestion that the socially realist documentary film should combine three elements - speech, music and effects, meaning here the noises of everyday life (Mansell 2017 p. 137). Samuels et al note sound's intimate connections to contexts of time and place with soundscape tending to be theorised as strongly geographic (p.330). Mansell (2017) discusses the 'sonic communitarianism built around

the shared rhythms of national life' (p.134) and in the case of Stevenage built around life in a specific community.

Watching and listening to the films of their locality created a space for the authentic 21st century voices of Stevenage residents to emerge. Some reactions and responses to films of Stevenage life some decades ago quoted from group discussion in the training sessions create a sense of the current voices of Stevenage': 'film is the picture you frame in your mind'; 'helps you to relive experiences and put them in context according to your personal perspective'; 'a common narrative - common memories; 'the good old days - rose tinted glasses?'; 'continuity from then to now'; reminiscence=remember'. One theme that emerged for volunteers through exploration of the films was town planning and gender - the personal experience of living and working in a top down planned community such as Stevenage especially, as one female volunteer remarked, 'the planners were all men!'. Gold & Ward in Clarke (1997) talk about town planning in the UK post WW2 as 'visionary - providing physical and social health' (p. 69) and that town planners were heroes 'able to work magic for society' (p. 77). The Stevenage films stress the town's cleanliness and space as represented in Fig. 7 but by 2018, volunteers noted many changes that had rendered the town less appealing, including the growth of housing and increased traffic. Another theme that emerged was 'leaving and coming back' coupled with the idea of 'retention' meaning here how to get young people to stay in the town. The volunteers had a strong emotional attachment to their place which they articulated in different ways: 'I love Stevenage (even though I know its faults); 'I'm a Stevenage lad (even though I've moved away)'; one group called their reminiscence exercise 'Stevenage Pride'. Through images and sounds of everyday life giving proximity to reality and through voices of the everyday, it was possible to begin to discover a plethora of small details and begin to create a sense of history and identity for Stevenage which would spread beyond a small group of volunteers.

CONCLUSION

The screenings carried out as part of the audience studies allowed for radical interventions as described above, the most significant of which allowed a space for audiences to discover and engage with their own collective and personal memories and histories through film, addressing a core research question. In all of the studies, I moved beyond accepted modes of practice. At EHG the audience used film as a jumping off point for an exploration of their local area. In the New Towns studies, audiences also explored collective and personal memories but the interventions also enabled them to find their voices as potential trainers. A significant finding was that moving beyond the use of metrics as a measure of success enables a rich narrative to emerge, including exploration of the soundscapes of archive film.

However as research data gathering exercises, the studies had certain challenges and limitations. Collecting metrics, which as interview respondents noted was an accepted part of practice, produces a snapshot of who engages with archive film but not how or why they do this. A challenge was to create a less passive audience response, working within the parameters of real –world institutions. A limitation was potentially an absence of 'hard' data, though this project was never intended as a purely data gathering exercise. In moving beyond metrics and through interventions, I opened up a discourse interrogating the links between archive film, archivists and audiences and the social impact of film archives, where little research has been assessed at the individual level. I also opened up areas for debate beyond the project by contributing to debates about the nature of vernacular memory, place and identity and spaces on the urban periphery.

The audience studies demonstrate how local archive film can be an opportunity for people to investigate their heritage and engage with their own history through images and sounds that create nostalgia and evoke memories. These studies interrogated the role and concept of the audience, their expectations and behaviour but also their obligation while participating in free events. The audience for EHG were self-selected members of what might be described as the public who had chosen to participate in free culture rather than compulsory culture. At the EHG screening the

audience appeared interested in the interventions and participated enthusiastically. There was less enthusiasm for the workshop and less willingness to engage though the small number that did contributed good ideas to group discussion. The audience for the New Towns project were volunteers/trainees who would later take on a different role. Areas for consideration were how might audience members become trainers and transmit values associated with the archive, preservation and access and ways in which the filmic event frames the relation of people to place both for trainees and a wider audience.

The audience engagement studies also interrogate issues around the value of specifically local film as discussed by Szczelkun (2000) who suggests many of the images can be dismissed as having little value once they have left the localised context. The EHG audience screening consisted of local film on the request of the organisers and the one film that was not Hillingdon based elicited no comment. The Stevenage volunteers had a special investment in the town and the films and it was not possible in this context to test the hypothesis that this film material would be interesting to audiences not related to Stevenage. Part of my ongoing challenge has been to interrogate whether it was possible to know/find out if this was the case and to carry out interventions in projects that were not fully under my control echoes the experience of archivist/practitioners gleaned through interviews. Working within institutional and financial parameters surrounding archive film screenings and the attendant expectations of funders and funded spaces and audiences is a major challenge for practitioners.

The findings of the studies give evidence of how the ebb and flow of history through the everyday and mundane can illuminate public history and value through aiding identity formation and memory work. I have previously explored the vulnerability, inaccessibility and institutional barriers that can make engaging with local archive film problematic. Yet making this material visible is an obligation for archivists and part of that obligation is engaging audiences wherever they may be found. To quote from EHG audience members, some of their ideas on the value of local archive film were: 'It reminds us of our history and how we used to live. What our values were in the past. A record of our

past. History in the making. May have implications in the future which were not known at time filmed. Record of life, fashion, buildings which no longer exist.' The same audience responded to the question 'What would happen if we never saw it?' by expressing a sense of loss: 'We would lose an interpretation of history. We would never know what life was like. We would be less well informed. We'd be the poorer'.

Conclusion

The conceptualisation of this doctoral project was rooted in my own career and experiences in the film archive sector. I spent twenty years in the sector as a lecturer, practitioner and researcher, collating archive film material and making it accessible through digitisation. I worked in community settings and schools across London with audiences of varying ages, screening local archive film that reflected ordinary lives and concerns. I had considerable experience of this material as a tool for memory work and for public history engagement in different locations working with colleagues, partners and audiences. Therefore the core of the project was a consistent set of questions around archive film, public history, place, memory and audiences. These questions asked how archive film might be used as a tool for public history engagement, what might be the role of archivists and practitioners and the role of this film material in exploring peripheral spaces around London.

In direct response to these questions I have explored ways in which archive film, particularly local material, might be used in public history engagement and practice to create affective experiences of cultural and personal memory in peripheral spaces around London. As part of this exploration I have examined the relationship of this film material to place and the idea of the 'village in the city' on the urban periphery. The relationship of the centre and the periphery has been a key theme throughout the research. This has been made manifest in several ways: firstly through an analysis of the relationship between the centre of the sector and its periphery in Chapter 3; secondly, through an exploration of the sometimes marginalised work of archivists and practitioners in Chapter 4; thirdly, through the audience studies in Chapter 6 which interrogate perceived attitudes to geographical spaces. Another major part of this research addressing core questions has been an interrogation of the role of the film archivist/practitioner in public history work with film archives. In what follows I will discuss my central arguments, the approaches used for the research and my contributions to ongoing debates on the use and value of archive film exploring constraints and barriers that have affected and altered the research. I will also consider the meaning and importance of the wider archive in general and the place of the film archive within a wider context.

In presenting a number of different ways of examining archive film and engagement, I have argued that this material offers an opportunity to explore cultural participation and everyday lives. The approach I have employed throughout the research is to allow a variety of voices to emerge from the film archive sector creating a space for the expression of the hopes, fears and lived experiences of those working and engaging with this material. This approach is manifested through the interviews with archivists and practitioners, through my own voice and experience and through studies where interactions with audiences enabled them to become participants in a debate on the value and usefulness of local archive film.

Thus a contribution to debate in this research has been an opening of ways for continuing consideration of the function, value and usefulness of local archive film material especially in a digital culture. This value is not self-evident and among the constraints and barriers affecting the research and its outcomes was the ongoing difficulty of addressing and interrogating the value of this material aside from instrumental metrics. Linked to this are issues around access to and availability of film material which are both often problematic due to its fragmentary and vulnerable nature and the need for preservation. Zimmerman (2008) notes the nature of the film archive, calling it 'never completed, always fragmentary, vast, infinite' (p.18) and the messy, flimsy and random nature of the material militates against easy access and use. Other challenges that affected the research were the institutional and financial parameters surrounding archive screenings which impinged on the five audience studies. These included the expectations of funders and the constraints of funded spaces and audiences as well as real-world issues with technology and dealing with the public, where control over venues, audience reactions and participation were not always predictable. This led to certain limitations with the research as explored in detail in Chapter 6.

Throughout the chapters of the thesis, I have explored work, practice, emotional labour and audience participation in the film archive sector. This qualitative research has created inductive hypothesis, generating research ideas rather than hypothesis testing. I was guided by a reluctance to impose meaning but rather to observe the field and those working and participating within it.

Therefore the project has presented me with a complex series of challenges including the need to closely examine and re-evaluate my own experience in the UK film archive sector. During my career I had carried out my practice with film and audiences often driven by expediency and funder demands so the project first enabled me to step back so I could undertake an overview of the sector. The archivists and practitioners who so generously and honestly shared their stories with me and the audiences who journeyed with me to engage with archive film have raised questions about how to deal with this important yet ostensibly neglected part of our history. We exist in a financial and political climate where the arts suffer generally from austerity and lack of funding/investment and where film archives in particular are subject to precarity and enforced mobility. I have given a voice to those who may be struggling in a world that does not appreciate that what they do is valuable.

I have collated testimonies of archivists and practitioners through interviews that revealed a cohort of voices from the film archive sector. These practices have not previously been systematically examined or analysed in detail epistemologically outside of project evaluations, which although they may record participants' thoughts about individual events, also very often gather data that feeds into instrumental metrics. Since the voice of the audience was part of this narrative a major aim was to get beyond normative ways of thinking about archive film and audience. The screening I describe in introduction to the thesis is similar in many ways to events I have organised, delivered or observed in the past. The pattern is familiar both to me and other practitioners. Some film, curated by a practitioner or archivist, is screened to a community audience followed possibly by questions, discussion, evaluation or a reminiscence session. There will possibly be refreshments and a chance to socialise. My aspiration was to challenge through interventions the conventions of this practice by enabling increased audience participation through the opening up of a space where their voices might emerge. I intended to create a conversation between the film text, the audience and the curator/practitioner encouraging audience participation thus moving participants from passive audience to contributor of valuable contextual material.

Throughout the research I was challenged by what Flinn notes as the difficulty of establishing a common understanding of terms employed in this area and how problematic definitions of 'community' and community archive' prove to be (Flinn 2007, p.152). Definitions of what a 'community' might be are especially complex and fluid and may focus on locality or on ideas of shared beliefs or shared values (p.153). For the work with audiences I found Flinn's definition of community archives particularly informative. His definition is 'the grassroots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, control and ownership is essential' (p.153). Gilliland & Flinn (2013) also question whether it is possible for a formal definition of community archiving to be developed and ask whether conceptual fluidity, diversity and lack of fixity might strengthen the sector (p.2). Alongside this was the challenge that perceptions and definitions of value for archive film material are varied and slippery. Local archive film material overwhelmingly deals in the prosaic, illuminating ordinary lives through different kinds of film footage. Memories of ordinary life and the mundane are thus preserved outside of 'official' records giving a voice to groups that may be marginal or invisible. While much of the practice carried out with this material takes as an assumption that film can empower people and communities to discover/rediscover history and memory, this is difficult to prove conclusively and defining value for moving image archive material in this context continues to be problematic.

In Chapter 3 I offer a critical examination of how the film archive sector in the UK has functioned both historically and currently to shape, enact and deliver strategies to facilitate or hinder public history practice with archive film. This leads into the final three chapters of the thesis which are concerned directly with voices from the sector. In Chapter 4 Voices from the Film Archive Sector 1 the human dimensions of practice are illuminated through interviews which map this landscape through respondent testimonies and uncover challenges for the sector. Here the function of local archive film as a tool for public history is filtered through the experiences of those working in the field and how they make meaning from moving image material. This discursive set of narratives creates a conjoint story where funding, value and access are central themes but other debates

emerge which concern the relationship of local archive film to mainstream cinema and aesthetics. I also offer observations from respondents on the use of archive film for memory work.

In Chapter 5: The London Screen Study Collection - an Autoethnographical Case Study my own narrative and journey with specific projects is added to that of archivists and practitioners. Areas for debate include how to create sustainability and legacy for projects like the LSSC in an era of austerity and financial constraints for the arts. The LSSC narrative is about success followed by failure and obscurity and it is impossible to separate the project from wider social and political issues and events of the years 2006-2015 that contributed to that failure. Similarly Screening Our Memories was a project on memory with no legacy and which left no lasting mark and created no memories, except in the minds of those who took part. The LSSC and Screening Our Memories are examples of projects which feel vital and worthwhile in conception and delivery but which disappear leaving no legacy. In Chapter 5, I analyse both projects and their demise as part of my own narrative and experience in the sector.

Chapter 6 Voices from the Periphery: The Audience allows space and privilege for the voices of the audience and non-professionals to emerge through training sessions, screenings and workshops. These voices are juxtaposed with the professional voices in Chapter 4 and 5. Chapter 6 also contains an in-depth exploration of a central theme of the thesis which is the examination of public history in peripheral areas of London and the idea of the 'village imaginary' where suburban areas function as villages particularly in terms of community life. The idea of the periphery here applies also to the film material used and its potential audience. The audience studies enabling these explorations were a series of community events in places on the geographical edges of London. Of particular interest was the idea of everyday participation as a situated process as defined by Miles & Gibson (2016 p.151). Eastcote House Gardens in Hillingdon, the venue for a screening and workshop was a public park and was as Gilmore (2017) suggests a 'vernacular space for everyday participation' (p.34). The interrogation of audience expectations and behaviour particularly considering locality, emotional

attachment and specificity of place was informed by microhistory defined by Szijarto (2002) as 'the intensive historical investigation of a small area' (p.209).

While this project has focused on the film archive the research links to wider debates about the nature of the archive and its function and reality in the 21st century. The research raises another overarching question which is: what is the archive and who is it for? Farge (2013) and Mills (2013) have discussed the archive in emotional terms as 'precious, damaged, infinite, indecipherable, like a highway' (Farge, p. 2), 'unsettling and colossal' (p. 5) and 'made up of fragments that are partial and incomplete, archives are enchanting, mysterious, seductive and addictive' (Mills, p.4). In her discussion of 'creatively engaged and enlivened archival practices that bring the past to life' (p.2), Mills suggests, as have other writers, that acknowledging the 'fragmentary and disordered nature of archives' (p. 5) is vital to a deeper understanding of how the form, contents and spaces of archives are changing due to the effect of technology and the growth of digital collections. I argue that discovering the nature of the archive calls for emotional engagement and reflection and this project has provided that with interviews, an autoethnographic exploration and audience studies which explore the commitment of workers and the potentially transformative nature of the material.

To return finally to film I note Mills' idea of 'ghosts' in the archive and what she calls the 'absent-presence' (p.9) of individuals no longer alive and frozen in time at a particular moment. Mills discusses issues of power and positionality where we can 'day dream about the lives of those found in the archive and try to imagine what their life was like' (p.10). Archive film can unfreeze these long-gone individuals, allowing the viewer to engage with everyday lives as if through a moving portal into another time. While the film runs, individuals and communities live for us again and it is possible to make contemporary connections between the archive and our everyday lives. The vastness of the archive can enable us seek out the cracks which help us define the past and in my research this illumination of public history led audience participants who viewed local archive film material to perceive it as a time capsule for future generations. My research has engaged with the lived

experience of archivists, practitioners and audience members as they interacted with this ebb and

flow of history through the everyday and mundane.

Appendix

INTERVIEWS/DATES

MJ (Age Exchange)	17/10/17
CW (MACE)	14/11/17
JP (ret MACE)	22/11/17
AH (NFCA)	18/1/18
East Midlands Group (PG, CW, JP, LP, SP)	7/3/18
SA (BUFVC)	8/3/18
YH (BFI Research Statistics Unit)	19/4/18
LP & SP (DMU, Leicester)	2/5/18
JB (ICO)	6/5/18
SC (Boots Archive)	14/6/18
IC (Birkbeck College)	11/7/18
SM (BBC etc.)	27/7/18

Bibliography

Aasman, S. (2014) 'Saving Private Reels: Archival Practices and Digital Memories' in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.)eds. *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Abercrombie, N. & Longhurst, B. (1998) 'Forms of the Audience' in *Audiences* London: Sage

Abraham, A. (2008) 'Deteriorating Memories: Blurring Fact and Fiction in Home Movies in India' in Ishizuka, K.L. & Zimmerman, P. eds. *Mining the Home Movie: Excavations in Histories and Memories* London: University of California Press

Adler, P.A & Adler, P. (1987) *Membership Roles in Field Research* London: Sage

Aitken, I. (1990) *Film and Reform: John Grierson and the Documentary Film Movement* London: Routledge

Alvarado, M. & Buscombe. E. (2008) 'Cultural Strategies: Publishing at the British Film Institute' In Focus: The British Film Institute 2008 (ed. T. Miller) *Cinema Journal 47,* No. 4 pp. 135-140

Anderson, L. (2006) 'Analytic Autoethnography' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* Vol. 35 Number 4 pp. 373-395

Arbeit, M. & Christie, I. eds. (2015) *Where is History Today: New Ways of Representing the Past.* Olomouc: Palacky University

Archives Task Force Report (2004) *Listening to the Past, Speaking to the Future* London: MLA Retrieved from https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/archives-sector/case-studies-and-research-reports/..

Arts Council England (2015) *Rural Evidence and Data Review* London: Arts Council England Retrieved from https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/.../Rural_Evidence_Review_2019_0.pdf

Ashton, P. & Kean, H. eds. (2008) *Public History and Heritage Today* London: Palgrave

Bachelard, G. (1964) *The Poetics of Space* New York: Orion Press

Balazs, B. (1952) *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art* London: Dobson

Baron, J. (2012) 'The Archive Effect: Archival Footage as an Experience of Reception' *Projections* Vol. 6 pp. 102-120

Bastian, J. & Alexander, B. eds. (2009) *Community Archives: the Shaping of Memory* London*:* Facet Publishing

Baudrillard, J. (1988) *America* London: Verso

Bazin, A. (1967) *What is Cinema? Vol.1* London: University of California Press

Bazin, A. (1971) *What is Cinema? Vol. 2* London: University of California Press

Becker, C.L (1935) *Everyman His Own Historian: Essays in History and Politics* Crofts and Co.

Belfiore, E. (2016) 'Cultural Policy Research in the Real World: Curating 'Impact', Facilitating Enlightenment' *Cultural Trends* 25:3 pp. 205-216

Benjamin, W. (1935) 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' in *Illuminations* (ed. H. Arendt) New York: Schocken Books 1969 pp. 218-22

Berliner, L.S. (2014) 'Shooting for Profit: the Monetary Logic of the YouTube Home Movie' in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.) eds. *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Bluck, S. (2003) 'Autobiographical Memory: Exploring its Functions in Everyday Life'. *Memory* 11 No. 2 pp. 113-23

Boscacci, L. (2015) 'The Archive in Contemporary Art: a Literature Review' *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science* Vol.3 No.8 pp 1- 8

Bottomore, S. (2004) 'From the Factory Gate to the 'Home Talent' Drama: an International Overview of Local Films in the Silent Era.' in Toulmin, V. Popple, S. & Russell, P. eds. The *Lost World of Mitchell and Kenyon: Edwardian Britain on Film.* London: BFI pp. 33-48

Boucher,M. (2006) What are Community Archives? Retrieved from: http://www.communityarchives.org.uk?page_id_32_path_0p1p73aspx

Brakhage, S. (2001) *Essential Brakhage: Selected Writings on Filmmaking* New York : Documentext (McPherson)

Brewer, W.F (1986) 'What is Autobiographical Memory?' in *Rubin*, D.C. ed. *Autobiographical Memory Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press

Brunow, D. (2015) *Remediating Transcultural Memory: Documentary Filmmaking as Archival Intervention.* Berlin: De Gruyter

Brunsdon, C. (2007) *London in Cinema: the Cinematic City since 1945* London: BFI

Burrows, E. (1995) *The British Cinema Source Book: BFI Archive Viewing Copies and Library Materials.* London: BFI

Butler, R.N. (1963) 'The Life Review: an Interpretation of Reminiscence in the Aged'. *Psychiatry* 26 pp. 65-76

Carroll, N. (2000) 'Introducing Film Evaluation' *in* Gledhill, C. & Williams, L. eds. *Reinventing Film Studies* London: Arnold

Carter, R. (2004) 'Of Things Said and Unsaid: Power, Archival Silence and Power in Silence'. *Archivaria* 61 pp. 215-232.

Caswell, M., Cifor, M. & Ramirez, M.H. (2016) 'To Suddenly Discover Yourself Existing: Uncovering the Impact of Community Archives' *The American Archivist* Vol 79 No1. pp. 56-81

Chalfen, R. (1986) 'Media Myopia and Genre-Centrism: the Case of Home Movies.' *Journal of Film and Video.* Vol. 38 No.3/4 Home Movies and Amateur Film Making pp.58-62

Chalfen, R. (1987) *Snapshot Versions of Life* Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press

Chalfen, R. (2002) 'Snapshots R Us: the Evidentiary Problematic of Home Media' *Visual Studies* 17 (2) pp.141-9

Children and Amateur Media in Scotland. Retrieved from http://www.gla.ac.uk/cams

Christie, I. (1994) *The Last Machine: Early Cinema and the Birth of the Modern World* London: BFI

Christie, I. (2015) 'Merely Local: Film and the Depiction of Place, especially in Local Documentary.' Olomouc: Palacky University

Chun, W.H.K (2008) 'The Enduring Ephemeral or The Future is a Memory' *Critical Inquiry* 35 pp. 148-171

Clarke, D. ed. (1997) *The Cinematic City* Oxford: Routledge

Collins, J. (2015) 'Doing it Together: Public History Making and Activist Archiving in Online Popular Music Community Archives' in Baker, S. ed. *Preserving Popular Music Heritage: do-it-yourself, do it together.* London: Routledge

Community Archives and Identities (UCL 2008-9) Retrieved from http://www.ucl.ac.uk/community

Community Archives Development Group (CADG) (2007) *The Impact of Community Archives* Retrieved from http://www.communityarchives.org.uk

Cook, T. (1997) 'What Past is Prologue? A History of Archival Ideas since 1898 and the Future Paradigm Shift.' *Archivaria* (43) pp 17-63

Cook, T. (2001) 'Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts.' *Archival Science* 1 (1) pp. 3-24

Cook, T. (2013) 'Evidence, Memory, Identity, Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms.' *Archival Science* 13(2-3) pp 95-120

Cookson, L. (1989) 'Amateur Film and the Archive' in *Researcher's Guide to British Film & TV Collections* (ed. J. Ballantyne) London: BUFVC

Cuevas, E. 'Change of Scale: Home Movies as Microhistory in Documentary Film' in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.) eds. *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Czach, L. (2014) 'Home Movies and Amateur Film as National Cinema' in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.) eds. *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Dallow, Peter (2003) 'Representing Creativeness: Practice Based Approaches to Research in Creative Arts' *Art, Design& Communication in Higher Education* 2(1) pp. 49-66

Dames, N. (2010) 'Nostalgia and its Disciplines: a Response' *Memory Studies* 3(3) pp 269-275

Davis, M. (1992) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* London: Verso

Davison, J. & English, A. (2011) *Screening Our Memories: A Practical Guide to Working with Archive Film and Reminiscence.* London: Film London

De Certeau, M. (1984) 'Walking in the City' *in The Practice of Everyday Life (*trans. S. Rendall) USA: University of California Press 2011

199

De Groot, J. (2009) *Consuming History: Historians and Heritage in Contemporary Popular Culture* Oxford: Routledge

Denzin, N. (2002) 'The Cinematic Society and the Reflexive Interview' in Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. (eds.) Handbook *of Interview Research: Context and Method.* Thousand Oaks: Sage

Deren, M. (1965) 'Amateur v. Professional ' *Film Culture 39* (Winter 1965)

Derrida, J. (1995) *Archive Fever: a Freudian Impression (*trans. Eric Prenowitz.) University of Chicago Press

Domankiewicz, P. (2019) 'Twenty Years after MOMI, Who Cares About Britain's Film History?' *The Guardian* 19/8/19

Dupin, C. (2006) 'The Post War Transformation of the BFI and its Impact on the Development of a National Film Culture in Britain.' *Screen* Vol. 47 issue4 pp 443-451

Ebrey, J. (2016) 'The Mundane and Insignificant, the Ordinary and the Extraordinary: Understanding Everyday Participation and Theories of Everyday Life.' *Cultural Trends* 25:3 pp. 158-168

Edwards, D. (2003) *London's Underground Suburbs* London: Capital Transport Publishing

Eisenstein, S. (1963) *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory* Dobson

Ellis, C., Adams, T.E & Bochner, A.P. (2011) 'Autoethnography: An Overview' *Forum: Qualitative Social Research (FQS)* Vol. 12 No 1 Art. 10

Ernst, W. (2013) *Digital Memory and the Archive* USA: University of Minnesota Press

Evans, F. (2015) 'The Barry Gray Archive' *Audiovisual Archives Conference* 17-19 July 2015 Retrieved from (British Library) eprints.mdx.ac.uk/17121

Farge, A. (2013) *The Allure of the Archives* New Haven: Yale University Press

Farley, P. & Symmons Roberts, M. (2013) *Edgelands: Journeys into England's True Wilderness* London : Jonathan Cape

Fee, S.B & Fee, T.R (2012) 'Visual Archaeology: Cultural Change Reflected by the Covers of Uncle Tom's' Cabin *Journal of Visual Literacy* Vol. 31 Issue 2

Finlay, L. (2002) 'Outing' the Researcher: the Provenance, Process and Practice of Reflexivity.' *Qualitative Health Research* 12 pp. 531-545

Flinn, A. (2007) 'Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges'. *Journal of the Society of Archivists.* Vol 28 No 2 October 2007. pp. 151-176

Flinn, A. (2011) 'Archival Activism: Independent and Community-led Archives, Radical Public History and the Heritage Professions.' *Interactions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies.* 7 (72) pp. 1-18

Flinn, A., Stevens, M. & Shepherd, E. (2009) 'Whose Memories, Whose Archives? Independent Community Archives, Autonomy and the Mainstream.' *Arch Sci* 9 pp. 71-86

Fossati, G. (2011) *From Grain to Pixel: the Archival Life of Film in Transition.* Amsterdam University Press

Fox, B. (2004) 'Rethinking the Amateur: Acts of Media Production in the Digital Age.' *Spectator* 24:1 pp. 5-16

Frayling, C. (1993) 'Research in Art and Design' *Royal College of Art Research Papers 1:1*

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures* New York: Basic Books

Gillham, B. (2005) *Research Interviewing: the Range of Techniques* Berkshire: Open University Press

Gilliland, A. & Flinn, A. (2013) 'Community Archives: What Are We Really Talking About?' *Keynote given at CIRN Prato Community Informatics Conference 2013*

Gilmore, A. (2017) 'The Park and the Commons: Vernacular Spaces for Everyday Participation and Cultural Value.' *Cultural Trends* 26:1 pp. 34-46

Glassberg, D. (1996) 'Public History and the Study of Memory' *The Public Historian* Vol. 18 No2. pp. 7-23

Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life USA*: Anchor Books

Gold, J.R & Ward, S.V. (1997) 'Of Plans and Planners: Documentary Film and the Challenge of the Urban Future 1935-52.' In Clarke, D. ed. *The Cinematic City* Oxford: Routledge

Grainge, P. ed. (2003) *Memory and Popular Film* Manchester University Press

Gray,C. (1996) 'Inquiry Through Practice: Developing Appropriate Research Strategies.' in *No Guru, No Method?* UIAH Helsinki

Gregory, B.S (1999) 'Is Small Beautiful? Microhistory and the History of Everyday Life.' *History and Theory* 38(1) pp.100-110

Gunning, T. (1981) 'The Cinema of Attractions: Early Film, its Spectators and the Avant Garde' in Elsaesser, T. with A. Barker (eds.) *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative.* London : BFI

Gunning, T. (2004)' Pictures of Crowd Splendour: the Mitchell and Kenyon Factory Gate Films.' in Toulmin, V. Popple, S. and Russell, P. eds. The *Lost World of Mitchell and Kenyon: Edwardian Britain on Film.* London: BFI pp. 49-58

Gutman,D. (1987) *Reclaimed Powers: Towards a New Psychology of Men and Women in Later Life.* New York: Basic Books

Habermas, J. (1962) 'The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere' (translated into English by Burger, T. & Lawrence, F. 1989)

Halbwachs, M. (1992) *On Collective Memory (*originally published 1941, edited and translated by L.Coser) University of Chicago Press

Haldar,P. (2019) 'Instituting an Archive' *Paper given at 'Interrogating Archives' symposium, Birkbeck Institute for Social Research .* 18/7/19

Hallam, J. (2010) 'Film, Space and Place: Researching a City in Film.' *New Review of Film and Television Studies* pp. 277-296

Hallam, J. (2012) 'Civic Visions: Mapping the 'City' Film 1900-1960' *Culture, Theory and Critique* 53:1 pp. 37-58

Harris, V. (2002) 'The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory and Archives in South Africa.' *Archival Science* 2 pp 63-86.

Harrison, H.W ed. (1991) *FIAF Cataloguing Rules for Film Archives* KG Saur

Hewison, R. (2014) *Cultural Capital: the Rise and Fall of Creative Britain* London: Verso

Hill, Geof (2015) 'Strategies for Evidencing the Frascatian Notion of Systematic Creative Work Contributing to the Body of Knowledge: an Example in 'Academic' Cabaret.' *Action Learning, Action Research Association Journal* Vol. 21 No 2 December 2015 pp. 150-175

Hill, Geof &Lloyd, Cathryn (2018) 'Articulating Practice Through Provenance' *Action Research Journal* Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1476750318786793

Hirsch, J. (1981) *Family Photographs: Content, Meaning and Effect* London: OUP

Holden, J. (2004) 'Capturing Cultural Value: How Culture Has Become a Tool of Government Policy' London: Demos

Holden, J. (2006) 'Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy: Why Culture Needs a Democratic Mandate' London: Demos

Holden, J. (2008) 'Democratic Culture: Opening Up the Arts to Everyone' London: Demos

Hopkins, I. (2008) 'Places From Which to Speak' *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 29(1)

Hutton, P.H. (1993) *History as an Art of Memory.* USA: University Press of New England

Huyssen, A. (1995) *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia* London: Routledge

Independent Cinema Office (2018) *New Towns, Our Town – Stories on Screen.* Application form to Heritage Lottery Fund 29/6/18

Ishizuka, KL & Zimmerman, P. (2008) *Mining the Home Movie: Excavations in Histories and Memories* USA: University of California Press

James, D. (1992) ed. *To Free the Cinema: Jonas Mekas and the New York Underground* USA: Princeton University Press

Jenkins, H. (2008) *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide.* USA: New York University Press

Jensen, B.E. (2008) 'Usable Pasts: Comparing Approaches to Popular and Public History' *in* Ashton, P. & Kean, H. eds. *Public History and Heritage Today* Palgrave

Jochelovitch, S. & Bauer, M.W. (2000) 'Narrative Interviewing' in Bauer, M.W & Gaskell, G.(eds) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound* Sage

Josias, A. (2011) 'Towards an Understanding of Archives as a Feature of Collective Memory.' *Arch Sci* 11 pp. 95-112

Kansteiner, W. (2002) 'Finding Meaning in Memory: a Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies.' *History and Theory* 41 pp.179-197

Kelley, R. (1978) 'Public History: its Origins, Nature and Prospects' *The Public Historian* 1(1)

Ketelaar, E. (2009) 'A Living Archive Shared by Communities of Records' in Bastian, J. and Alexander, B. eds (2009) *Community Archives: the Shaping of Memory* Facet Publishing

Kilborn, R. (2014) 'I am a Time Archaeologist': Some Reflections on the Filmmaking Practice of Peter Forgacs'. in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.)eds. *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Kokaram, A.C. (2004) 'On Missing Data Treatment for Degraded Video and Film Archives: a Survey and a New Bayesian Approach.' Retrieved from ieeexplore.ieee.org

Kracauer, S. (1969) *History: the Last Things Before the Last* OUP

Lewis, C.N. (1971) 'Reminiscing and Self-concept in Old Age' *Journal of Gerontology* 26 pp. 240-243

Livingstone , S. (1998) 'Relationships Between Media and Audiences: Prospects for Audience Reception Studies.' Retrieved from LSE Research Online http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/1005

Long, P. (2015)' Really Saying Something? What Do We Talk About When We Talk About Popular Music Heritage, Memory, Archives and the Digital?' in Baker, S. ed. *Preserving Popular Music Heritage: do-it-yourself, do it together.* London :Routledge

Lund, C. (2018) 'The Struggle is Not Over: Remediating Archives of Militant Cinema'. *Besides the Screen Conference 5-6 July 2018* CIAC- ISMAI, Porto

Lury, K. (2014) 'The Amateur Film: from Artefact to Anecdote' in Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.) eds *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web* London:. Bloomsbury

Malik, S., Chapain, C., & Comunian, R. (2014) *Spotlight on Community Filmmaking: a Report on Community Filmmaking and Cultural Diversity Research*. Brunel University, University of Birmingham and King's College, London

Mander, D. (2009) 'Special, Local and About Us: the Development of Community Archives in Britain' in Bastian, J. & Alexander, B. eds. *Community Archives: the Shaping of Memory* Facet Publishing

Manoff, M. (2004) 'Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines.' *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4 (1) pp. 9-25

Mansell, J.G. (2017) *The Age of Noise in Britain* UK: University of Illinois Press

Mapping the City in Film (2008-10) Retrieved from http://www.liverpool.ac.uk/cava

Marelli, N. (2004) 'Archival Appraisal and the Preservation of Audiovisual Records at Concordia University Montreal Canada' in Craig, B. *Archival Appraisal: Theory and Practice* K.G. Saur

Marshall, J. (2011) 'Images of Changing Practice Through Reflective Action Research' *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 24 (20) p. 244-256

Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place and Gender* Cambridge: Polity Press

Massey, D. (2004) 'Geographies of Responsibility'. Open University online Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00150.x

Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts* UK: Comedia

McArthur, C. (1997) 'Chinese Boxes and Russian Dolls: Tracking the Elusive Cinematic City' *in* Clarke, D. ed. *The Cinematic City* Oxford: Routledge

McRobbie, A. (1999) *In The Culture Society* Oxford: Routledge

Mennel, B. (2008) *Cities and Cinema* Oxford:Routledge

Meyerhoff, M. (2004) 'Doing and Saying: Some Words on Women's Silence' *in* Bucholtz, M. ed. *Language and Women's Place: Text and Commentaries* Toronto: Harper and Row

Miles, A & Gibson,L. (2017) 'Everyday Participation and Cultural Value in Place' *Cultural Trends* 26:1 pp.1-3

Miles, A.& Ebrey,J. (2017) 'The Village in The City: Participation and Cultural Value on the Urban Periphery.' *Cultural Trends* 26:1 pp.58-69

Miles,A. & Gibson, L. (2016) 'Everyday Participation and Cultural Value' *Cultural Trends* 25:3 pp. 151-157

Miller, J. (2014) 'The Fourth Screen: Mediatisation and the Smartphone' *Mobile Media and Communication* Vol. 2(2) pp.209-226

Miller, T. (2008) 'Who Are These People?' In Focus: The British Film Institute 2008 (ed. T. Miller) *Cinema Journal* 47 *No. 4* pp. 121-163

Mills, S. (2013) 'Cultural-Historical Geographies of the Archive: Fragments, Objects and Ghosts.' *Geography Compass* 7 (10) pp. 1-19.

Morley, D. (1986) *Family Television: Cultural Power and Domestic Leisure* UK: Comedia

Morner, C. (2011) 'Dealing with Domestic Films: Methodological Strategies and Pitfalls in Studies of Home Movies from the Predigital Era.' *The Moving Image.* Vol. 11 *No 2* pp 22-45

Muncey, T. (2005) 'Doing Autoethnography' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* pp. 69-86

Newman, J. (2008) 'Harry Jacobs: the Studio Photographer and the Visual Archive' *in* Ashton, P. & Kean, H. eds. *Public History and Heritage Today* London :*Palgrave*

Nicholson, H.N. (2008) 'As If By Magic: Authority, Aesthetics and Visions of the Workplace in Home Movies c. 1931-1949.' *in* Ishizuka, KL & Zimmerman, P. *Mining the Home Movie: Excavations in Histories and Memories* University of California Press

Nicolini, D. (2009) 'Articulating Practice through the Interview to the Double' *Management Learning* 49 (2) *pp. 195-212*

Niemeyer, K. (2014) ed. *Media and Nostalgia: Yearning for the Past, Present and Future* Palgrave

Nora, P. (1989) 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire' *Representations Spring 1989* pp. 7-24

Nowell-Smith, G. (2008) 'The British Film Institute' In Focus: The British Film Institute 2008 (ed. Toby Miller) *Cinema Journal* 47 *No. 4* pp. 121-163

Odin, R. (2015) 'Visiting a City, Watching a Film' in *Where is History Today: New Ways of Representing the Past.* (M. Arbeit & I. Christie eds.) Olomouc : Palacky University

Ogborn, M. (2005) 'Mapping Worlds' *New Formation* no 57. Winter 2005-6 p. 145

Orgeron, D. (2006) 'Mobile Home Movies: Travel and *le politique des amateurs' The Moving Image: the Journal of the Association of Moving Image Archivists* 6(2) pp 74-100

Orr, J. (2003) 'The City Reborn: Cinema at the Turn of the Century' in Shiel, M & Fitzmaurice, T. eds. *Screening the City* London: Verso

Osborne, T. (1999) 'The Ordinariness of the Archive' *History of the Human Sciences* Vol. 12 No2 pp.51-64 Sage Publications

Petley, J. (1978) 'Realism and the Problem of Documentary' in Petley, J. ed. *BFI Distribution Library Catalogue* London :BFI

Polkinghorne, D. (1988) *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences* SUNY Press

Prelinger, R. (2007) 'Archives and Access in the 21st Century' *Cinema Journal* Vol. 46 No.3 Spring 2007

Rapley, T. (2004) 'Interviews' in Seale, C. et al (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice* UK: Sage

Rascaroli, L. & Young, G. (with Monahan, B.) eds. (2014) *Amateur Film Making: the Home Movie, the Archive, the Web.* London: Bloomsbury

Raune, J.M (2005) 'Talking Heads: the Interview' in *Essentials of Research Methods: a Guide to Social Science Research* Blackwells

Reason, P. ed. (1988) *Human Inquiry in Action: Developments in New Paradigm Research* London: Sage

Reason, P.& Bradbury, H. (2001) *Handbook of Action Research* Thousand Oaks :Sage

Roberts, L. & Koeck, R. (2007) 'The Archive City: Reading Liverpool's Urban Landscape Through Film' in Grunberg, C. & Knifton, R. eds. *Centre of the Creative Universe: Liverpool and the Avant-Garde.* Liverpool University Press

Roberts, L. and Cohen, S. (2014) 'Unauthorising Popular Music Heritage: Outline of a Critical Framework.* ' International Journal of Heritage Studies* 20(3) pp 241-261

Roberts. L. (2010) 'Making Connections: Crossing Boundaries of Place and Identity in Liverpool and Merseyside Amateur Transport Films.' *Mobilities* Vol. 5 No.1 pp. 83-109

Robinson, A. (2013) 'Walter Benjamin: Art, Aura and Authenticity' Ceasefire Magazine Retrieved from https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/walter-benjamin-art-aura-authenticity

Rosenzweig, R. and Thelen, D. (1998) *The Presence of the Past; Popular Uses of History in American Life* USA: Columbia University Press

Russell, P. (2004) 'Truth at 10 Frames Per Second? Archiving Mitchell and Kenyon.' in Toulmin, V. Popple, S. and Russell, P. eds. (2004) The *Lost World of Mitchell and Kenyon: Edwardian Britain on Film.* London: BFI

Samuel, Raphael (1994) *Theatres of Memory* London: Verso

Samuels, D.W *et al* (2010) 'Soundscapes: Toward a Sounded Anthropology.' *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 39 pp. 329-345

Schon, D. (1991) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* London: Ashgate

Schwartz, J.M. and Cook, T. (2002) 'Archives, Records and Power: the Making of Modern Memory' *Archival Science* Vol. 2 nos. 1-2

Shand, R. (2008) 'Theorizing Amateur Cinema: Limitations and Possibilities' *Moving Image* 8 No 2*.* pp 37-60.

Shand, R. (2014) 'Retracing the Local: Amateur Cine Culture and Oral Histories.' in Hallam, J. & Roberts, L. eds. *Locating the Moving Image: New Approaches to Film and Place* London: IUP

Shepherd, E. (2009) 'Culture and Evidence: or What Good are the Archives? Archives and Archivists in 20th century England.' *Arch. Sci* 9 *pp.173-185*

Shiel, M. & Fitzmaurice, T. eds. (2003) *Screening the City* London: Verso

Shiel, M. (2003) 'A Nostalgia for Modernity: New York, Los Angeles and American Cinema in the 1970s.' *in* Shiel, M. & Fitzmaurice, T. eds. *Screening the City* London: Verso

Short, J. Rennie (2006) *Urban Theory: A Critical Assessment* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Siegel, A. (2003) 'After the Sixties: Changing Paradigms in the Representation of Urban Space.' in Shiel, M. & Fitzmaurice, T. eds. *Screening the City* London: Verso

Silverman, D. (2001) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction* London: Sage

Sitney, P.A (2002) *Visionary Film: the American Avant-garde 1943-2000* 3rd edition London: OUP

Steedman, C. (2001) 'Something She Called a Fever: Michelet, Derrida and Dust.' *American Historical Review* 106 (4) pp 1159-1180

Stenhouse, L. (1981) 'What Counts as Research?' *British Journal of Educational Studies* 29(2) pp103-114

Stringer, J. (2003) 'Raiding the Archive: Film Festivals and the Revival of Classic Hollywood.' *in* Grainge, P. ed. Memory *and Popular Film* Manchester University Press

Stubbings, S. (2003) 'Look Behind You! Memories of Cinema-going in the 'Golden Age' of Hollywood.'in Grainge, P. ed. Memory *and Popular Film* Manchester University Press

Sutcliffe, A. (1984) 'The Metropolis in the Cinema' in Sutcliffe, A. ed. *Metropolis 1890-1940* London: Mansell

Szczelkun, S. (2000) 'The Value of Home Movies' *Oral History* 28(2*)* pp. 94-98

Szijarto, I. (2002) 'Four Arguments for Microhistory' *Rethinking History* 6:2 pp. 209-215

Tallack, D. (2000) 'City Sights: Mapping and Representing New York City' in Balshaw, M. & Kennedy, L. eds. *Urban Space and Representation* London: Pluto Press

Taylor,M. (2016) 'Non-participation or Different Styles of Participation? Alternative Interpretations from Taking Part.' *Cultural Trends* 25:3 pp. 169-181

Thompson, J.B (1995) *The Media and Modernity: a Social Theory of the Media* London: Polity Press

Thompson, E. (2004) *The Soundscape of Modernity: Architectural Acoustics and the Culture of Listening in America 1900-1933* USA: MIT Press

Tilley, C. (1994) *A Phenomenology of Landscape* . Oxford: Berg

Toulmin, V. Popple, S. and Russell, P. eds. (2004) The *Lost World of Mitchell and Kenyon: Edwardian Britain on Film.* London: BFI

Turci, A. (2006) 'The Use of Digital Restoration within European Film Archives: a Case Study.' *Moving Image* Vol. 6 (1) *pp 111-124*

Van Dijck, J. (2007) *Mediated Memories in the Digital Age* California :Stanford University Press

Vecco, M. (2010). 'A Definition of Cultural Heritage: from the Tangible to the Intangible.' *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 11 pp.321-324

Wang, QI & Brockmeier, J. (2002) 'Autobiographical Remembering as Cultural Practice: Understanding the Interplay between Memory, Self and Culture' *Culture &Psychology* 8(1) pp. 45-64

Wellbeing Policy and Analysis: an Update of Wellbeing Work across Whitehall. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224910/Wellbeing_Policy_and_Analysis_FINAL.PDF

Wisniewski, T. (2007) 'Framers of the Kept: Against the Grain Appraisal of Ephemeral Moving Images' *Moving Image* 7 no2. pp.2-24

Zimmerman, P. (1995) *Reel Families: A Social History of Amateur Film* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press

https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/takingpartsurvey

https://www.bafta.org

https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b0brzkzx

www.bbk.ac.uk/arts/.../london-screen-studies-collection

https://www.bfi.org.uk

https://www.bfi.org.uk/britain-on-film

https://www.bfi.org.uk/education

http://www.bfi.org.uk/news-opinion/news-bfi/announcements/bfi2022-five-year-strategy-uk-film

https://www.bfi.org.uk/britain-on-film/regional-national-archives

https://www.bfi.org.uk/.../national-regional-film-agencies

https://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/walter-benjamin-art-aura-authenticity

https://eastcotehousegardens.weebly.com.

http://www.filmlondon.org.uk

http://forumdesimages.fr/

https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-curriculum

https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-wellbeing

https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/uk-film-council

https://www.independentcinemaoffice.org.uk

https://learningonscreen.ac.uk

https://www.londonsscreenarchives.org.ukhttp://www.communityarchives.org.uk

https://www.macearchive.org

https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census

www.filmlondon.org.uk/london-a-bigger-picture

www.screenonline.org.uk/film/id/1084507

https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/nfca

ttps://spectator.co.uk/article/11th-june-1932/9/the-film-in-national-life

localstats.co.uk/census-demographics/england/london/hillingdon

Filmography

Blow-up	(M. Antonioni, 1966)
The Blue Lamp	(B. Dearden, 1950)
The City	(A. Calvalcanti, 1939)
The Crowd	(King Vidor, 1928)
Hands of the Potter	(Charles J. Chislett, 1948)
Home of Your Own	(T. Thompson, 1951)
Housing Problems	(A. Elton& E. Anstey, 1935)
Housing Progress	(M. Nathan, 1938)
Land of Promise	(P. Rotha, 1946)
London Can Take It	(H. Jennings, 1940)
Men of Steel	(Charles J. Chislett, 1949)
Midnight Cowboy	(J. Schlesinger, 1969)
New Town	(Halas & Batchelor, 1948)
New Worlds for Old	(P. Rotha, 1938)
Night and the City	(Jules Dassin, 1950)
Planned Town	(Welwyn Garden City Company, 1948)
Proud City	(R. Keene, 1946)
Taxi Driver	(M. Scorsese, 1976)

Waterloo Road   (S. Gilliat, 1945)

<u>Hillingdon films</u>

Uxbridge May Carnival 1922

Heston and Isleworth Charter Celebrations 3rd October 1932

Ruislip/Northwood Coronation Procession 1953

Heathrow Airport 1958

Town Twinning Newsreel (Hayes and Harlington)1959

Uxbridge Panorama (Uxbridge Past and Present) 1960s