The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

Paul Kerr

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

Paul Kerr

These outputs, with commentary and appendices, have not been submitted for any other academic award, and are submitted here in partial fulfilment of the requirements of London Metropolitan University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Prior Output

April 2013

Acknowledgements

In a Commentary partially devoted to problematising ideas of individual authorship in audio-visual media productions, an acknowledgement of the contribution of other individuals and indeed institutions is particularly appropriate. Thanks are due to colleagues from three very different periods of my career, those covering the years I was employed by the BFI (1979-1985) and, over a longer but overlapping period, members of SEFT and the editorial board of Screen throughout the 1980s; colleagues over almost twenty-five years making television programmes (1984-2007); and finally those I have worked with since becoming an academic. All, in one way or another, contributed to the research, writing and/or production of the submitted outputs.

The list of all those involved over more than thirty years, comprising two periods of publication interrupted by two decades of production, is too long to include here: people from SEFT, Screen and the BFI; and from the BBC, C4 and five independent television production companies - Illuminations, Beat Ltd, Wall to Wall, Mentorn and October Films, not to mention actual and potential interviewees consulted during production; then there are peer reviewers, editors, conference organizers, co-panellists and delegates at conferences in Britain and abroad where I have given presentations; and finally academic colleagues at LMU since my appointment there in 2007.

In the final category are past and present colleagues in what is now the Faculty for Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH) but was then the Department of Applied Social Sciences (DASS) including the Dean, Professor John Gabriel, two former academic leaders, Anna Gough-Yates and James Bennett, as well as other colleagues in the Media Information and Communication Section. All of them deserve thanks for their friendly support, but I must single out Mike Chopra-Gant and particularly Professor Paul Cobley for their extremely patient and perceptive supervision. Residual authorial possessiveness obliges me to take full responsibility for whatever mistakes are included in what follows.

Abstract

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

There is an inherent irony in assembling a range of published and broadcast outputs which share my name, for the precise purpose of contextualising them in a Commentary concerned with interrogating the very idea of individual authorship. This submission consists of a number of such outputs, the work of over three decades, ranging from academic publications to broadcast television programmes. The former group are attributed to me; the latter include my name among the credits, either as producer, director, executive producer or a combination of the three. The accompanying Commentary aims to set the submitted work in context, demonstrate that it constitutes a coherent whole, and that it makes an independent and original contribution to knowledge and to the advancement of these two academic and professional fields.

A number of overlapping contexts are summarised here: the history of theoretical ideas of authorship in film (and media) studies, a field in which several of this candidate's own publications intervened; a brief sketch of the academic milieu in which media practice as research developed, to whose RAE 2008 Unit of Assessment several broadcast documentary examples, attributed to this candidate, were submitted and valorised and which now constitute part of this submission; a discussion of the ways in which authorship has been variously addressed within that documentary practice; and, finally, a consideration of how the theoretical concepts of 'shared textual authority' and 'collaborative authorship' can be deployed to analyse and, indeed, complicate conventionally auteurist readings of the (auto)biographical and oral history documentaries included in this submission.

These discrete but interlocking discussions form the major sections here, together with a brief introduction and conclusion. An appendix lists the candidate's relevant publications and productions, while another lists conference presentations. In addition, the documentation includes, as required, statements by explicit co-authors.

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

1. Introduction

'Contexts'

The work submitted and discussed here was published and produced over four decades.[1] To revisit it is to write a kind of academic and professional autobiography, but it is also, ironically, to interrogate the very idea that individual 'authorship' can be claimed for such publications and programmes. To set such work in the contexts in which it was produced necessitates both an intellectual curriculum vitae and a sketch of several institutional histories. I have already published two articles unpacking the production histories of specific televisual projects on which I was employed (Kerr, 1996 and Kerr, 2009, Output iv) and a third such production has been the subject of a paper at an academic conference (Kerr, 2010a). Fortunately, there already exists a range of academic analyses of the various institutional contexts in and for which I have worked, including the BFI, *Screen*, the BBC, C4 and the independent production sector that emerged to supply the latter. I have also written about the move of media academics into television (Kerr, 1991) and, more recently, of an exodus of television professionals into academia (Kerr, 2008).

The first academic strand of activity was, for me and for most colleagues, part of a wider strategy of establishing the claim for film and subsequently television as legitimate subjects of academic enquiry; this in turn contributed to making it possible to produce serious programmes about film in particular and the media in general for British broadcasters in the 1980s and '90s –

[1] Appendix A lists the submitted academic outputs, the in-text references to which are in the Harvard style with an added Output number, ordered chronologically, **eg** (Kerr, 1979/80, Output 1). Appendix B lists the submitted 'practice' outputs or television programmes.

my own entrée to the medium. However, if, in film studies, auteurism remains a default response, in broadcasting any interest in cinema as more than either Hollywood or entertainment has all but disappeared from terrestrial screens; thus this Commentary is also, in some sense, an obituary for a particular time and space for certain sorts of practice, not least those adopting and adapting some academic ideas about film and television and applying them to and in film and, in my case, television productions.

The British Film Institute and SEFT

In 1929, during a conference run by the British Institute for Adult Education, a Commission of Educational and Cultural Films was set up to produce, among other things, a report on film in education, the development of public appreciation of films and the establishment of a 'permanent central agency' to achieve these objectives. That report, *The Film in National Life*, published in 1932, recommended the creation of an independent film institute funded by the state and that body, the British Film Institute, was officially registered in 1933 (Nowell-Smith and Dupin, 2012; Dupin, 2008, and Alvarado and Buscombe, 2008).

In 1950 a Film Appreciation Officer was appointed by the BFI and that same year the Society of Film Teachers (SFT) was set up to promote the teaching of film appreciation in colleges and schools. In 1959 SFT changed its name to The Society for Education in Film and Television and its journal *Screen Education* was launched. In 1969 *Screen Education* was re-launched as *Screen.* By then, Paddy Whannel, head of BFI Education, had reconstructed his department as 'an academy in waiting'. Thus, when Asa Briggs[2] recommended in 1971 that the Education Department abandon its academic research and revert to assisting teachers and film appreciation, Whannel and several colleagues resigned. However, in the ensuing settlement the reformulated Society for Education in Film and Television

[2] Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey (2008) 'The British Film Institute', *Cinema Journal*: 47: 4, 128

and its journals achieved a surprising degree of financial and editorial autonomy. By 1978, when I joined the Society, *Screen* was an explicitly academic publication (Britton, 1978/79; Kuhn, 2009; Rosen, 2008; Bolas, 2009).

Among BFI Education's achievements in this period were an annual series of film theory summer schools in the 1970s (of which I attended two) and the funding of a series of film lectureships in British Universities, with Robin Wood's appointment at Warwick in 1973, Richard Dyer at Keele in 1974 and Peter Wollen at Essex in 1975. Eventually BFI funding for SEFT and *Screen* ceased in 1989, SEFT was disbanded and *Screen* moved to the University of Glasgow.

I completed my MA by thesis, on American Private Detective Films, under Richard Dyer at Keele in 1977. While working as a freelance film and TV journalist, I began teaching evening classes on a Diploma in Film Studies for the University of London's Extra Mural Studies department. In 1979 I was offered a short-term contract in BFI Education, as a researcher on a Film Extract Catalogue for teachers.[3] That same year I published my first article in *Screen Education*. In 1980 I got a full time job in the National Film Archive and this period coincided with an increasing involvement in SEFT and on the editorial board of *Screen* and my first contributions to academic journals. This experience at the NFA equipped me with the skill-set for my first film researcher job in TV and functioned as my introduction to some of the raw material, the found footage, with which two of the submitted outputs were produced some twenty years later.

My years at the BFI also coincided with the creation of Channel Four and my subsequent entrée into television was largely facilitated by interconnections between the two institutions. Not least of these was Anthony Smith's role as Director of the BFI

[3] This Extract Catalogue evolved to become the first edition of *The Cinema Book* (Cook, 1985). My contribution to this volume is uncredited.

(1979-1988); having been a key member of the Annan Committee on the Future of Broadcasting (1977), he became one of the first Board members of the Channel (1981-1985). [4]An ex-NFA Curator, Paul Madden, was among the first commissioning editors at C4 (for media programmes) and a book I co-edited at the BFI, *MTM: Quality Television* (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi, 1984) became the basis for a one-off documentary for the channel (*Cat Among Lions*, Kerr, 1984) that he commissioned. My next television job, on a 6 part series about TV itself, *Open the Box* (C4, 1986)[5] was as film researcher on a formal co-production between BFI Education and the independent production company, Beat Ltd. Beat's owner, Michael Jackson, was a Media Studies graduate, while my co-researcher on that series, Jane Root, had also worked for BFI Education. Beat's next production, *The Media Show*, a weekly magazine programme for C4 about the media, also initially series edited by Jackson, was based on a similar commitment to 'media literacy'.

Channel Four the independent sector and the BBC

The 1980 Broadcasting Act and the launch of C4 in 1982 led to the creation of hundreds of independent production companies. My first three employers in TV (Illuminations, Beat Ltd and Wall to Wall Television) were just such small companies, then specialising in public service programmes about the arts and media, generally one production at a time. An inherent paradox of the independent sector was and remains that tension between public service and private enterprise, creativity and commerce (Bennett and Kerr, 2012 Output i; Bennett, Strange, Kerr and Medrado, 2012).[6] I moved to the BBC in 1990, series editing a weekly film programme for BBC2 (initially as an in-house

[4] Annan Committee (1977) *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting* HMSO
[5] See also Jane Root's spin-off publication, *Open the Box* (1986) London: Comedia.
[6] For more on TV Independents see Doyle and Paterson, 2008, Robin and Cornford, 1992, Sparks, 1994, Ursell, 2000 and 2003 and Zoellner, 2009. There are currently only two book length studies of the British TV independent production sector, neither of them academic (Darlow, 2004 and Potter, 2008) but there are several studies of Channel Four including Blanchard and Morley, 1982, Lambert, 1982, Docherty, Morrison and Tracey, 1988, Harvey, 1994, Goodwin, 1996, Brown, 2008 and Hobson, 2008.

producer but subsequently at an independent production company) until 1996. Georgina Born's influential ethnographic study of the BBC covers some of that same period (Born, 2005). The programmes I worked on in the 1990s and 2000s fall within two categories, about both of which there is now a considerable literature: Arts television, (Hayward, 1988; Walker, 1993; Wyver, 2007) – primarily making programmes about the cinema (Ellis in Mulvey& Sexton, 2007; Kerr in Hill and McLoone, 1996; and Holmes, 2005) - and History television (Bell and Gray, 2007, Bell and Gray 2010 and Gray and Bell, 2012). There are auteurs associated with both categories, each with its own specific constraints on such creativity.

The 2003 Communications Act accelerated the commercialisation of the independent sector and inevitably diluted even those TV documentary production cultures still committed to public service programming principles (Zoellner, 2010, Bennett and Kerr, 2012, Output i). By 2007, with History programming also increasingly subject to market forces in dramatic ways (Bell and Gray, 2010, Kerr 2009, Output iv) I had decided that I could no longer sustain a career, even in this expanded niche, and either had to begin making programmes I was much less interested in or seek another profession. I took a job as Senior Lecturer in Broadcast Media at London Metropolitan University. And once I had, more or less successfully, found my feet in academia and completed my PGCHE, I returned to some of the academic concerns that had intrigued me over two decades earlier, ballasted with the industry experience of those twenty years in the independent television production sector.

2. Authorship and/in Theory: The concept of authorship as addressed in my academic output

Much of my academic work has been addressed to contesting or contextualising attributions of creative agency or authorship in film and television. From my first academic publication (Kerr 1979/1980 Output vi) to the most recent (Bennett and Kerr, 2012 Output i) I have explicitly or implicitly considered the place of authorship within the film and television industries and the ways in which the academic practice of auteurism has distorted discussions of the professional practices of those industries.

Authorship remains perhaps the most familiar and influential theory of cinema. The idea of the author as simultaneous source and centre of cinematic texts, and the subsequent challenges to that conception, have long been at the heart of film studies. Indeed, the elevation of – and attribution of meaning to - individual authors was an arguably inevitable strategy in the struggle to validate the cinema, imbuing it with the cachet of artistic respectability within a primarily literary academic culture. Thus, perhaps the best known British auteur critic, Robin Wood, in his book on Howard Hawks, whilst admitting that Hollywood is a remorseless commercial industry, equally insists on it as 'a great creative workshop, comparable to Elizabethan London or the Vienna of Mozart…' (Wood, 1968: 9) Similarly, his first acknowledgement at the end of that book is to the work of F.R. Leavis. In *Hitchcock's Films Revisited* (Wood, 1989) he returns to Leavis and literary criticism. [7]

Auteurism thus functioned as something of a Trojan horse within which the shock troops of Hollywood were smuggled into the citadel of cinematic Art, helping to provide the new field of film studies with a critical vocabulary and cultural kudos of its own. Caughie (1981: 3), discussing the historical and indeed geographical specificity of auteurism, reveals 'the

[7] For a brief discussion of the auteur case for Hawks and Hitchcock see Kerr (1986).

concentration of authorship theory on a single cinematic practice – the classic Hollywood cinema.' My own publications include attempts to situate authorship within the specific histories of the Hollywood film industry (Kerr, 1983, Output v and 2011, Output ii) and to address its pertinence and productivity beyond Hollywood, to the international art cinema from which the idea of the director as artist was initially appropriated (Kerr, 2010, Output iii). Auteurism soon became a privileging of one professional role over all others in film studies – and one that to a surprising extent, at least for a brief period, was reflected in Hollywood itself. Meanwhile, the continuing appearance of academic anthologies on the subject, two recent examples of which republished my work, demonstrate its continuing resonance and relevance (Caughie, 1981; Gerstner &Staiger, 2003; Wexman, 2003; Grant, 2008). [8]

If auteurism itself had an author, then perhaps it was Francois Truffaut in 1954, who famously deployed the French word auteur, for a film's author, in calling for a "cinema d'auteurs". (Truffaut, 1954)). Truffaut's polemic, or critical policy – *la politique des auteurs* - advocated a cinema in which film directors, rather than relying on over-literary scripts and adaptations from literature (as, he alleged, was the case with French cinema's then celebrated but creatively moribund 'tradition of quality'), would write and create their own films without a pre-existing cultural prosthesis.

This auteur theory - as it was mistranslated and subsequently popularized (Sarris, 1962, 1968) - celebrated directors (and their visual style and themes) over writers (and their verbal storytelling, characterisation and dialogue skills). As Sarris put it, 'Ultimately, the auteur theory is not so much a theory as an attitude, a table of values that converts film history into directorial autobiography' (Sarris, 1968: 30). This early auteurism was often characterised by a celebration of the

[8] Of course the concept of authorship goes far beyond screen studies – see for instance Burke (1998) and Bennett (2005), but this is beyond the scope of this Commentary.

supposed tension between an artist's personal vision and the means at his or her disposal for its realization – financial, technical, generic, institutional and so on. Such constraints were often seen as positive, prompting expressive and sometimes excessive stylistic and thematic strategies on the part of the heroic director.

Ironically, just as Sarris's book length auteurist study, *The American Cinema*, was published in 1968, debates about authorship outside the English-speaking world were moving on. So called 'auteur-structuralism', reliant on the work of the linguist Saussure and his studies of language (1974) and the anthropologist Levi-Strauss's analyses of myths (1968), represented one departure from 'auteur theory'. This began to lend a more or less scientific theoretical patina to the somewhat empirical practical criticism associated with Sarris and the journal *Movie*, replacing it with the revelation of structural oppositions at the heart of an auteur's*oeuvre*. That there was an implicit incompatibility between the social (rather than individual) and unauthored myths studied by Levi-Strauss (1969) in anthropology and the directorial subjectivities unearthed by auteur-structuralism in relation to cinema was ignored (Eckert, 1973; Henderson, 1973; Wollen, 1968 and 1972). Peter Wollen could write, 'Fuller or Hawks or Hitchcock, the directors, are quite separate from 'Fuller' or 'Hawks' or 'Hitchcock', the structures named after them and should not be methodologically confused' (Wollen, 1972: 147) as if that resolved the problem (Kerr, 1986).

By 1968, in France, the original *Cahiers* critics (Truffaut, Chabrol, Rohmer, Rivette, Godard) had all left the magazine and been replaced by editors Jean-Louis Commolli, Jean Narboni and Jean-Pierre Oudart who were at once more avowedly political and more intellectually stringent than their predecessors. Drawing on Althusserian Marxism and Lacanian psychoanalysis as well as Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' (1968/1977) and Foucault's 'What is an Author?' (1969/1977),

they saw authorship as a reading strategy, deeply influenced by Barthes' assertion that 'the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author'. (1977: 148) Here authorship had been reconceived as the site of discourses, a Foucauldian notion in which the author becomes just another text to be decoded, as exemplified by the influential *Cahiers* study of John Ford's *Young Mr Lincoln* (1970). Once again this theoretical development was swiftly taken up in the English-speaking world, this time by the translation of the *Cahiers'* piece in *Screen* (1972).

In his Introduction to *Theories of Authorship*, Caughie admits he has 'very little to say on the place of the author within institutions (industrial, cultural, academic), or the way in which the author is constructed by and for commerce.' (Caughie, 1981: 2) Two years later I attempted 'to sketch out – if not yet fill in – some of the gaps discussed by Caughie concerning the place of the author within those institutions' (Kerr, 1983: 48, Output v). My own subsequent Reader in Film Studies, in the same series as Caughie's, (Kerr, 1986) anthologised a number of pieces on Hollywood as an industry which attempted to specify some of the institutional determinants on meaning and delimitations on agency. These institutional or organizational determinants included the banks, the studios, exhibition strategies, the technologies of sound and colour, the screenplay and the studio unions. As part of this endeavour I included my own essay on the industrial determinants of the B Film Noir (Kerr, 1979/80, Output vi).

That article summarized the ways in which, in numerous studies of film noir, critics identified novelists, painters, photographers and philosophers who influenced the genre or shifted the focus beyond the director to other professional practitioners including screenwriters and cinematographers (Kerr, 1979/80: 45, Output vi) or further still to the war or capitalism or the American zeitgeist itself. Rather than relying on the notion of individual artistry, I attempted to demonstrate that it was not merely the stylistic signature of some film industrial employees but

precisely specific film industrial conditions and modes of production in the 1940s and 1950s that facilitated the economic and stylistic choices which have been retrospectively identified as characterising film noir and conventionally attributed to their auteur directors. Discussing previous attempts to attribute film noir to either such artists or the form's cultural ancestors, I concluded that

'What they have not done however is to relate those general – and generally untheorised – notions of 'influence' to the specific modes of production, both economic and ideological, upon which they were, presumably, exercised; in this case, those structures and strategies adopted by certain fractions within the American film industry over a period of almost two decades.' [9] (Kerr, 1979/80: 45, Output vi).

The article has since been reprinted (in Bennett, 1990; Silver and Ursini, 1996; Miller, 2009). My 1986 collection included a brief commentary on the development of authorship within film studies (Kerr, 1986: 12-19) and other outputs included here include subsequent case studies re-contextualising films attributed to particular auteur directors – Joseph H Lewis (Kerr, 1983, Output v), Billy Wilder (Kerr, 2011, Output ii) and Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu (Kerr, 2010, Output iii) – within the corporate institutions and production cultures where these directors worked.

The first of these re-contextualisations, a case study of the production, exhibition and critical consumption of Lewis' film noir output, discusses 'the very real difficulty auteurists have experienced attempting to define and describe these films" and identifies "their representativeness of a particular professional strategy at a specific moment and mode of the American cinema's, and indeed the American film industry's, development…' (Kerr, 1983: 49, Output v). It goes on to discuss the ways in which the B movie milieu Lewis inhabited 'was an accidentally propitious arena in which the process of

'authorisation' could be played out and institutionally inscribed' (Kerr, 1983: 66, Output v)

The second analyses *Some Like it Hot* (Wilder, 1959),which is almost certainly Billy Wilder's most popular film - and in many conventional senses it is 'his' film: he is credited as producer, director and co-writer – but I discuss it not as a Wilder film, but rather as an industrially authored, package-unit film, independently produced by the Mirisch Company (Kerr, 2011, Output ii). In the third, I argued that the network narrative structure of *Babel* (Inarritu, 2006) can be attributed not only to its director and screenwriter (on what was the final film of three network narrative collaborations) but also to 'a structural homology: both of its mode of production and of the social relations of that production.' (Kerr, 2010: 48, Output iii)

Where Caughie's influential anthology acknowledged its silence on the institutional and economic site of individual auteurs, my published work was pioneering in its attempts to specifically situate such individual professionals within precise film industrial circumstances. Indeed, the Introduction to *The Hollywood Film Industry* (Kerr, 1986: 1-30) argued that film theory in general and auteurism in particular had *occluded* an understanding of how the film industry itself produced films. The anthology thus reprinted my essay on the emergence of a specific American film genre or style, not through its auteurs (*pace*Kitses on the Western, 1968 or McArthur on the gangster film, 1972, both of which essentially deploy genre as a canvas on which to display their chosen director subjects' signature styles and structures) but as a particular moment and precise economic mode of production in Hollywood's industrial history (Kerr, 1979/80 Output vi).

Developing this work on the industrial contexts for – and not just constraints on – creativity, I have published articles and co-edited books on the work of specific film and TV production companies – MTM Enterprises and its development of an

aesthetic strategy and a demographic and financial rationale for quality television (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi 1984) and The Mirisch Corporation's production of the auteurist classic, *Some Like it Hot* (Kerr, 2011, Output ii); two of that company's productions were also the subjects of television documentaries. In discussing the historical and retrospective construction of spaces for directorial reputations in a case study of the noir films directed by Joseph H Lewis (Kerr, 1983, Output v), or the circulation of authorial brands and signature narrative strategies within transnational art cinema, in an analysis of Inarritu's*Babel* (Kerr, 2010, Output iii), from the so called B studios that employed Lewis to the Art cinema circuits in which the work attributed to Inarritu is exhibited, I have attempted to address Caughie's acknowledged lacuna.

Thus I have consistently argued that film theory needs to calibrate its focus more precisely between the wide shot approach which sees Hollywood films as no more than a reflection of American society or of capitalism and a perspective in which the entire frame is filled with a close up on just a single member of the production team, the director. Both the director as auteur and (American) society as auteur approaches effectively evacuate the film industry itself from their analyses. Too often films have been and continue to be attributed simply to specific individual directors and/or general American ideologies – capitalism, Republicanism and so on - not least by the influential *Cahiers* study of *Young Mr Lincoln.*

But whilst Hollywood history (both as film industry and cinematic practice) is now the subject of detailed academic scrutiny, non-fiction film - specifically documentary - has barely begun to experience this critical revision. Suffice it to say here that if, as I argue above, the elevation of – and attribution of meaning to - individual authors was an explicit strategy in the struggle to validate the cinema, that inevitability is specific to cinema *fiction.* In documentary cinema and documentary television alike, the foregrounding of the creator has been

implicit and hardly needed to be iterated since Grierson's oft-cited but rarely sourced definition of the genre as "the creative treatment of actuality" (Grierson, 1933: 8). In this formulation, while 'actuality' functions as the guarantor of documentary authenticity, 'creativity' testifies to the art of the documentarists. And yet, as will be seen, the foregrounding of the individual documentary auteur – Grierson, Jennings et al - is also open to contestation.[10]

Documentary, at least in what is sometimes considered its quintessential or ideal form, the observational film, aims at being as close to unmediated, as close to the experience of one hypothetical (human) fly on the wall, as possible (Nichols, 2000; Bruzzi, 2006; Ellis, 2011). Documentary filmmaking, indeed cinema itself after all, dates back to the Lumieres' 1895 *actualités*. In one history of this film practice, then, aiming if not actually claiming to show actuality with minimal mediation has effectively and instrumentally occluded authorship.

If documentary therefore occupies a problematic position for the theory of auteurism, the place of television further confuses the issue. A number of observers have tried to figure television as a location in which authorship akin to that posited for cinema might exist. Newcomb and Alley in *The Producer's Medium* (1983) argue that 'the television producer is the creative center who shapes, through choices big and small, works of television that speak of personal values and decisions' (quoted in Wexman, 2003: 11). Similarly, Thompson and Burns (1990) identify a canon of American television authors before the death sentence of cinematic authorship is announced for TV fiction too. There is even one forlorn book-length attempt to apply Sarris' approach to American TV fiction directors (Wicking and Vahimagi, 1979). My own contribution to this debate, on the other hand, (Feuer, Kerr and Vahimagi, 1984) was an early attempt to discuss the industrial and corporate cultural

[10] Grierson was, after all, primarily a patron and executive producer figure, with only a single directing credit to his name. See also Dai Vaughan's study of Jennings' editor, Stewart McAllister, *Portrait of an Invisible Man* (1983).

authorship of American television. Both my essays in that volume focused on the production of American TV fiction. (Outputs vii and viii). The approach to American TV fiction that they embody subsequently found considerable favour. Writing on British TV fiction, on the other hand, has accorded the status of auteur to writers who retain their traditional literary/theatrical prestige (Brandt, 1981; Caughie, 2000; Creeber, 1998; Cooke, 2003; Tulloch, 2002).[11]

Meanwhile, in discussions of documentaries, for small and big screen alike, the director continues to be perceived unproblematically as creator, author or filmmaker, if only implicitly (Nichols, 2001/2010, Rascaroli, 2009; Renov, 2004; Austin and de Jong, 2008, Bruzzi, 2006, Ellis, 2011, Lee-Wright, 2010, Nichols, 2001/2010, Rascaroli, 2009.) There is thus a conspicuous absence of academic writing about - and specifically interrogative of - the attribution of individual authorship within television documentary. Meanwhile, the TV industry itself and the press stress, through their deployment of the possessive pronoun, the creative role of TV presenters in documentaries in which they appear and which they are often credited as writing – Louis Theroux, Simon Schama, Andrew Marr among many others. In academic studies of television documentaries in the UK, Jeremy Tunstall's*TV Producers* (1993) is a rare exception to this rule.

In academia the implicit auteurist impulse remains. Thus, for Nichols – writing essentially about documentary cinema (not television)

'Every documentary has its own distinct voice. Like every speaking voice, every cinematic voice has a style or "grain" all its own that acts like a signature or fingerprint. It

[11] Sometimes this is facilitated through the adaptation of established literary classics. See Kerr (1982: 6-19), which noted that television's regular reliance on the literary novel for its reputation for quality, which echoes the situation diagnosed by Truffaut (1954) in French cinema in the early 1950s.

attests to the individuality of the filmmaker or director…

> Individual voices lend themselves to an auteur theory of Cinema' (Nichols, 2001: 99).

The voices of the subject and the author in documentary, particularly in television, remain problematic even in the most recent theoretical writings. I will demonstrate the relevance of concepts of documentary voice and authorship to some examples of my own prior output in documentary practice later in this Commentary.

3: Authorship and/in Practice: The concept of authorship as posed by and problematised in my documentary output

As we have seen, the traditional idea of the author, in the sphere of film theory, has been under siege for some decades. Yet, in the wake of the 2008 RAE results, in which Practice as Research was highly valued, that idea, at least as far as media practice is concerned, seems not only to have emerged unscathed but to have been reinforced as the methodological fulcrum on and by which the evaluation of such practice pivots (RAE2008 UoA 66 subject overview report http://www.rae.ac.uk).

In thus celebrating practice-as-research, the RAE appeared to recognise as unproblematic, indeed transparent, the role of individual authorship in media practice, including film and video-making, after a long period of theoretical challenge of such attributions in Film and Media Studies, examples of which may well have been entered for and validated by the very same Unit of Assessment.

This seems particularly ironic in the context of the present Commentary, in that examples of 'my' documentary practice were rated as 4* world-leading research in the 2008 RAE. Four of 'my' documentaries were the only examples of Practice submitted for the UoA66 by London Metropolitan University. The four submitted documentaries were *Marilyn on Marilyn*

(BBC2 28.12.01, Output e); *Nobody's Perfect*, (BBC2 16.4.01, Output d); *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea (*C4 26.06.05, Output g); and *The Last Slave* (C4 11.03.07, Output h). All four of those documentaries are also submitted here as examples of 'my' prior output, together with this Commentary - one of whose arguments is precisely that such attribution ignores both the collaborative and institutional realities of practice and the impact of film and media theory, as exemplified in my published work, some of which is also submitted here as prior output. As I hope to demonstrate, this work complicates, if it does not severely undermine, just such traditional notions of authorship.

Indeed, in the words of one recent observer, '...the research assessment process, driven in part by the master/mistress criterion of the 'production of new knowledge', is placing a new emphasis on the role of individual authorship in the production process' (Harvey, 2009: 81). This section of the Commentary begins by tracing the development of the conceptualisation of media practice within the academy and the relative absence of such critiques of individual authorship in discussions of documentary practice in particular. For just as the acceptability within the academy of creative media practice is belatedly in the ascendant,

'In a process of essentially industrialized cultural production (aka popular culture) – not only in Hollywood for example but also in most television production – it has become difficult not to accept the proposition that there are many labourers in the vineyard of meaning-making...' (Harvey 2009: p 82-83).

The debate about the value of Practice as Research has occupied Film and Media Studies since the emergence of the field in the 1970s (Bell 2004, 2006; Piccini and Rye in Allegue, 2009; and Dowmunt, 2003). The first course in Film Studies was set up at the University of Warwick in 1972, the National Film and Television School was founded in 1976 and the institutional

divisions between the two fields has remained characteristic of the divide ever since. The ambitions of academic courses like the former, were, at least in part, to legitimate the study of the medium; they involved developing and deploying theoretical models and templates for the academic analysis of cinema (and later television), while the National Film and Television School, and departments and institutions like it, often saw their role as providing professional craft skills for work in those two industries (Bell, 2004: 739).

I started working in television as a specialist archive researcher in programmes about the media, and my hybrid background (in the National Film Archive but also on the editorial board of *Screen*) continued to underwrite my early employability in the TV industry (Kerr, 1991). Thus 'my' broadcast output includes programmes about the making of several classic or cult films – for instance, documentaries about *Some Like it Hot* (*Nobody's Perfect*, Kerr, 2001, Output d), *The Magnificent Seven* (*Guns for Hire: The Making of The Magnificent Seven*, Kerr, 2000, Output c), *The Usual Suspects* (*Nothing is as it Seems,* Kerr, 1998) and *The Silence of The Lambs* (*Lambs Tales*, Kerr, 1991), as well as others about specific production companies: Palace Pictures – *Who's Crying Now?* (Kerr, 1994) and MTM Enterprises – *Cat Among Lions* (Kerr, 1984a). All of these, however implicitly, problematise the attribution of authorship or creative credit to the signature of single individuals. One example identified in *Guns for Hire* is the crediting of multiple writers for the screenplay of and multiple claimants to having had the original idea for *The Magnificent Seven.*[12]

There is a curious gap between television's onscreen attribution of multiple professional credits and the academic privileging of a very limited selection from that fluid hierarchy of credited roles in publications and courses about the medium. It is curious

[12] It is perhaps significant here that two of those collaborative documentaries (Kerr, 2000 and 2001) provided raw material for subsequent academic publication (Kerr, 2011) whilst a third (Kerr, 1984), my first TV 'credit', was itself based on a collaborative academic publication. (Feuer, Kerr and Vahimagi, 1984)

not least because of the often implicit assumption that such courses are preparing students, among other things, for possible employment in the audio-visual media (Kerr, 1991 and Kerr, 2008). This disparity makes the acknowledgement of the work attributed to such credited authors by academic institutions like the RAE all the more complicated.

To confuse matters further, while film studies remains residually auteurist in academia despite the concept being contested, TV is still in some senses pre-auteurist. The Harvard referencing system for a feature film requires the title, year of release, director, country of origin, and film studio, while for a broadcast television program the requirements are title, and episode number if relevant, year of broadcast, broadcasting organization and channel, date and time of transmission. Despite this acknowledgment of the institutional and national rather than human determinants of a broadcast in the referencing requirements, it was a selection of 'my' own practice as TV documentary maker (and that possessive pronoun conceals the complexity of such attributions) which was awarded the accolade of world leading research in the 2008 RAE, rather than, say, any such qualities being attributed to the production companies or the broadcasters.

As Bannerman and McLaughlin point out, 'virtually all creative work in the arts is collaborative, and that any claim to single authorship is inherently unethical as it does not acknowledge the contributions of others.' (Bannerman in Alleque et al, 2009: 66-67)McLaughlin develops this idea, in his discussion of precedents for collaborative films that actually acknowledge their collaborative nature – films like those of David and Judith MacDougall and Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin (McLaughlin in Alleque et al, 2009: 73). I will develop this idea of collaborative filmmaking and specifically what Renov (2004) has called 'shared textual authority' later in this Commentary. Similarly, Sorennssen notes that the burden of representation characteristic of Griersonian documentary practice led to 'several experiments

in letting the subjects in the documentary express themselves more directly...where enthusiastic filmmakers passed out cameras and sound equipment...' (Brown and Sorenssen, 2008: 57). An early, notorious example of this is the story of Grierson's sister Ruby's off-screen thrusting of the microphone at slum tenants in Housing Problems (1934) requesting them to 'tell the bastards what it's really like' (Lee-Wright, 2009: 84). Bell cites another form of such collaboration when he notes that, 'television and film producers working in the factual field hire specialist picture researchers to locate relevant archival images. They call on the services of specialist academics such as historians to develop scripts and programme treatments...' (Bell, 2006: 86).

The RAE historically encouraged creative practitioners to find public exhibition for work which could be seen in some sense to parallel the peer-reviewed publication outlets of written work:

'This was the primary model employed by the RAE to assess individual academic's research output, and art institutes were greatly relieved to find they could re-inscribe the art work of lecturing staff within it and qualify for RAE recognition and funding. Universities began to hire professional filmmakers and visual artists with impressive portfolios of exhibited work to strengthen their research profile in the area of art, design and media' (Bell, 2006: 88).

I was a beneficiary of this development. Thus selected examples of some professional media practitioners' practice were submitted to the RAE, as Bell puts it, 'irrespective of whether the authors themselves conceived of their art works in this way" (Bell, 2006: 86). I would neither claim to be the author of 'my' works submitted in this way, nor that they were "art works', in this valorized sense, nor indeed was even aware of the existence of the RAE - nor even of any agreed criteria for academic assessment of practice - when they were produced.

My own twenty plus year career in TV repeatedly demonstrated to me both the collective rather than individual, and the industrial/institutional as well as residually artisanal nature of creative audio-visual production, particularly in the many instances where that work itself focused *on* creative production. As I have stated, that career began with a role as a researcher and interviewer on a one-off documentary, *Cat Among Lions* (Kerr, 1984a), about a production company specializing in drama and comedy. It was made for Channel 4 and was an attempt to offer alternative ways of thinking about cultural production and authorship beyond individual attributions. This documentary profile of an independent production company was itself produced by a small independent production company, Illuminations and was commissioned to coincide with the publication of a book which I co-edited and co-wrote and a season of screenings at the National Film Theatre that I co-curated. This was the book about an American TV production company, MTM Enterprises, entitled *MTM: Quality Television.* (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi, 1984), discussed above. As a study of, among other things, corporate authorship, published as an academic anthology of which I was one of three editors, this was hardly an auspicious entrée for a career as an unreflective television auteur.

Among the book's aims was an attempt to complicate conventional accounts of authorship in the production processes of American network television. Indeed, *contra* the majority of academic accounts of creativity in film and television (see above), my career in the industry continued in collaborative mode, in an environment led not by the agency of individualistic acts of artistry but by the structuring demands of formats, commissioning departments, scheduling conventions, budgets, multi-skilling and multi-tasking, the working practices of other colleagues and the respective production cultures of the independent production companies in which - and the broadcasters for which - we worked and the generic traditions and creative spaces into and for which such programmes were

produced. A production case study of the last documentary I produced, *The Last Slave* (C4 2007, Output iv), provides an analysis of the role such forces play in shaping a television production (Kerr, 2009 Output iv).

From over 150 programmes I worked on in the collaborative milieu of TV production, the selection from my professional output submitted with this Commentary constitutes just 10 documentaries (one three-part series and seven single documentaries). On those documentaries my on-screen credit ranges from Series Producer to Producer to Producer/Director. However those roles were never undertaken in an institutional/generic or collaborative vacuum. It will suffice here to discuss the production of just one of those many programmes.

The Crimean War (Kerr, 1997, Output b) series could hardly be further from having an onlie begetter or single author. It was inspired by and borrowed from the techniques associated with the award-winning PBS series *The Civil War* (Burns, 1990) which used eye witness accounts (from letters, diaries, memoirs and so on, together with interviews with historians, narration, and contemporary photographs of that war). When a long-running BBC2 series I had been producing (*Moving Pictures,* BBC2, 1990-1996) was suddenly cancelled in the autumn of 1996, I had to win a swift commission in order to secure my continued employment at the production company, MentornBarraclough Carey. A colleague and I researched and wrote a proposal for a series about the Crimean War which was not only a British conflict a decade before the American Civil War, but was actually the first war to be professionally photographed, preceding the American conflict by a decade, the first to have its own professional war correspondents and to use the telegraph. So the genesis of that series was arguably due to (if not exactly authored by) a combination of plagiarism and job insecurity. I had previously produced one history documentary, a *Timewatch* edition entitled *The Projection Racket*, (1995, BBC2) (Kerr, 1995, Output a) about the mafia's infiltration of the

American film industry unions in the 1930s. That documentary included some dramatic reconstructions which were rigorously based on verbatim extracts from trial testimony and subsequently the production team (and parts of British broadcasting more generally) had become interested in oral history and limited dramatized documentary. The latter programme, furthermore, developed on an essay – not by me - anthologized in my BFI Reader (Kerr, 1986) and at the same time recapitulated an earlier academic interest in the form (Kerr, 1981 and Goodwin, Kerr, MacDonald 1982).

Perhaps significantly, that documentary's inclusion of dramatic reconstruction (albeit based on historical documents and supported by accompanying interviews with the surviving participants from the court case) had met with considerable resistance from the BBC's *Timewatch* series editor, Laurence Rees, later to take up the tools of reconstruction far more controversially himself (Bruzzi, 2006: 45-46). Within a couple of years the pressures for ratings and international sales made reconstruction virtually obligatory in history programmes. Such compromises are of the essence of television documentary and individual agency can often do little to resist them. The Crimean War was thus an example of following rather than prefiguring television fashion.

As an oral history of the war, *The Crimean War* focused on the experiences of eye witnesses who were often ordinary soldiers, sailors, nurses, reporters, civilians and so, from all sides of the conflict, rather than only Monarchs, politicians and Generals. The practicalities of the series – an oral history of a multinational war - meant that staffing *The Crimean War* required the employment of French and Russian speaking members of the core team. Television oral history, perhaps even more than any other television history form, necessitates multiple authorship, with technical, editorial and other skills. On this production I was credited as Series Producer and Mick Gold as Series Director, and the logistics of scheduling necessitated three films being simultaneously shot and then simultaneously

edited, with the consequence that, in post-production, Mick Gold wrote and directed the first, the present candidate wrote and directed the second and the Associate Producer wrote and directed the third. The Series Researcher, Georgina Pye and Picture Researcher Karla Bryan were also crucial contributors, and there was an Executive Producer, George Carey and two C4 commissioning editors involved in the process – Alan Hayling and Peter Moore. And as the series was a co-production for France's La Cinquieme and America's The Learning Channel there was also some post-post-production 'versioning' in response to specific national, institutional and demographic requirements.

As this was a three part series, the material filmed for each episode was all directed by Gold and shot by the cameraman and so the individual directors were actually assembling, with their respective editors, appropriate location footage, extracts from interviews and relevant archive material for their specific programme. The production team of the series also co-wrote and co-edited a book about the history of the war based on the same oral sources discovered and deployed for the series. The conventions of publishing and marketing necessitated that one of us took editorial credit, but once again the reality was much more collaborative. (Kerr, 1997)

Any analysis of creative agency in television thus needs to account for the contributions of the institutional spaces for authorship provided by the broadcaster, the production company or production department, the commissioning department, the programme genre and form (one-off or series/serial), and in my own case its identity as documentary or magazine programme, the presumed place in the schedule, the anticipated demographic of its audience, the budget, and so on.

In 1999, having moved as a freelance from MentornBarraclough Carey Productions to October Films, I was appointed Series Producer of four 30 minute biographies of black Britons for BBC Knowledge (now BBC4) entitled *Hidden History*, both

because of my experience producing a previous history series and because one of those four subjects was the Crimea heroine, Mary Seacole. Since this series was limited by very low budgets, digital rather than terrestrial transmission, thirty minute rather than one hour slots and inexperienced presenters, I subsequently attempted to secure a commission for an hour long, higher budgeted documentary about her. This was finally commissioned by C4 as *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* (C4, 2005, Output g) in the bicentenary year of her birth, and, being partly based on Seacole's autobiography, every word spoken by the actress playing her - in the intermittent, minimally dramatized, reconstructions that punctuated the documentary aspects of the programme (the conventional interviews with experts and expositional voice over narration) was a verbatim extract from that book. Seacole herself therefore is, in a sense, a co-author of the film. Similarly, a subsequent Samuel Johnson biography was constructed from autobiographical extracts from the lexicographer's (and others, including Boswell's) writings. Both these projects, then, developed from the interest in oral history begun in *The Projection Racket* and *The Crimean War*. But where those two projects used multiple first person testimony to 'document' the historical world, the Seacole and Johnson documentaries relied primarily on first person testimony of - and about - the subjects themselves.

Meanwhile, the Seacole documentary had reminded October Films that C4 was keen on anniversaries as pegs for programmes, but also familiarized us with the history of British slavery, specifically in Jamaica (Lee quoted by de Jong in Austin and de Jong, 2008: 168). 2007 was the bicentenary of the abolition of the British slave trade and in 2005 we came up with the idea at a development meeting at October Films. (Kerr, 2009 Output iv) A decade after *The Crimean War* series we attempted to apply the same, oral history and eye witness approach to a series for the same C4 History commissioning department about the final journey of the last legal British slaveship.

The Crimean War series widened the niche of programming for which I was considered eligible or employable by the industry, from media and arts programmes to history programmes. But this professional persona had to operate in an increasingly client-based and demand- rather than supply-led industry. (Ellis, 2000) Thus I was also the passive recipient (rather than the proactive initiator) of a series of film programme commissions from, first, C4 and, then, the BBC. This in turn led to a range of commissions of programmes to contextualise the screenings of acquired feature films and film seasons which C4 and the then new Film4 digital channel were planning. Apart from the obvious and implicit advertorial role of such commissions, the relation of such programmes to their parent channels was always closer than almost any previous productions I had been involved with and the degree of editorial independence or authorship - individual or institutional - that could be exercised was concomitantly diminished. Such commissions included making-of documentaries about Hollywood classics like *The Magnificent Seven* and *Some Like it Hot* and the research period of the latter turned up material which was to lead to another documentary, *Marilyn on Marilyn* (Output e).

Arguably, it is not the present writer's authorship but that of the entire team of collaborators and most significantly the film's posthumous co-author which might best explain both the critical and ratings success of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* (Output f). Furthermore, as films 'made in the cutting room' perhaps more than is true or many documentaries, authorship can equally, if not more unequivocally, be attributed to the editors of these two films, Dan Carey and OllyHuddlestone, and their archive researchers, Matt Haan, Louise Smith, and Alastair Siddons.[13] Furthermore, archive-based oral histories pose particular problems for documentary theory. As I argue in the following section of this Commentary, they raise fundamental questions for documentary authorship.

[13] As evidence of their individual 'creativity' Carey has composed, mixed and/or produced numerous music albums and Siddons has subsequently directed three feature films.

The voice-over narration - seen by many scholars as *a* (if not *the)* locus of authorship, or signature (Nichols, 2000, Bruzzi, 2006) - of most television documentaries is often constructed in a collaboration between the producer, director, executive producer, commissioning editor and, because of its writing or re-writing during post-production, the editor. On *The Crimean War* the voice-over narration was expository - objective in Nichols' sense of voice-of-God narration (Nichols, 2001: 105-109) - partly to distinguish it from the multiple off-screen voices reading extracts from the eye witnesses' letters, diaries, memoirs and newspaper reports that comprised the series' oral history of the war. Of course, that narration then had to be read in the recording studio by a narrator who brought her own voice to the mix. Thus the attribution of individual authorship is once again inadequate to the institutional, occupational and technological realities of television production. But if this is the case of all narrated documentaries, how much more complex is that of those whose own subjects' narrated them?

The three documentaries submitted here which I both produced and directed, *Nobody's Perfect, Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie*, are all based on archival material and the latter pair are particularly problematic in auteurist terms. *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* involved filming no new interviews at all and only a few minutes of new footage was shot for and included in either film. Thus the conventional locus of creativity in many auteurist analyses – production itself, rather than pre-production (research and writing) and post-production (editing, music, narration etc) – can be virtually omitted from consideration. This implies that the auteur is rare indeed in the archive-based documentary. Bruzzi does discuss the exceptional documentary work of directors Esther Shub and Emile de Antonio, but they remain exceptions, albeit pioneering ones. (Bruzzi, 2006: 15-36).

While *Marilyn on Marilyn* avoids expository, voice of God narration, opting instead for half a dozen on screen captions, and raises the question of authorship through its reliance on two pre-

recorded sound interviews with the star, *Billie on Billie* not only deploys pre-recorded sound interviews but also extracts from Holiday's autobiography read by an actress, an autobiography furthermore that was itself ghost-written. [14] These latter extracts were then voiced in post-production by one actress, as was the narration, by another, narration which was itself written in collaboration with the editor, the BBC commissioning editor and the October Films executive producer. I will discuss one way of re-conceptualising the authorship of this kind of archive-based documentary filmmaking later.

The success of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and its sequels rekindled my interest in oral history and this too may have eased the commission of both *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* and *Samuel Johnson: The Dictionary Man*. In the event, the former was radically transformed in pre-production negotiations with the commissioning editor for History, Ralph Lee, and subsequently with the director, Sonali Fernando, into a heavily dramatised documentary, and the second by the intervention during post-production of the BBC's Commissioning Editor. In this latter case a documentary commissioned by one BBC executive precisely because it proposed an appropriately alphabetical non-linear structure, was compelled to become a conventional biographical narrative by a different executive uninvolved in the commissioning. And it wasn't only the alphabetical structure that suffered at the hands of what we considered insensitive executive producer intervention. When we were unable to find a first person account of an episode in Johnson's childhood we wanted to include, we were simply advised to 'make it up'.

Similarly, on *The Last Slave*, the first person narrative account left by the freed slave - who was, after all, the co-protagonist - was barely mentioned in the final film. Thus a documentary which was once intended to be based on one of only a handful of surviving 'slave narratives', had, by the final cut, seen that

[14] This autobiography, Lady Sings the Blues (1956) was co-written with (or more likely ghost-written by) William Duffy.

freed slave's voice all but muted by instead giving voice to a charismatic descendant – a journeyer in his ancestor's footsteps. (Kerr, 2009, Output iv). Of such moments of agency, for good and ill, are the structures of broadcasting – and the culture industry itself – punctured and populated. If these are the spaces for authorship, they are highly contested.

4: Documentary Practice, (auto)biography, authorship and shared textual authority.

'In the documentary the basic material has been created by god, whereas in the fiction film the director is the god' - Alfred Hitchcock (Truffaut, **1969: 110).**

Documentary theory has long had an intrinsic problem with authorship. Grierson's famous definition fails to conceptualise the precise role played by the 'creatives' providing that 'treatment'. Similarly, Nichols' description of documentary as a "discourse of sobriety" (Nichols, 2001: 39, 54-55) is implicitly prohibitionist, puritanical in its interdiction of the inebriatingly subjective.

The above epigraph expresses Hitchcock's tongue-in-cheek distinction between filmic fiction and non-fiction. But it also reinforces the two normative modes with which Nichols characterises classical or canonical documentary – the Observational, which is, in a sense, God's world unmediated by (a camera-) man's intervention, and the Expository, which Nichols associates with the deployment of an omniscient, voice-of-God commentary (Nichols, 2000/2006). Nichols' other four documentary modes are Participatory, Reflexive, Poetic and Performative. Of these, only the Poetic and the Observational, at least in their ideal forms, prohibit interviews – indeed the interview has become all but ubiquitous in mainstream documentary. Nichols has diagnosed this as a problem for both documentary theory and practice, because, 'The sense of a hierarchy of voices becomes lost' (Nichols, 2005: 25). [15]

[15] See Cobley (2001: 94-107) for a discussion of hierarchy of voices in the classic realist text, a concept that can easily be adapted and applied to the casting of supporting interviewees in expository documentary.

Recently however that hierarchy of voices has begun to be challenged. In 2004, documentary theorist Michael Renov described what he called 'the recent turn to filmic autobiography' as 'the defining trend of "post-verite" documentary practice...' (Renov, 2004: xxiii). Subsequently, Renov went further still, suggesting that 'the very idea of autobiography challenges/reinvents the VERY IDEA of documentary' (Renov, 2008: 40). Here the *subject matter* of the film and the *subject making* the film, the matter and the maker, are one and the same. Indeed, a number of recent theatrical documentaries, because of their status between biography and autobiography, have prompted the construction of an entirely new conceptual category, deploying archival film, often in the form of home movies, to document the lives of their human subjects. Examples include the found footage of the Friedman family in *Capturing the Friedmans* (Jarecki, 2003), of Jonathan Caouette and his mother in *Tarnation* (Caouette, 2003), of Louis Kahn in *My Architect: A Son's Journey* (Kahn, 2003) and of Timothy Treadwell in *Grizzly Man* (Herzog, 2005), all of which provide key sequences in their respective films.

Bruzzi also deploys the term performative to describe documentaries in which the filmmakers themselves appear and perform roles in the text – citing the work of Nick Broomfield, Michael Moore and others (Bruzzi, 2006). Indeed Bruzzi notes the common criticism of performative documentary directors (or author-performers as she calls them) of getting between the actuality and the camera, of not allowing the subject matter to 'speak for itself' (2006: 198). But as she points out it is often too easily assumed that the repression of the author is a necessary condition for the capture of authentic documentary footage. Bell has also discussed documentary and specifically found footage filmmaking using precisely these terms (Bell, 2004a: 22). Interestingly, meanwhile, Bruzzi's notion of the performative refers to the presentation of self – otherwise designated as 'the autobiographical turn' - in recent documentary (Bruzzi, 2006: 185-218). Here Bruzzi discusses Nick Broomfield as a 'star

director', the epitome of the performative documentary auteur, and applies Wollen's auteur-structuralist perspective to distinguish Broomfield from 'Broomfield'. But the director 'performing' as a putative 'presenter' on screen is not quite the issue in some of the examples from my own practice submitted here. Thomas Austin (2008: 51), discussing *Grizzly Man*, a film attributed to the auteur Werner Herzog, asks what happens to authorship when a documentary re-contextualises footage originally shot by the now dead subject, for their own unrealised documentary purposes, in a subsequent film.

Austin characterises *Grizzly Man* as exhibiting a form of 'dual' or 'double authorship', a combination of sometimes 'competing' voices. A different approach to the multi-vocal nature of documentary filmmaking is Lebow's, citing another of Renov's formulations, 'assisted autobiography' (Lebow, 2008 xxxiii). She adds a category of her own, 'posthumous authorship' (Lebow, 151): in films displaying this trope, 'the death of the author is no post-structuralist axiom; it is the very condition of the film's production' (Lebow, 153). Here Lebow is offering a way of conceptualising the death of the 'assisted autobiographer', the collaborator whose autobiography is then completed by their 'assistant', posthumous colleague and implicit biographer. In the case of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and its sequels this constitutes what Foucault or Barthes might have called the death of the co-author.

Discussing Myerhoff and Littman's *In her Own Time* (1985), which she describes as by (and about) Myerhoff but co-directed by Littman, Lebow writes that there is no clear author as the credited filmmaker is self-effacing but the original filmmaker died before authorship was accomplished. For Lebow, such films are 'made by a ghost on whose reputation the film rides' (Lebow, 2008: 155) But if *In Her Own Time* rides on Myerhoff's posthumous reputation, how much more does *Marilyn on Marilyn* ride on Monroe's? The recording of Monroe's answers to interviewers' questions provides the narration for the

documentary, but it also orchestrates its direction. The (co-)director's job was perhaps to contribute to the arrangement of that orchestration since, unusually, this narration, at least in its unedited form, long pre-existed the making of the documentary.

These concepts are all germane to my own practice, but it is Renov's term 'shared textual authority' (Renov, 2004:222) which describes what he calls the 'shared camera' of domestic ethnographic filmmaking, that is perhaps most pertinent. Renov had previously argued that the trope of the 'shared camera' effects 'an erosion of textual authority or directorial control ((which)) is endemic to domestic ethnography…' (Renov, 1999: 147). Hagedoorn, following Renov, argues that *The Maelstrom*, *Grizzly Man* and *My Architect*, by virtue of their shared textual authority, all destabilize notions like biography and autobiography (Hagedoorn, 2009). The implication of Hagedoorn's work – and of Renov's - is that authorship is destabilised too, but neither develop this notion. [16]

However Hagedoorn does argue that the practice of found footage filmmaking complicates the identity of the biographer in such films. 'Through its prominent use of found footage, *The Maelstrom*problematizes the notions of both autobiography and biography in documentary filmmaking… No explicit 'voice-of-authority' commentary (whether written or spoken) is included in *The Maelstrom'*. (Hagedoorn, 2009: 187) Rather than defining *The Maelstrom* as biographical or autobiographical, Hagedoorn describes it as sharing textual authority, as a 'collaborative autobiography'. (Hagedoorn, 2009: 190) She deploys this concept to describe documentary work where 'two or more parties are included in the production of an autobiographical text through the process of shared textual authority…' (Hagedoorn, 2009: 190) But of course in the case of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie*, far more than two

[16] See *Cinema's Alchemist: The Films of Peter Forgacs* (2012) edited by Renov and Nichols for the latest discussion of these films. Lebow has also edited a new collection of essays on first person filmmaking, *The Cinema of Me: The Self and Subjectivity in First-Person Documentary Film* (2012).

people were engaged in their production, not to mention determinants beyond the agency of individual programme-makers. Two of 'my' documentaries, submitted as outputs here, (though that possessive pronoun remains problematic), particularly bear out the proposals of Renov and Hagedoorn.
Marilyn on Marilyn is a kind of 'compilation film', (Bruzzi, 2006: 26) constructed almost exclusively from archival footage. Unlike the films of others mentioned above, however, it was not constructed from footage shot by only one or two previous filmmakers (like Treadwell, the Friedmans, Caouette etc) as the films discussed by Hagedoorn were. Instead, it is a collage of many different kinds of film – newly shot material, stock footage, home movies, screen tests, out takes from newsreels, and so on. Where the films directed by Jarecki, Kahn and Herzog all made use of footage shot (or, rather, directed) by others (in the cases of Jarecki and Herzog's films by their subjects themselves), I refer here not to *Marilyn on Marilyn*'s visual components - which comprise a wide range of found footage – but to its audio track, specifically its voice-over. This was constructed from the editing together of extracts from two non-broadcast interviews, conducted for magazine articles and recorded on reel-to-reel tape recorders towards the end of Monroe's life. These interviews, for *Life* magazine and *Marie Claire* (Paris) by Richard Meryman and Georges Belmont respectively, provide some of the key documentary material for the film and are, arguably, where Renov's notion of 'shared textual authority' applies to *Marilyn on Marilyn.*

As Renov has pointed out, autobiography is a form 'in which the author, the narrator, and the protagonist are identical'(Renov, 2004: xi). One way of approaching *Marilyn on Marilyn* is thus as a work in which the narrator and protagonist are identical but conventionally, at least, the author is not. And yet I want to suggest here - followingRenov's and, more specifically, Hagedoorns's conception of 'shared textual authority' - that while Monroe neither personally filmed nor recorded any of the sounds or images in *Marilyn on Marilyn* she was, in some sense,

'recruited' by the film as a kind of posthumous collaborator. Renov notes that 'the word 'autobiography' is composed of three principal parts – 'auto', 'bio' and 'graphy' – which make up the essential ingredients of this representational form: a self, a life and a writing practice' (2004: xii). *Marilyn on Marilyn* is thus a form of filmic 'writing' about the 'life' of a specific - although, in a sense, fictional - 'self': Marilyn Monroe. Like several of the films Renov discusses, *Marilyn on Marilyn* is also based on interviews, but I didn't conduct them, nor were they filmed.

Despite the assumption that (auto)biography is suffused with representations of the self, documentary film autobiographies have usually downplayed the affective or individual experiences of the humans that are their subjects in favour of allegedly objective observation. This should not, however, be allowed to conceal the intrinsically subjective aspect of all more conventional documentary forms. Corner argues that autobiography involves subjectivity presented subjectively, in contrast to the conventional 'objectivity' with which documentary treats its 'subjective' interview material in the normative expository heirarchy of voices. (Corner, 2006: 125-128)

Bruzzi (2006) discusses archive filmmaking and 'compilation' films in some detail. But the archival material she discusses is exclusively visual, since the documentary pioneers were working in the silent era. Bruzzi usefully characterises two common modes of archival usage, with the former 'not asking the spectator to question the archival documents but simply to absorb them as a component of a larger narrative', noting that in such archive-reliant modes the 'provenance' of such footage is rarely an issue. The provenance of the archival sound recordings is explicitly revealed in the inter-titles at the beginning of *Marilyn on Marilyn*, but we are not, as viewers, encouraged to be entirely credulous of them. Discussing *Marilyn on Marilyn* in her book, *The Many Lives of Marilyn Monroe*, Sarah Churchwell (2004: 107/8) argues that,

'The film opens, cannily, with a preamble that raises the question of her relationship to her own words and to the truth.... In other words, even Monroe's speech is (rightly) problematized by the film from the beginning, in raising the question of how deliberately she presented her 'self' to her audience; of the way in which answers were elicited by the simple fact of being interviewed, by a self-conscious presentation of her identity as a performance; and of whether she might be lying.'

Bruzzi's second category of archival usage concerns the use of found footage in the kind of documentary where 'the derivation of such archive is a significant issue and which frequently uses such footage dialectically or against the grain.' (Bruzzi, 2006: 26) *Marilyn on Marilyn* attempts to use found footage and amateur film in ways both poetically evocative (rather than prosaically illustrative) and against the grain – at least the grain of expectation - using outtakes rather than already-edited sequences from newsreels, snatched home movies rather than polished feature film clips. One potential avenue for such usage, if the expository 'objective' route is not taken, is that of exploring subjectivity, memory.

In a recent essay on biographical documentary, Corner notes that 'Given the rich readability of the face, it is not surprising that biographical documentaries typically do a lot of 'face work,' combining facial images with different kinds of speech and music....' (Corner, 2002: 99) The face of a film star like Marilyn Monroe is, at least superficially, a quintessentially readable entry point, the default image for such a documentary. But Corner also notes the importance of recorded voice in giving the 'viewer' access to subjectivity, not least in counterpoint to conventional voiced-over commentary. (Corner, 2002: 99)

In *Marilyn on Marilyn* 'recorded voice' or, more precisely, the pre-recorded voice of Monroe, is transformed into 'voiced-over

commentary' and this, by upsetting the conventional hierarchies of sound and image in documentary, including biographical documentary, inevitably complicates its status. Jeffrey K. Rouff, writing about the 'Conventions of Sound in Documentary' (in Altman, 1992: 222) outlines the conventional hierarchy of voices as follows: 'The clarity of sound in documentary usually depends on the degree of control that the filmmaker has over the profilmic events. Voice over narration allows for maximum control over sound quality...' Of course, when voice over is recorded not in a sound booth but as an audio interview on location on a reel to reel tape recorder, such assumptions are overturned. Indeed, I want to argue that *Marilyn on Marilyn* disturbs the conventional distinction between on-screen interviewee and filmmaker voice-over, both formally and technically. Thus when Rouff suggests 'The lack of clarity of the (observational) sound undermines the communicative intent of these films' (Altman, 1992: 224) *Marilyn on Marilyn* seems to reverse Rouff's rule. The very lack of clarity and the apparent 'amateurishness' of the recording of Monroe's voice actually reinforces its power as voice-over, appearing to give us access to her inner voice, in an intimate, as if unmediated, confessional manner.

Discussing the celebrated Zapruder 8mm footage of the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas, Bruzzi suggests that, 'The discrepancy between quality and magnitude of content and the Zapruder film's accidental nature make it particularly compelling.'(Bruzzi, 2000: 13) Such discrepancy applies equally to amateur footage of Kennedy's equally iconic 'contemporary' - Marilyn Monroe. Indeed, the discrepancy Bruzzi refers to remains as applicable to sound recordings as recorded images. The home movie, non-professional quality of Zapruder's images finds an echo in the metallic, slightly distorted sound quality of the reel-to-reel recordings of Marilyn Monroe's voice answering questions for a magazine interview – rather than for broadcast.

For Bruzzi, amateur footage (and, by extension, non-professional audio recording) offers 'an alternative point of view, a perspective that is partly predicated upon the absenting of the film's auteur' (2006: 18). Rather than claiming a status for myself as an auteur, absent or present, I want to argue that *Marilyn on Marilyn* recruited the late actress's voice to 'share textual authority', not just as a posthumous narrator but as a kind of audible 'silent partner' in the film and specifically in the narration, an unwitting co-author and posthumous auto-biographical collaborator. It is thus primarily with Monroe, as well as with her two interviewers, and finally with the literally anonymous makers of the archive footage re-used in the film that I and the other programme-makers of *Marilyn on Marilyn* share textual authority.

But what does it mean for a documentary's 'voice' or more specifically its voice-over to be delegated to such a 'shared' author? In her chapter on 'Narration', Bruzzi discusses the conventional assumption that'...voice over narration (is)...arguably the most blatant example of intervention on the part of the documentary filmmaker' (Bruzzi, 2006: 46). She goes on to consider that 'whereas in a fiction film the voice-off is traditionally that of a character in the narrative, in a documentary the voice over is more usually that of a disembodied and omniscient narrator,' (Bruzzi, 2006: 47) In *Marilyn on Marilyn*, we attempted to avoid this, not to extinguish our own presence from the film (which was made, almost entirely, in the cutting room) but in order to allow Marilyn's own voice to narrate the film, hence the decision to constrain the conventionally omniscient filmmaker's verbal guidance to the minimum number of on screen captions (the minimum acceptable to the BBC that is – whose executive producer had initially urged we also use traditional, 'expository' voice-over commentary).

Bruzzi cites Mary Ann Doane's remark that'it is precisely because the voice (in a documentary) is not localisable, because

it cannot be yoked to a body, that it is capable of interpreting the image, producing the truth' (Doane, 1980: 43, cited in Bruzzi, 2006: 63). The only exceptions to this rule that Bruzzi discusses are the 'performative' documentaries of Michael Moore and Nick Broomfield. But *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* seem to me to warrant consideration as exceptions too. For, like Bruzzi's auteur examples, they could be said to fracture 'the tacit documentary 'pact' that the voice-over will remain objective' (Bruzzi, 2006: 63)

Bruzzi usefully identifies two distinct strategies for female narration since the 1990s – as either objective voice of God or as subjective voice of the filmmaker. However *Marilyn on Marilyn* and to a lesser extent *Billie on Billie* require a third category, that of the posthumous narrator, neither the director herself nor the omniscient narrator in the audio booth. Significantly, perhaps, Bruzzi also notes how an equivalence is often assumed between a woman's voice as physical utterance and as metaphoric access of her inner self (Bruzzi, 2000: 58) and that very sleight of hand was one of the strategies of *Marilyn on Marilyn,* aiming tocreate an impression of an intimate interiority about one woman's inner self or selves by virtue of 'shared textual authority'. Not through literally sharing the camera with her, or indeed the microphone or tape recorder, but nevertheless by allowing her voice to tell her own story – and excluding any other such voices. This is not to deny, of course, who finally controlled the selection and juxtaposition of extracts of that voice's utterances. But then this also remains the case in Renov and Hagedoorn'scanonic examples.

If the voice on the audio track can provide an illusion of unmediated access to an inner self so too can the image. In an essay on self-inscription in first person films Renov describes how filmmaker Faith Hubley offers 'visual correlatives for elusive interior states' (Renov, 2008: 42) in her *My Universe Inside Out.* He goes on to suggest that if Greirsonian documentary actuality is, by definition, exterior, objectively

observable, then autobiography's terrain is interior, subjective and ultimately invisible. Thus, for Renov, correlatives for subjective interiority on the visual track can function to reinforce the status of the speaker's voice on the audio track as somehow objective. Yet of course, in *Marilyn on Marilyn*, that voice is that of the subject herself, Marilyn Monroe.

How then does the image track of *Marilyn on Marilyn* attempt to sustain the illusion of such interiority? Jerome Rafferty, discussing Chris Marker, has claimed that 'the far flung documentary images of *Sunless* are assembled as an autobiography – the form has no subject, except the consciousness, the memory of the man who shot it - yet Marker attributes this consciousness to the invented 'SandorKrasna', removes it from himself to a yet more spectral entity.' (cited in Bruzzi, 2006: 67) In *Marilyn on Marilyn* the documentary images are also assembled as the autobiography of a consciousness, a memory - but not that of the filmmakers who compiled it, nor of the two journalists who recorded the interviews which provide its voice, nor indeed of the many anonymous filmmakers whose stock footage of Los Angeles is included, but of the woman who 'narrates' it. Like Krasna, however, she too is in some senses a fictional character, the actress Marilyn Monroe, also known as Norma Jeane Baker. As Renov puts it, '...the subject in documentary has, to a surprising degree, become the subject of documentary' (Renov, 2004: xxiv), Thus the double or indeed multiple authorship of *Marilyn on Marilyn,* its 'shared textual authority', not only disturbs the conventional attributions of authorship in documentary film, but also the very objectivity of the exterior reality being documented. In the Library Catalogue of Middlesex University *Marilyn on Marilyn* is listed as having four authors – Monroe, Marilyn; Kerr, Paul; Belmont, Georges; and Meryman, Richard.

Conclusion

In the more than thirty years since the publication of the first of the outputs submitted here, both the fields of academic writing about film and television and the practice of television documentary production in the UK have changed almost beyond recognition. The former, three decades ago, was populated by a mere handful of journals in this country - the contributors to which were virtually all known to each other. Today there are dozens of such publications and the numbers of academics writing and teaching about film, television and media in this country is very large indeed. The latter field has been equally dramatically transformed, as three channels have been replaced by hundreds, though the number of new UK produced television documentaries and specifically one-offs – neither formatted series episodes nor reality shows nor docusoaps – may have actually decreased and certainly has done on a programme per channel basis (Bennett, Strange, Kerr and Medrado, 2012). But whether or not the quantity of outputs in both fields has expanded, the evaluation of the quality of that output is much more contested in spite of peer reviews, the RAE and the REF on the one hand and reviews, audience figures, profits and prizes on the other.

The outputs submitted here inevitably reflect the periods and contexts when and where they were produced and my development - from full time archivist and freelance critic and sometime academic writer to professional practitioner to full time academic - within those contexts and with the respective institutional support and collaborators employed in them. This commentary has reinserted these outputs into their contexts and demonstrated an, albeit retrospective, coherence to their engagement with ideas about authorship and points of origin. Further, that reinsertion is into academic debates in which my work not only participated but whose assumptions it sometimes challenged, complicating ideas of individual authorship with the specifics of industrial film and TV fictional and factual

production on the one hand and problematising both directorial agency *within* and documented actuality's authority *over* documentary texts on the other. Meanwhile, the writing (and teaching) about film and television produced during the 1970s and 80s contributed to the British television culture in which it was, albeit briefly, possible to make educational programming about film and television (and indeed other media) that provided me with an entrée into the industry. Subsequently I worked in Arts and History documentaries and - when and where possible - explored the possibilities of oral history in those two documentary genres. Examples of that work are offered here as texts that can, I have suggested, be productively analysed through the lens of shared textual authority, a concept that reopens vexed but still urgent questions about authorship and the orchestration of documentary voice(s). To summarise, the publications presented here challenge attributions of unique individual agency through case studies of the complexities of specific film and television industrial productions, while the documentaries challenge the unequivocal authority of either observational documentary reality or the omniscient expository documentarian's univocal representation of it, through the theory and practice of shared textual authority. My conclusion is that these productions and publications contributed in a small way to the creation of a culture in which assignations of individual authorship to audio-visual productions are increasingly contested and contentious.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alleque, L, Jones, S, Kershaw, B Piccini, A (eds) (2009) *Practice-as-Research: In performance and screen* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Altman, R (1992) *Sound Theory Sound Practice*, London: Routledge

Alvarado, M and Buscombe, E, (2008) *"Cultural Strategies: Publishing at the British Film Institute."* In Focus: 47:4 (summer 2008): 133–138.

Annan, N. (1977) *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting*. London, HMSO.

Austin, T and de Jong, W, (2008), *Rethinking Documentary: New Perspectives and Practices*

Maidenhead: Open University Press

Barthes, R (1977) *Image Music Text* London, Fontana

Bell, D (2006) Creative film and media practice as research: In pursuit of that obscure object of knowledge *Journal of Media Practice* (2006) 7: 2, 85-100 London: Intellect

Bell, D (2004) Shooting the Past? Found Footage, Filmmaking and Popular Memory, in *Kinema*, Spring 2004.

Bell, E and Gray, A (2007) History on Television: charisma, narrative and knowledge, in Helen Wheatley (ed), *Re-Viewing Television History* London: I.B. Tauris, 2007

Bell, E and Gray, A (eds) (2010) *Televising History: Mediating the Past in Postwar Europe*. London: Palgrave MacMillan

Gray, A and Bell, E (2012). *History on Television*. London: Routledge

Bennett, Andrew ((2005) *The Author*, London, Routledge

Bennett, T (ed.) 1990, *Popular Fiction: Technology, Ideology, Production, Reading*, London & New York: Routledge.

Bennett and Kerr, (2012) A 360° Public Service Sector? The Role of Independent Production in the UK's Public Service Broadcasting Landscape, in *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media* (Ferrell Lowe, G and Steemers, J (eds) RIPE 2011 Nordicom: University of Gothenburg

Bennett, J Strange, N Kerr, P andMedrado, A (2012). *Multiplatforming public service broadcasting: the economic and cultural role of UK digital and TV indies.* (AHRC/Royal Holloway/University of Susssex/London Metropolitan University

http://cowboysorindies.co.uk/2012/09/21/multiplatform-psb-report/

Blanchard , S and Morley, D *What's This Channel Four? An Alternative Report*, London: Comedia 1982,

Bolas, T *Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies* London: Intellect 2012

Born,G.(2005) *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC*. London: Vintage.

Brandt, G *British Television Drama* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Britton, A 1978/79; "The Ideology of *Screen*," *Movie* 26 (Winter 1978-79): 2-28.

Bruzzi, S (2000) *New Documentary: A Critical Introduction* London/New York: Routledge

Bruzzi, S (2006) *New Documentary* (2nd edition) London/New York: Routledge

Burke, Sean (1998) *The Death and Return of the Author: criticism and subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thompson, R J and Burns, G (eds) (1990) *Making Television: Authorship and the Production Process*. New York: Praeger Publishing 1990

'John Ford's Young Mr Lincoln. A collective text by the Editors of Cahiers du Cinema', translated by Helene Lackner and Diana Matias, Screen, v 13 n 3, 5-44 (Autumn 1972)

Caughie, J (1981) *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*, London: BFI /Routledge 1981

Caughie, J (2000) *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism and British Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Churchwell, S (2005) *The Many Lives of Marilyn Monroe*, London: Granta

Cobley, P (2001) *Narrative*, London: Routledge,

Cook, P (1985), (ed) *The Cinema Book* London:British Film Institute

Cooke, L (2003) *British Television Drama: A History* London:British Film Institute

Corner, J (2002) 'Biography Within the Documentary Frame: A Note', *Framework:* 43:1 2002)

Corner, J (2006) 'A fiction (un)like any other'. Critical Studies in Television 125-128

Creeber, G, (1998) *The Television Genre Book*, London: BFI (2nd edition, London: Palgrave MacMillan 2008)

Dowmunt, T (2003) A Whited Sepulchre, *Journal of Media Practice*, 4: 1, 1 March 2003, pp. 17-26

Doyle, G and Paterson, R (2008), Public Policy and Independent TV Production in the UK, *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 5 (3): 17-33.

Duffy, W and Holiday, B, *Lady Sings the Blues* New York: Harlem Moon (2006)

Dupin, C (2006) "The Postwar Transformation of the British Film Institute and its Impact on the Development of a National Film Culture in Britain," *Screen* 47, no. 4 (2006): 443–44.

Eckert, C 1973; ' The English Cine-Structuralists*Film Comment,* May-June 1973 New York

Ellis, J (1999) *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty* London: I.B. Tauris

Ellis, J (2011) *Documentary: Witness and Self-Revelation*, London: Routledge

Feuer, J, Kerr, P and Vahimagi, T *MTM: Quality Television,* London: BFI 1984

Foucault, M 'What is an Author?' (1969), in Harari, J V., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979

Gerstner, D A &Staiger, J, (eds) *Authorship and Film,* London/New York: Routledge 2002;

Goodwin, A Kerr, P & MacDonald, I (eds) (1982). London: BFI *Drama Documentary*

Grant, B K, (2008). *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader* Malden, MA, USA/Oxford, UK/ Carlton, Australia: Blackwell (2008)

Grierson, J (1933), 'Documentary (2)': *Cinema Quarterly*1.3 (1933): 135-139.

Hagedoorn, B. (2009). '"Look what I found!": (Re-)crossing boundaries between public/private history and biography/autobiography in PéterForgács' The Maelstrom'. *Studies in Documentary Film*, 3(2), 177-192.

Hagedoorn, B (2007) 'Shared Textual Authority in the Found Footage Documentary: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis of The Maelstrom, Grizzly Man and My Architect.' Research MA Thesis. Utrecht University, Utrecht, 2007.

Harvey, S 2009: 'To Be An Author Or Not To Be?' *Journal of Media Practice* 10: 1 pp. 81-85

Hayward, P (1998) *Picture This: Media Representations of Visual Art and Artists*, Luton: University of Luton Press

Henderson, B (1973) Critique of Cine-Structuralism (Part11) *Film Quarterly* 27: 2 (Winter 1973-74) 37-46

Hill, J and McLoone, M (eds) (1996) *Big Picture, Small Screen: The Relations Between Film and Television*, Luton, John Libbey

Holmes, S (2005) *British TV and Film Culture of the 1950s: Coming to a TV Near You* London: Intellect

Kerr, P (1979/1980) 'Out of What Past? Notes on the B Film Noir', *Screen Education* 32/33

Kerr, P (1982) 'Classic Serials - To Be Continued' *Screen* 23: 1

Kerr, P (1983) 'My Name is Joseph H Lewis' *Screen* 24: 4-5

Kerr, P (1991) 'Opportunity Knocks?' *Screen* 32: 4

Kerr, P (ed) (1986) *The Hollywood Film Industry* London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Kerr, P (1996) 'Television Programmes about the Cinema: the Making of Moving Pictures' in *Big Picture, Small Screen: the Relations Between Film and Television*, (John Hill and Martin McLoone, eds) Luton: University of Luton Press

Kerr, P (ed) (1997) *The Crimean War* London: Boxtree/MacMillan

Kerr, P (2008) 'Introduction: thinking outside the box' *Screen* 49: 3

Kerr, P (2009) 'The Last Slave (2007): The Genealogy of a British Television History Programme' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 29: 3

Kerr, P (2010) 'Babel's network narrative: packaging a globalized art cinema' *Transnational Cinemas* 1: 1

Kerr, P (2011) '"A Small, effective organization": The Mirisch Company, the Package Unit System and the Production of *Some Like it Hot' in Billy Wilder. Movie-Maker: Critical Essays on the Films* (Karen McNally, ed)Jefferson, USA and London: McFarland

Kitses, J (1968) *Horizons West,* London: British Film Institute

Kuhn, A (2009) Screenand screen theorizing today, *Screen* 50:1 Spring 2009.

Lebow, A (2008) *First Person Jewish* Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press

Lebow, A (2012) (ed) *The Cinema of Me: The Self and Subjectivity in Documentary*

Film New York/Chichester: Wallflower/Columbia University Press

Lee-Wright, P (2009) *The Documentary Handbook* London: Routledge

Levi-Strauss, C (1978) *Myth and Meaning* London/New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul,

McArthur, C (1972) *Underworld USA (Cinema One)* London: BFI

McNally, K (2010) *Billy Wilder, Movie-Maker: Critical Essays on the Films* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland

Miller, T (ed) (2009) *The Contemporary Hollywood Reader* London/New York: Routledge 2009

Mulvey, L & Sexton, J (2007) *Experimental British Television* Manchester University Press

Newcomb, H and Alley, R (1983) *The Producer's Medium* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Nichols, B (2001) *Introduction to Documentary* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Nichols, B (2010) *Introduction to Documentary* (2nd edition) Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Nichols, B. (1988). 'The Voice of Documentary'. *New Challenges For Documentary* .

Nichols, B and Renov, M (2012) *Cinema's Alchemist: The Films of Peter Forgacs*Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Nowell Smith, G and Dupin, C (2012) *The British Film Institute, the Government and Film Culture (1933-2000)* Manchester University Press

RAE2008 UoA 66 subject overview report http://www.rae.ac.uk

Rascaroli, L (2009) *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film* London and New York: Wallflower

Renov, M (1993) (ed) *Theorizing Documentary* London/New York: Routledge

Renov, M (1999) Domestic `Ethnography and the Construction of the 'Other' Self in Renov, M and Gaines, JM (eds*) Collecting Visible Evidence*, 140-155 Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Renov, M (2004) *The Subject of Documentary*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Renov, M (2008) First person films: some theses on self-inscription in *Rethinking*

Documentary: New Perspectives and Practices (Austin, T and De Jong, W (eds)

Root, J *Open the Box: About Television*, 1986 London: Comedia

Rosen, 2008; 'Screen and Film Theory in the 1970s,' in Lee Grieveson and Heidi Wasson, eds.,*Inventing Film Studies* Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Rosenthal, A. and J. Corner, Eds. (2005). *New Challenges for Documentary*. New York, Manchester University Press

Rouff, J K (1992) 'Conventions of Sound in Documentary', in *Sound Theory Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman. London, BFI Film Reader/Routledge

Sarris, A 1962, 'Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962', *Film Culture* 1962/63

Sarris, A (1968) *The American Cinema*: *Directors and Directions 1929-1968* New York: DaCapo Press

Saussure, F (1977) *Course in General Linguistics*, Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1977.

ScaifeGott, Sir Benjamin (1032) *The Film in National Life*. Commission on Educational and Cultural Films

Silver, A and Ursini, J (eds) (1996) *Film Noir* New York: Limelight

Brown, A R and Sorensen, A (2008) 'Integrating Creative Practice and research in the Digital Media Arts' in *Practice-Led Research, Research-led Practice* (Hazel Smith and Roger Dean, eds) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Tunstall, J *TV Producers* Abingdon: Routledge (1993)

Truffaut, F 'A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema', *Cahiers du Cinema* 31 (1954).

Truffaut, **F** (1969) *Hitchcock,* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Tulloch, J (2002). *Television Drama: Agency, Audience and Myth* Abingdon, Routledge

Walker, J (1993) *Arts TV: A History of the Arts Television in Britain*, London: John Libbey and Company

Wees, W C. (2002) The Ambiguous Aura of Hollywood Stars in Avant-Garde Found-Footage Films' *Cinema Journal* 41: 2 Winter 2002)

Wright Wexman, V (2002) (ed), *Film and Authorship*, New Brunswick, New Jersey/London: Rutgers University Press

Wicking, C and Vahimagi, T (1979*). The American Vein: Directors and Directions in*

Television London/New York: Dutton

Wollen, P (1968) *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* London: BFI

Wood, R (1968*) Hitchcock's Films* London: Zwemmer/New York: Barnes

Wood, R (1989) Hitchcock's Films Revisited New York:Columbia University Press

Wyver, J 2007 *Vision On: Film, Television and the Arts in Britain* Wallflower Press

Zoellner, A (2010) "The Changing Face of UK Documentary Production: Commerce, Reflexivity and Professionalism",*Journal for the Study of British Cultures.***17**.1: 69-80.

Zoellner A (2009) "Professional Ideology and Programme Conventions: Documentary Development in Independent British Television Production",*Mass Communication and Society.***12**.4: 503-536.

FILMOGRAPHY

Television Programmes

Cat Among Lions: The MTM Story (TV Programme) Illuminations. C4 10 December 1984

Moving Pictures, (Television programme) BBC and Barraclough Carey Productions. BBC2, 1990-1996

Who's Crying Now? (Television programme) Barraclough Carey Productions. BBC2 19 December 1993

The Civil War (Television programme) Florentine Films. PBS 23-27 September1990

Timewatch: The Projection Racket (Television programme) MentornBarraclough Carey. BBC 2, 5 November 1995

The Crimean War (Television programme). C4, 9 November to 23 November 1997)

Hidden History (Television programme) October Films BBC Knowledge September 2000

Guns for Hire: The Making of The Magnificent Seven, (Television programme) October Films. C4 13 May 2000)

Marilyn on Marilyn (TV Programme) October Films. BBC2 28 December 2001

Nobody's Perfect, (TV Programme) October Films. BBC2 16 April 2001

Billie on Billie (Television Programme) October Films 31 March 2003

*Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea (*TV Programme) October Films. C4 26

June 2005

Samuel Johnson: The Dictionary Man. (Television programme) October Films. BBC4 26 June 2006

The Last Slave (TV Programme) October Films. C4 11 March 2007

Films

The Usual Suspects, 1995. (Film) Directed by Bryan Singer. USA: Polygram Filmed Entertainment

The Magnificent Seven, 1959. (Film) Directed by John Sturges. USA: United Artists

Some Like it Hot, 1960 (Film) Directed by Billy Wilder. USA: United Artists.

Housing Problems, 1935 (Film) Directed by Arthue Elton and Edgar Anstey. UK: British Commercial Gas Association

Capturing the Friedmans, 2003, (Film) Directed by Andrew Jarecki. US: Notorious Pictures

Tarnation, 2003, (Film) Directed by Jonathan Caouette US: Wellspring

My Architect: A Son's Journey, 2003 (Film) Directed by Nathaniel Kahn, US: New Yorker Films

Grizzly Man, 2005 (Film) Directed by Werner Herzog , US: Lions Gate Films

In her Own Time, 1985 (Film) Directed by Lynne Littman, US: Direct Cinema Limited

The Maelstrom: A Family Chronicle, 1997 (Film) Directed by Peter Forgacs, Hungary/Netherlands:

My Universe Inside Out, 1996 (Film) Directed by Faith Hubley, US: Hubley Studios

Sans Soleil/Sunless 1983, (Film) Directed by Chris Marker, France: Argos Films

Babel, 2006 (Film) Directed by Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu. France/US/Mexico: Paramount Vantage

Young Mr Lincoln, 1939 (Film) Directed by John Ford. US: Twentieth Century Fox

The Silence of the Lambs. 1991 (Film) Directed by Jonathan Demme. US: Orion Pictures Corporation

Appendix A. Published academic outputs submitted

i) 'A 360° Public Service Sector? The Role of Independent Production in the UK's Public Service Broadcasting Landscape' (James Bennett and Paul Kerr) in *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media*, (eds Lowe, G and Steemers, J, RIPE@2011. 2012, NORDICOM at the University of Gothenburg)

ii) '"A small, effective organization": The Mirisch Company, the package-unit system and the production of Some Like It Hot', in *Billy Wilder, Moviemaker: Critical Essays on the Films*, (ed, McNally, K, McFarland, January 2011).

iii) 'Babel's Network Narrative: Packaging a Globalized Art Cinema', *Transnational Cinemas*, 1: 1 (February 2010, Intellect)

iv) 'The Last Slave (2007) The Genealogy of a British Television History Programme',*Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 29: 3(Sept 2009) pp 381-397

v) 'My Name is Joseph H. Lewis', Screen 24: 4-5 (1983)

vi) 'Out of What Past? Notes on the B Film Noir', *Screen Education* 1979/80, republished in *The Hollywood Film Industry: A Reader*, (ed Kerr, P BFI/RKP, 1986), *Film Noir Reader* (eds Silver, A and Ursini, J Limelight Editions, 1996) and*Contemporary Hollywood Reader* (ed Miller, T Routledge, 2009)

vii) 'The Making of (The) MTM (Show), in *MTM: 'Quality Television'* (edsFeu P and Vahimagi, T) 1984. London: BFI

viii) 'Drama at MTM: *Lou Grant* and *Hill Street Blues'*), in *MTM: 'Quality Tele* edsFeuer, J Kerr, P and Vahimagi, T) 1984. London: BFI

Appendix B. Broadcast television documentary outputs submitted.

a) *Timewatch: The Projection Racket* (Mentorn for BBC2 5.11.95) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Christopher Spencer

b) *The Crimean War* (Mentorn for C4 17.11.97-02.12.97, 3 x 1 hours) Series Producer (and Director, Episode 2): Paul Kerr; Series Director: Mick Gold; Assistant Producer: Teresa Cherfas; Researcher Georgina Pye.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pqik0WDMDco

c) *Guns For Hire* (October Films for C4 13.5.00) Producer: Paul Kerr Director:

Louis Heaton (Included as Special Feature on The Magnificent Seven Collection Box Set DVD. ASIN: B00005OA80). http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XVwW1Ygv-b8

d) *Nobody's Perfect* (October Films BBC2 16.4.01) Producer / Director: Paul Kerr

e) *Marilyn on Marilyn* (October Films for BBC2 28.12.01) Producer / Director: Paul Kerr

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tyWW0bDnY28

f) *Billie on Billie* (October Films for BBC2 31.3.03) Producer/Director: Paul Kerr

g) *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* (October Films for C4 26.6.05) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Sonali Fernando

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RIrim4r-LbY

h) *The Last Slave* (October Films for C4 11.3.07) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Julia Harrington

Conferences

2007

The Transnational Viewing Experience, Reading University 7 September 2007 Paper: 'Hill Street Blues to Holby Blue'.

2008

London Metropolitan University - DASS Conference on Methodological Innovation - Panel on 'Identity and Empowerment' – 26th June 2008: – 'Silent Voices/Absent Viewers'

Sounding Out 4 (University of Sunderland) Conference on sound and music in audio-visual media. - 4th-6th September 2008) 'Voicing Memory: Marilyn on Marilyn'

Kadir Has University, Istanbul - Sept 12th – 14th 2008 - Reel Politics: Reality Television as a Platform for Political Discourse: "Reality television and the demise of the 'real': A case study of how history is being evicted from the television 'house'."

Television, The Archive and the Document – Warwick University, May 22nd 2008 'Documentary and the Document: Notes Toward a History of a Television History Programme'

2009

MeCCSA Annual Conference, Bradford, January 2009. *'Voicing memory - 'Marilyn on Marilyn'*

'The Visual Archive: The Moving Image and Memory' workshop 28th-29th May 2009 CRESC The Open University: 'Speaking for Marilyn: Voice Over, 'found sound' and 'shared textual authority''

Visible Evidence XVI, August 13-17, 2009, School of Cinematic Arts, USC, Los Angeles: Listening to Marilyn: Voice over, 'found sound' and 'shared textual authority'

Documentary and Intimacy symposium, Film Studies, University of Surrey16th September 2010 'Marilyn on Marilyn – An essay on Intimacy'

University of Lincoln : Televising History Conference, 22nd-25th July 2009:'The Last Slave: The genealogy of a television history programme'

American independent Cinema Conference. Liverpool John Moores University, 8-10 May 2009, 'The Mirisch Company, the Package-unit System and the Production of Some Like it Hot'

2010

Television without Borders. Co-producing/ international sales and the global television market, Reading University July 2nd 2010:

The Transnational Cinema in Globalising Societies, UNNC-Universidad Iberoamericana, Puebla, 2010 Mexico, Aug 29-31 2010'Babel, International Co-production and Network Narrative' -

Acting with Facts, Reading University, September 2010 'Some facts about producing TV with facts and actors: A TV CV'

MeCCSA Annual Conference, LSE 6- 8.1.10 'Moving 'Moving Pictures': A case study of a television series' shift from in-house, 'producer unit' to independent 'package-unit' production'.

BFI Media Studies Conference, National Film Theatre, London. 7.7.10: 'Developments in UK TV Production'.

Documentary Now 2010, Birkbeck, London 16.1.10: 'Found Footage, Documentary Voice and Shared Textual Authority'

2011

Transnational Cinemas Symposium, Portsmouth University, 13.2.11
'Babel's Network Narrative: Packaging a Globalized art Cinema'.

Beijing 2011 –The New Landscape of Global Communication.
An International Conference Organised bySchool of Journalism and Communication, Renmin University of China and theChina Media Centre, University of Westminster, Beijing 1st – 3rd July 2011. 'Circulating authorship and authenticity as global brands: the case of Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu'

2012

Transformations in/of Broadcasting University of Leeds, 12-13 July 2012 'The Only way is Ethics'

Cowboys or Indies, National Film Theatre, 20.09.12 'The Only way is Ethics: British Television Documentary, Public Service Broadcasting and Independent Production' (Royal Holloway, University of London and AHRC)

Channel 4 Television and British Film Culture, National Film Theatre, 2.11.12 'Who Called the Shots? Producing cinema programmes for C4 in the Nineties and the Noughties.' (University of Portsmouth)

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

Paul Kerr

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

Paul Kerr

These outputs, with commentary and appendices, have not been submitted for any other academic award, and are submitted here in partial fulfilment of the requirements of London Metropolitan University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Prior Output

April 2013

Acknowledgements

In a Commentary partially devoted to problematising ideas of individual authorship in audio-visual media productions, an acknowledgement of the contribution of other individuals and indeed institutions is particularly appropriate. Thanks are due to colleagues from three very different periods of my career, those covering the years I was employed by the BFI (1979-1985) and, over a longer but overlapping period, members of SEFT and the editorial board of Screen throughout the 1980s; colleagues over almost twenty-five years making television programmes (1984-2007); and finally those I have worked with since becoming an academic. All, in one way or another, contributed to the research, writing and/or production of the submitted outputs.

The list of all those involved over more than thirty years, comprising two periods of publication interrupted by two decades of production, is too long to include here: people from SEFT, Screen and the BFI; and from the BBC, C4 and five independent television production companies - Illuminations, Beat Ltd, Wall to Wall, Mentorn and October Films, not to mention actual and potential interviewees consulted during production; then there are peer reviewers, editors, conference organizers, co-panellists and delegates at conferences in Britain and abroad where I have given presentations; and finally academic colleagues at LMU since my appointment there in 2007.

In the final category are past and present colleagues in what is now the Faculty for Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH) but was then the Department of Applied Social Sciences (DASS) including the Dean, Professor John Gabriel, two former academic leaders, Anna Gough-Yates and James Bennett, as well as other colleagues in the Media Information and Communication Section. All of them deserve thanks for their friendly support, but I must single out Mike Chopra-Gant and particularly Professor Paul Cobley for their extremely patient and perceptive supervision. Residual authorial possessiveness obliges me to take full responsibility for whatever mistakes are included in what follows.

Abstract

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

There is an inherent irony in assembling a range of published and broadcast outputs which share my name, for the precise purpose of contextualising them in a Commentary concerned with interrogating the very idea of individual authorship. This submission consists of a number of such outputs, the work of over three decades, ranging from academic publications to broadcast television programmes. The former group are attributed to me; the latter include my name among the credits, either as producer, director, executive producer or a combination of the three. The accompanying Commentary aims to set the submitted work in context, demonstrate that it constitutes a coherent whole, and that it makes an independent and original contribution to knowledge and to the advancement of these two academic and professional fields.

A number of overlapping contexts are summarised here: the history of theoretical ideas of authorship in film (and media) studies, a field in which several of this candidate's own publications intervened; a brief sketch of the academic milieu in which media practice as research developed, to whose RAE 2008 Unit of Assessment several broadcast documentary examples, attributed to this candidate, were submitted and valorised and which now constitute part of this submission; a discussion of the ways in which authorship has been variously addressed within that documentary practice; and, finally, a consideration of how the theoretical concepts of 'shared textual authority' and 'collaborative authorship' can be deployed to analyse and, indeed, complicate conventionally auteurist readings of the (auto)biographical and oral history documentaries included in this submission.

These discrete but interlocking discussions form the major sections here, together with a brief introduction and conclusion. An appendix lists the candidate's relevant publications and productions, while another lists conference presentations. In addition, the documentation includes, as required, statements by explicit co-authors.

The 'Author' in Theory and Documentary Practice: Authorship, (Auto)biography and Shared Textual Authority

1. Introduction

'Contexts'

The work submitted and discussed here was published and produced over four decades.[1] To revisit it is to write a kind of academic and professional autobiography, but it is also, ironically, to interrogate the very idea that individual 'authorship' can be claimed for such publications and programmes. To set such work in the contexts in which it was produced necessitates both an intellectual curriculum vitae and a sketch of several institutional histories. I have already published two articles unpacking the production histories of specific televisual projects on which I was employed (Kerr, 1996 and Kerr, 2009, Output iv) and a third such production has been the subject of a paper at an academic conference (Kerr, 2010a). Fortunately, there already exists a range of academic analyses of the various institutional contexts in and for which I have worked, including the BFI, *Screen*, the BBC, C4 and the independent production sector that emerged to supply the latter. I have also written about the move of media academics into television (Kerr, 1991) and, more recently, of an exodus of television professionals into academia (Kerr, 2008).

The first academic strand of activity was, for me and for most colleagues, part of a wider strategy of establishing the claim for film and subsequently television as legitimate subjects of academic enquiry; this in turn contributed to making it possible to produce serious programmes about film in particular and the media in general for British broadcasters in the 1980s and '90s –

[1] Appendix A lists the submitted academic outputs, the in-text references to which are in the Harvard style with an added Output number, ordered chronologically, **eg** (Kerr, 1979/80, Output 1). Appendix B lists the submitted 'practice' outputs or television programmes.

my own entrée to the medium. However, if, in film studies, auteurism remains a default response, in broadcasting any interest in cinema as more than either Hollywood or entertainment has all but disappeared from terrestrial screens; thus this Commentary is also, in some sense, an obituary for a particular time and space for certain sorts of practice, not least those adopting and adapting some academic ideas about film and television and applying them to and in film and, in my case, television productions.

The British Film Institute and SEFT

In 1929, during a conference run by the British Institute for Adult Education, a Commission of Educational and Cultural Films was set up to produce, among other things, a report on film in education, the development of public appreciation of films and the establishment of a 'permanent central agency' to achieve these objectives. That report, *The Film in National Life*, published in 1932, recommended the creation of an independent film institute funded by the state and that body, the British Film Institute, was officially registered in 1933 (Nowell-Smith and Dupin, 2012; Dupin, 2008, and Alvarado and Buscombe, 2008).

In 1950 a Film Appreciation Officer was appointed by the BFI and that same year the Society of Film Teachers (SFT) was set up to promote the teaching of film appreciation in colleges and schools. In 1959 SFT changed its name to The Society for Education in Film and Television and its journal *Screen Education* was launched. In 1969 *Screen Education* was re-launched as *Screen*. By then, Paddy Whannel, head of BFI Education, had reconstructed his department as 'an academy in waiting'. Thus, when Asa Briggs[2] recommended in 1971 that the Education Department abandon its academic research and revert to assisting teachers and film appreciation, Whannel and several colleagues resigned. However, in the ensuing settlement the reformulated Society for Education in Film and Television

[2] Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey (2008) 'The British Film Institute', *Cinema Journal*: 47: 4, 128

and its journals achieved a surprising degree of financial and editorial autonomy. By 1978, when I joined the Society, *Screen* was an explicitly academic publication (Britton, 1978/79; Kuhn, 2009; Rosen, 2008; Bolas, 2009).

Among BFI Education's achievements in this period were an annual series of film theory summer schools in the 1970s (of which I attended two) and the funding of a series of film lectureships in British Universities, with Robin Wood's appointment at Warwick in 1973, Richard Dyer at Keele in 1974 and Peter Wollen at Essex in 1975. Eventually BFI funding for SEFT and *Screen* ceased in 1989, SEFT was disbanded and *Screen* moved to the University of Glasgow.

I completed my MA by thesis, on American Private Detective Films, under Richard Dyer at Keele in 1977. While working as a freelance film and TV journalist, I began teaching evening classes on a Diploma in Film Studies for the University of London's Extra Mural Studies department. In 1979 I was offered a short-term contract in BFI Education, as a researcher on a Film Extract Catalogue for teachers.[3] That same year I published my first article in *Screen Education*. In 1980 I got a full time job in the National Film Archive and this period coincided with an increasing involvement in SEFT and on the editorial board of *Screen* and my first contributions to academic journals. This experience at the NFA equipped me with the skill-set for my first film researcher job in TV and functioned as my introduction to some of the raw material, the found footage, with which two of the submitted outputs were produced some twenty years later.

My years at the BFI also coincided with the creation of Channel Four and my subsequent entrée into television was largely facilitated by interconnections between the two institutions. Not least of these was Anthony Smith's role as Director of the BFI

[3] This Extract Catalogue evolved to become the first edition of *The Cinema Book* (Cook, 1985). My contribution to this volume is uncredited.

(1979-1988); having been a key member of the Annan Committee on the Future of Broadcasting (1977), he became one of the first Board members of the Channel (1981-1985). [4]An ex-NFA Curator, Paul Madden, was among the first commissioning editors at C4 (for media programmes) and a book I co-edited at the BFI, *MTM: Quality Television* (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi, 1984) became the basis for a one-off documentary for the channel (*Cat Among Lions*, Kerr, 1984) that he commissioned. My next television job, on a 6 part series about TV itself, *Open the Box* (C4, 1986)[5] was as film researcher on a formal co-production between BFI Education and the independent production company, Beat Ltd. Beat's owner, Michael Jackson, was a Media Studies graduate, while my co-researcher on that series, Jane Root, had also worked for BFI Education. Beat's next production, *The Media Show*, a weekly magazine programme for C4 about the media, also initially series edited by Jackson, was based on a similar commitment to 'media literacy'.

Channel Four the independent sector and the BBC

The 1980 Broadcasting Act and the launch of C4 in 1982 led to the creation of hundreds of independent production companies. My first three employers in TV (Illuminations, Beat Ltd and Wall to Wall Television) were just such small companies, then specialising in public service programmes about the arts and media, generally one production at a time. An inherent paradox of the independent sector was and remains that tension between public service and private enterprise, creativity and commerce (Bennett and Kerr, 2012 Output i; Bennett, Strange, Kerr and Medrado, 2012).[6] I moved to the BBC in 1990, series editing a weekly film programme for BBC2 (initially as an in-house

[4] Annan Committee (1977) *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting* HMSO
[5] See also Jane Root's spin-off publication, *Open the Box* (1986) London: Comedia.
[6] For more on TV Independents see Doyle and Paterson, 2008, Robin and Cornford, 1992, Sparks, 1994, Ursell, 2000 and 2003 and Zoellner, 2009. There are currently only two book length studies of the British TV independent production sector, neither of them academic (Darlow, 2004 and Potter, 2008) but there are several studies of Channel Four including Blanchard and Morley, 1982, Lambert, 1982, Docherty, Morrison and Tracey, 1988, Harvey, 1994, Goodwin, 1996, Brown, 2008 and Hobson, 2008.

producer but subsequently at an independent production company) until 1996. Georgina Born's influential ethnographic study of the BBC covers some of that same period (Born, 2005). The programmes I worked on in the 1990s and 2000s fall within two categories, about both of which there is now a considerable literature: Arts television, (Hayward, 1988; Walker, 1993; Wyver, 2007) – primarily making programmes about the cinema (Ellis in Mulvey& Sexton, 2007; Kerr in Hill and McLoone, 1996; and Holmes, 2005) - and History television (Bell and Gray, 2007, Bell and Gray 2010 and Gray and Bell, 2012). There are auteurs associated with both categories, each with its own specific constraints on such creativity.

The 2003 Communications Act accelerated the commercialisation of the independent sector and inevitably diluted even those TV documentary production cultures still committed to public service programming principles (Zoellner, 2010, Bennett and Kerr, 2012, Output i). By 2007, with History programming also increasingly subject to market forces in dramatic ways (Bell and Gray, 2010, Kerr 2009, Output iv) I had decided that I could no longer sustain a career, even in this expanded niche, and either had to begin making programmes I was much less interested in or seek another profession. I took a job as Senior Lecturer in Broadcast Media at London Metropolitan University. And once I had, more or less successfully, found my feet in academia and completed my PGCHE, I returned to some of the academic concerns that had intrigued me over two decades earlier, ballasted with the industry experience of those twenty years in the independent television production sector.

2. Authorship and/in Theory: The concept of authorship as addressed in my academic output

Much of my academic work has been addressed to contesting or contextualising attributions of creative agency or authorship in film and television. From my first academic publication (Kerr 1979/1980 Output vi) to the most recent (Bennett and Kerr, 2012 Output i) I have explicitly or implicitly considered the place of authorship within the film and television industries and the ways in which the academic practice of auteurism has distorted discussions of the professional practices of those industries.

Authorship remains perhaps the most familiar and influential theory of cinema. The idea of the author as simultaneous source and centre of cinematic texts, and the subsequent challenges to that conception, have long been at the heart of film studies. Indeed, the elevation of – and attribution of meaning to - individual authors was an arguably inevitable strategy in the struggle to validate the cinema, imbuing it with the cachet of artistic respectability within a primarily literary academic culture. Thus, perhaps the best known British auteur critic, Robin Wood, in his book on Howard Hawks, whilst admitting that Hollywood is a remorseless commercial industry, equally insists on it as 'a great creative workshop, comparable to Elizabethan London or the Vienna of Mozart…' (Wood, 1968: 9) Similarly, his first acknowledgement at the end of that book is to the work of F.R. Leavis. In *Hitchcock's Films Revisited* (Wood, 1989) he returns to Leavis and literary criticism. [7]

Auteurism thus functioned as something of a Trojan horse within which the shock troops of Hollywood were smuggled into the citadel of cinematic Art, helping to provide the new field of film studies with a critical vocabulary and cultural kudos of its own. Caughie (1981: 3), discussing the historical and indeed geographical specificity of auteurism, reveals 'the

[7] For a brief discussion of the auteur case for Hawks and Hitchcock see Kerr (1986).

concentration of authorship theory on a single cinematic practice – the classic Hollywood cinema.' My own publications include attempts to situate authorship within the specific histories of the Hollywood film industry (Kerr, 1983, Output v and 2011, Output ii) and to address its pertinence and productivity beyond Hollywood, to the international art cinema from which the idea of the director as artist was initially appropriated (Kerr, 2010, Output iii). Auteurism soon became a privileging of one professional role over all others in film studies – and one that to a surprising extent, at least for a brief period, was reflected in Hollywood itself. Meanwhile, the continuing appearance of academic anthologies on the subject, two recent examples of which republished my work, demonstrate its continuing resonance and relevance (Caughie, 1981; Gerstner &Staiger, 2003; Wexman, 2003; Grant, 2008). [8]

If auteurism itself had an author, then perhaps it was Francois Truffaut in 1954, who famously deployed the French word auteur, for a film's author, in calling for a "cinema d'auteurs". (Truffaut, 1954)). Truffaut's polemic, or critical policy – *la politique des auteurs* - advocated a cinema in which film directors, rather than relying on over-literary scripts and adaptations from literature (as, he alleged, was the case with French cinema's then celebrated but creatively moribund 'tradition of quality'), would write and create their own films without a pre-existing cultural prosthesis.

This auteur theory - as it was mistranslated and subsequently popularized (Sarris, 1962, 1968) - celebrated directors (and their visual style and themes) over writers (and their verbal storytelling, characterisation and dialogue skills). As Sarris put it, 'Ultimately, the auteur theory is not so much a theory as an attitude, a table of values that converts film history into directorial autobiography' (Sarris, 1968: 30). This early auteurism was often characterised by a celebration of the

[8] Of course the concept of authorship goes far beyond screen studies – see for instance Burke (1998) and Bennett (2005), but this is beyond the scope of this Commentary.

supposed tension between an artist's personal vision and the means at his or her disposal for its realization – financial, technical, generic, institutional and so on. Such constraints were often seen as positive, prompting expressive and sometimes excessive stylistic and thematic strategies on the part of the heroic director.

Ironically, just as Sarris's book length auteurist study, *The American Cinema*, was published in 1968, debates about authorship outside the English-speaking world were moving on. So called 'auteur-structuralism', reliant on the work of the linguist Saussure and his studies of language (1974) and the anthropologist Levi-Strauss's analyses of myths (1968), represented one departure from 'auteur theory'. This began to lend a more or less scientific theoretical patina to the somewhat empirical practical criticism associated with Sarris and the journal *Movie*, replacing it with the revelation of structural oppositions at the heart of an auteur's*oeuvre*. That there was an implicit incompatibility between the social (rather than individual) and unauthored myths studied by Levi-Strauss (1969) in anthropology and the directorial subjectivities unearthed by auteur-structuralism in relation to cinema was ignored (Eckert, 1973; Henderson, 1973; Wollen, 1968 and 1972). Peter Wollen could write, 'Fuller or Hawks or Hitchcock, the directors, are quite separate from 'Fuller' or 'Hawks' or 'Hitchcock', the structures named after them and should not be methodologically confused' (Wollen, 1972: 147) as if that resolved the problem (Kerr, 1986).

By 1968, in France, the original *Cahiers* critics (Truffaut, Chabrol, Rohmer, Rivette, Godard) had all left the magazine and been replaced by editors Jean-Louis Commolli, Jean Narboni and Jean-Pierre Oudart who were at once more avowedly political and more intellectually stringent than their predecessors. Drawing on Althusserian Marxism and Lacanian psychoanalysis as well as Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' (1968/1977) and Foucault's 'What is an Author?' (1969/1977),

they saw authorship as a reading strategy, deeply influenced by Barthes' assertion that 'the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author'. (1977: 148) Here authorship had been reconceived as the site of discourses, a Foucauldian notion in which the author becomes just another text to be decoded, as exemplified by the influential *Cahiers* study of John Ford's *Young Mr Lincoln* (1970). Once again this theoretical development was swiftly taken up in the English-speaking world, this time by the translation of the *Cahiers'* piece in *Screen* (1972).

In his Introduction to *Theories of Authorship*, Caughie admits he has 'very little to say on the place of the author within institutions (industrial, cultural, academic), or the way in which the author is constructed by and for commerce.' (Caughie, 1981: 2) Two years later I attempted 'to sketch out – if not yet fill in – some of the gaps discussed by Caughie concerning the place of the author within those institutions' (Kerr, 1983: 48, Output v). My own subsequent Reader in Film Studies, in the same series as Caughie's, (Kerr, 1986) anthologised a number of pieces on Hollywood as an industry which attempted to specify some of the institutional determinants on meaning and delimitations on agency. These institutional or organizational determinants included the banks, the studios, exhibition strategies, the technologies of sound and colour, the screenplay and the studio unions. As part of this endeavour I included my own essay on the industrial determinants of the B Film Noir (Kerr, 1979/80, Output vi).

That article summarized the ways in which, in numerous studies of film noir, critics identified novelists, painters, photographers and philosophers who influenced the genre or shifted the focus beyond the director to other professional practitioners including screenwriters and cinematographers (Kerr, 1979/80: 45, Output vi) or further still to the war or capitalism or the American zeitgeist itself. Rather than relying on the notion of individual artistry, I attempted to demonstrate that it was not merely the stylistic signature of some film industrial employees but

precisely specific film industrial conditions and modes of production in the 1940s and 1950s that facilitated the economic and stylistic choices which have been retrospectively identified as characterising film noir and conventionally attributed to their auteur directors. Discussing previous attempts to attribute film noir to either such artists or the form's cultural ancestors, I concluded that

'What they have not done however is to relate those general – and generally untheorised – notions of 'influence' to the specific modes of production, both economic and ideological, upon which they were, presumably, exercised; in this case, those structures and strategies adopted by certain fractions within the American film industry over a period of almost two decades.' [9] (Kerr, 1979/80: 45, Output vi).

The article has since been reprinted (in Bennett, 1990; Silver and Ursini, 1996; Miller, 2009). My 1986 collection included a brief commentary on the development of authorship within film studies (Kerr, 1986: 12-19) and other outputs included here include subsequent case studies re-contextualising films attributed to particular auteur directors – Joseph H Lewis (Kerr, 1983, Output v), Billy Wilder (Kerr, 2011, Output ii) and Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu (Kerr, 2010, Output iii) – within the corporate institutions and production cultures where these directors worked.

The first of these re-contextualisations, a case study of the production, exhibition and critical consumption of Lewis' film noir output, discusses 'the very real difficulty auteurists have experienced attempting to define and describe these films" and identifies "their representativeness of a particular professional strategy at a specific moment and mode of the American cinema's, and indeed the American film industry's, development…' (Kerr, 1983: 49, Output v). It goes on to discuss the ways in which the B movie milieu Lewis inhabited 'was an accidentally propitious arena in which the process of

'authorisation' could be played out and institutionally inscribed' (Kerr, 1983: 66, Output v)

The second analyses *Some Like it Hot* (Wilder, 1959),which is almost certainly Billy Wilder's most popular film - and in many conventional senses it is 'his' film: he is credited as producer, director and co-writer – but I discuss it not as a Wilder film, but rather as an industrially authored, package-unit film, independently produced by the Mirisch Company (Kerr, 2011, Output ii). In the third, I argued that the network narrative structure of *Babel* (Inarritu, 2006) can be attributed not only to its director and screenwriter (on what was the final film of three network narrative collaborations) but also to 'a structural homology: both of its mode of production and of the social relations of that production.' (Kerr, 2010: 48, Output iii)

Where Caughie's influential anthology acknowledged its silence on the institutional and economic site of individual auteurs, my published work was pioneering in its attempts to specifically situate such individual professionals within precise film industrial circumstances. Indeed, the Introduction to *The Hollywood Film Industry* (Kerr, 1986: 1-30) argued that film theory in general and auteurism in particular had *occluded* an understanding of how the film industry itself produced films. The anthology thus reprinted my essay on the emergence of a specific American film genre or style, not through its auteurs (*pace*Kitses on the Western, 1968 or McArthur on the gangster film, 1972, both of which essentially deploy genre as a canvas on which to display their chosen director subjects' signature styles and structures) but as a particular moment and precise economic mode of production in Hollywood's industrial history (Kerr, 1979/80 Output vi).

Developing this work on the industrial contexts for – and not just constraints on – creativity, I have published articles and co-edited books on the work of specific film and TV production companies – MTM Enterprises and its development of an

aesthetic strategy and a demographic and financial rationale for quality television (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi 1984) and The Mirisch Corporation's production of the auteurist classic, *Some Like it Hot* (Kerr, 2011, Output ii); two of that company's productions were also the subjects of television documentaries. In discussing the historical and retrospective construction of spaces for directorial reputations in a case study of the noir films directed by Joseph H Lewis (Kerr, 1983, Output v), or the circulation of authorial brands and signature narrative strategies within transnational art cinema, in an analysis of Inarritu's*Babel* (Kerr, 2010, Output iii), from the so called B studios that employed Lewis to the Art cinema circuits in which the work attributed to Inarritu is exhibited, I have attempted to address Caughie's acknowledged lacuna.

Thus I have consistently argued that film theory needs to calibrate its focus more precisely between the wide shot approach which sees Hollywood films as no more than a reflection of American society or of capitalism and a perspective in which the entire frame is filled with a close up on just a single member of the production team, the director. Both the director as auteur and (American) society as auteur approaches effectively evacuate the film industry itself from their analyses. Too often films have been and continue to be attributed simply to specific individual directors and/or general American ideologies – capitalism, Republicanism and so on - not least by the influential *Cahiers* study of *Young Mr Lincoln.*

But whilst Hollywood history (both as film industry and cinematic practice) is now the subject of detailed academic scrutiny, non-fiction film - specifically documentary - has barely begun to experience this critical revision. Suffice it to say here that if, as I argue above, the elevation of – and attribution of meaning to - individual authors was an explicit strategy in the struggle to validate the cinema, that inevitability is specific to cinema *fiction.* In documentary cinema and documentary television alike, the foregrounding of the creator has been

implicit and hardly needed to be iterated since Grierson's oft-cited but rarely sourced definition of the genre as "the creative treatment of actuality" (Grierson, 1933: 8). In this formulation, while 'actuality' functions as the guarantor of documentary authenticity, 'creativity' testifies to the art of the documentarists. And yet, as will be seen, the foregrounding of the individual documentary auteur – Grierson, Jennings et al - is also open to contestation.[10]

Documentary, at least in what is sometimes considered its quintessential or ideal form, the observational film, aims at being as close to unmediated, as close to the experience of one hypothetical (human) fly on the wall, as possible (Nichols, 2000; Bruzzi, 2006; Ellis, 2011). Documentary filmmaking, indeed cinema itself after all, dates back to the Lumieres' 1895 *actualités*. In one history of this film practice, then, aiming if not actually claiming to show actuality with minimal mediation has effectively and instrumentally occluded authorship.

If documentary therefore occupies a problematic position for the theory of auteurism, the place of television further confuses the issue. A number of observers have tried to figure television as a location in which authorship akin to that posited for cinema might exist. Newcomb and Alley in *The Producer's Medium* (1983) argue that 'the television producer is the creative center who shapes, through choices big and small, works of television that speak of personal values and decisions' (quoted in Wexman, 2003: 11). Similarly, Thompson and Burns (1990) identify a canon of American television authors before the death sentence of cinematic authorship is announced for TV fiction too. There is even one forlorn book-length attempt to apply Sarris' approach to American TV fiction directors (Wicking and Vahimagi, 1979). My own contribution to this debate, on the other hand, (Feuer, Kerr and Vahimagi, 1984) was an early attempt to discuss the industrial and corporate cultural

[10] Grierson was, after all, primarily a patron and executive producer figure, with only a single directing credit to his name. See also Dai Vaughan's study of Jennings' editor, Stewart McAllister, *Portrait of an Invisible Man* (1983).

authorship of American television. Both my essays in that volume focused on the production of American TV fiction. (Outputs vii and viii). The approach to American TV fiction that they embody subsequently found considerable favour. Writing on British TV fiction, on the other hand, has accorded the status of auteur to writers who retain their traditional literary/theatrical prestige (Brandt, 1981; Caughie, 2000; Creeber, 1998; Cooke, 2003; Tulloch, 2002).[11]

Meanwhile, in discussions of documentaries, for small and big screen alike, the director continues to be perceived unproblematically as creator, author or filmmaker, if only implicitly (Nichols, 2001/2010, Rascaroli, 2009; Renov, 2004; Austin and de Jong, 2008, Bruzzi, 2006, Ellis, 2011, Lee-Wright, 2010, Nichols, 2001/2010, Rascaroli, 2009.) There is thus a conspicuous absence of academic writing about - and specifically interrogative of - the attribution of individual authorship within television documentary. Meanwhile, the TV industry itself and the press stress, through their deployment of the possessive pronoun, the creative role of TV presenters in documentaries in which they appear and which they are often credited as writing – Louis Theroux, Simon Schama, Andrew Marr among many others. In academic studies of television documentaries in the UK, Jeremy Tunstall's*TV Producers* (1993) is a rare exception to this rule.

In academia the implicit auteurist impulse remains. Thus, for Nichols – writing essentially about documentary cinema (not television)

'Every documentary has its own distinct voice. Like every speaking voice, every cinematic voice has a style or "grain" all its own that acts like a signature or fingerprint. It

[11] Sometimes this is facilitated through the adaptation of established literary classics. See Kerr (1982: 6-19), which noted that television's regular reliance on the literary novel for its reputation for quality, which echoes the situation diagnosed by Truffaut (1954) in French cinema in the early 1950s.

attests to the individuality of the filmmaker or director…

> Individual voices lend themselves to an auteur theory of Cinema' (Nichols, 2001: 99).

The voices of the subject and the author in documentary, particularly in television, remain problematic even in the most recent theoretical writings. I will demonstrate the relevance of concepts of documentary voice and authorship to some examples of my own prior output in documentary practice later in this Commentary.

3: Authorship and/in Practice: The concept of authorship as posed by and problematised in my documentary output

As we have seen, the traditional idea of the author, in the sphere of film theory, has been under siege for some decades. Yet, in the wake of the 2008 RAE results, in which Practice as Research was highly valued, that idea, at least as far as media practice is concerned, seems not only to have emerged unscathed but to have been reinforced as the methodological fulcrum on and by which the evaluation of such practice pivots (RAE2008 UoA 66 subject overview report http://www.rae.ac.uk).

In thus celebrating practice-as-research, the RAE appeared to recognise as unproblematic, indeed transparent, the role of individual authorship in media practice, including film and video-making, after a long period of theoretical challenge of such attributions in Film and Media Studies, examples of which may well have been entered for and validated by the very same Unit of Assessment.

This seems particularly ironic in the context of the present Commentary, in that examples of 'my' documentary practice were rated as 4* world-leading research in the 2008 RAE. Four of 'my' documentaries were the only examples of Practice submitted for the UoA66 by London Metropolitan University. The four submitted documentaries were *Marilyn on Marilyn*

(BBC2 28.12.01, Output e); *Nobody's Perfect*, (BBC2 16.4.01, Output d); *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea (*C4 26.06.05, Output g); and *The Last Slave* (C4 11.03.07, Output h). All four of those documentaries are also submitted here as examples of 'my' prior output, together with this Commentary - one of whose arguments is precisely that such attribution ignores both the collaborative and institutional realities of practice and the impact of film and media theory, as exemplified in my published work, some of which is also submitted here as prior output. As I hope to demonstrate, this work complicates, if it does not severely undermine, just such traditional notions of authorship.

Indeed, in the words of one recent observer, '...the research assessment process, driven in part by the master/mistress criterion of the 'production of new knowledge', is placing a new emphasis on the role of individual authorship in the production process' (Harvey, 2009: 81). This section of the Commentary begins by tracing the development of the conceptualisation of media practice within the academy and the relative absence of such critiques of individual authorship in discussions of documentary practice in particular. For just as the acceptability within the academy of creative media practice is belatedly in the ascendant,

'In a process of essentially industrialized cultural production (aka popular culture) – not only in Hollywood for example but also in most television production – it has become difficult not to accept the proposition that there are many labourers in the vineyard of meaning-making...' (Harvey 2009: p 82-83).

The debate about the value of Practice as Research has occupied Film and Media Studies since the emergence of the field in the 1970s (Bell 2004, 2006; Piccini and Rye in Allegue, 2009; and Dowmunt, 2003). The first course in Film Studies was set up at the University of Warwick in 1972, the National Film and Television School was founded in 1976 and the institutional

divisions between the two fields has remained characteristic of the divide ever since. The ambitions of academic courses like the former, were, at least in part, to legitimate the study of the medium; they involved developing and deploying theoretical models and templates for the academic analysis of cinema (and later television), while the National Film and Television School, and departments and institutions like it, often saw their role as providing professional craft skills for work in those two industries (Bell, 2004: 739).

I started working in television as a specialist archive researcher in programmes about the media, and my hybrid background (in the National Film Archive but also on the editorial board of *Screen*) continued to underwrite my early employability in the TV industry (Kerr, 1991). Thus 'my' broadcast output includes programmes about the making of several classic or cult films – for instance, documentaries about *Some Like it Hot* (*Nobody's Perfect*, Kerr, 2001, Output d), *The Magnificent Seven* (*Guns for Hire: The Making of The Magnificent Seven*, Kerr, 2000, Output c), *The Usual Suspects* (*Nothing is as it Seems,* Kerr, 1998) and *The Silence of The Lambs* (*Lambs Tales*, Kerr, 1991), as well as others about specific production companies: Palace Pictures – *Who's Crying Now?* (Kerr, 1994) and MTM Enterprises – *Cat Among Lions* (Kerr, 1984a). All of these, however implicitly, problematise the attribution of authorship or creative credit to the signature of single individuals. One example identified in *Guns for Hire* is the crediting of multiple writers for the screenplay of and multiple claimants to having had the original idea for *The Magnificent Seven.*[12]

There is a curious gap between television's onscreen attribution of multiple professional credits and the academic privileging of a very limited selection from that fluid hierarchy of credited roles in publications and courses about the medium. It is curious

[12] It is perhaps significant here that two of those collaborative documentaries (Kerr, 2000 and 2001) provided raw material for subsequent academic publication (Kerr, 2011) whilst a third (Kerr, 1984), my first TV 'credit', was itself based on a collaborative academic publication. (Feuer, Kerr and Vahimagi, 1984)

not least because of the often implicit assumption that such courses are preparing students, among other things, for possible employment in the audio-visual media (Kerr, 1991 and Kerr, 2008). This disparity makes the acknowledgement of the work attributed to such credited authors by academic institutions like the RAE all the more complicated.

To confuse matters further, while film studies remains residually auteurist in academia despite the concept being contested, TV is still in some senses pre-auteurist. The Harvard referencing system for a feature film requires the title, year of release, director, country of origin, and film studio, while for a broadcast television program the requirements are title, and episode number if relevant, year of broadcast, broadcasting organization and channel, date and time of transmission. Despite this acknowledgment of the institutional and national rather than human determinants of a broadcast in the referencing requirements, it was a selection of 'my' own practice as TV documentary maker (and that possessive pronoun conceals the complexity of such attributions) which was awarded the accolade of world leading research in the 2008 RAE, rather than, say, any such qualities being attributed to the production companies or the broadcasters.

As Bannerman and McLaughlin point out, 'virtually all creative work in the arts is collaborative, and that any claim to single authorship is inherently unethical as it does not acknowledge the contributions of others.' (Bannerman in Alleque et al, 2009: 66-67)McLaughlin develops this idea, in his discussion of precedents for collaborative films that actually acknowledge their collaborative nature – films like those of David and Judith MacDougall and Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin (McLaughlin in Alleque et al, 2009: 73). I will develop this idea of collaborative filmmaking and specifically what Renov (2004) has called 'shared textual authority' later in this Commentary. Similarly, Sorennssen notes that the burden of representation characteristic of Griersonian documentary practice led to 'several experiments

in letting the subjects in the documentary express themselves more directly…where enthusiastic filmmakers passed out cameras and sound equipment…' (Brown and Sorenssen, 2008: 57). An early, notorious example of this is the story of Grierson's sister Ruby's off-screen thrusting of the microphone at slum tenants in Housing Problems (1934) requesting them to 'tell the bastards what it's really like' (Lee-Wright, 2009: 84). Bell cites another form of such collaboration when he notes that, 'television and film producers working in the factual field hire specialist picture researchers to locate relevant archival images. They call on the services of specialist academics such as historians to develop scripts and programme treatments…' (Bell, 2006: 86).

The RAE historically encouraged creative practitioners to find public exhibition for work which could be seen in some sense to parallel the peer-reviewed publication outlets of written work:

'This was the primary model employed by the RAE to assess individual academic's research output, and art institutes were greatly relieved to find they could re-inscribe the art work of lecturing staff within it and qualify for RAE recognition and funding. Universities began to hire professional filmmakers and visual artists with impressive portfolios of exhibited work to strengthen their research profile in the area of art, design and media' (Bell, 2006: 88).

I was a beneficiary of this development. Thus selected examples of some professional media practitioners' practice were submitted to the RAE, as Bell puts it, 'irrespective of whether the authors themselves conceived of their art works in this way" (Bell, 2006: 86). I would neither claim to be the author of 'my' works submitted in this way, nor that they were "art works', in this valorized sense, nor indeed was even aware of the existence of the RAE - nor even of any agreed criteria for academic assessment of practice - when they were produced.

My own twenty plus year career in TV repeatedly demonstrated to me both the collective rather than individual, and the industrial/institutional as well as residually artisanal nature of creative audio-visual production, particularly in the many instances where that work itself focused *on* creative production. As I have stated, that career began with a role as a researcher and interviewer on a one-off documentary, *Cat Among Lions* (Kerr, 1984a), about a production company specializing in drama and comedy. It was made for Channel 4 and was an attempt to offer alternative ways of thinking about cultural production and authorship beyond individual attributions. This documentary profile of an independent production company was itself produced by a small independent production company, Illuminations and was commissioned to coincide with the publication of a book which I co-edited and co-wrote and a season of screenings at the National Film Theatre that I co-curated. This was the book about an American TV production company, MTM Enterprises, entitled *MTM: Quality Television.* (Feuer, Kerr, Vahimagi, 1984), discussed above. As a study of, among other things, corporate authorship, published as an academic anthology of which I was one of three editors, this was hardly an auspicious entrée for a career as an unreflective television auteur.

Among the book's aims was an attempt to complicate conventional accounts of authorship in the production processes of American network television. Indeed, *contra* the majority of academic accounts of creativity in film and television (see above), my career in the industry continued in collaborative mode, in an environment led not by the agency of individualistic acts of artistry but by the structuring demands of formats, commissioning departments, scheduling conventions, budgets, multi-skilling and multi-tasking, the working practices of other colleagues and the respective production cultures of the independent production companies in which - and the broadcasters for which - we worked and the generic traditions and creative spaces into and for which such programmes were

produced. A production case study of the last documentary I produced, *The Last Slave* (C4 2007, Output iv), provides an analysis of the role such forces play in shaping a television production (Kerr, 2009 Output iv).

From over 150 programmes I worked on in the collaborative milieu of TV production, the selection from my professional output submitted with this Commentary constitutes just 10 documentaries (one three-part series and seven single documentaries). On those documentaries my on-screen credit ranges from Series Producer to Producer to Producer/Director. However those roles were never undertaken in an institutional/generic or collaborative vacuum. It will suffice here to discuss the production of just one of those many programmes.

The Crimean War (Kerr, 1997, Output b) series could hardly be further from having an onlie begetter or single author. It was inspired by and borrowed from the techniques associated with the award-winning PBS series *The Civil War* (Burns, 1990) which used eye witness accounts (from letters, diaries, memoirs and so on, together with interviews with historians, narration, and contemporary photographs of that war). When a long-running BBC2 series I had been producing (*Moving Pictures,* BBC2, 1990-1996) was suddenly cancelled in the autumn of 1996, I had to win a swift commission in order to secure my continued employment at the production company, MentornBarraclough Carey. A colleague and I researched and wrote a proposal for a series about the Crimean War which was not only a British conflict a decade before the American Civil War, but was actually the first war to be professionally photographed, preceding the American conflict by a decade, the first to have its own professional war correspondents and to use the telegraph. So the genesis of that series was arguably due to (if not exactly authored by) a combination of plagiarism and job insecurity. I had previously produced one history documentary, a *Timewatch* edition entitled *The Projection Racket*, (1995, BBC2) (Kerr, 1995, Output a) about the mafia's infiltration of the

American film industry unions in the 1930s. That documentary included some dramatic reconstructions which were rigorously based on verbatim extracts from trial testimony and subsequently the production team (and parts of British broadcasting more generally) had become interested in oral history and limited dramatized documentary. The latter programme, furthermore, developed on an essay – not by me - anthologized in my BFI Reader (Kerr, 1986) and at the same time recapitulated an earlier academic interest in the form (Kerr, 1981 and Goodwin, Kerr, MacDonald 1982).

Perhaps significantly, that documentary's inclusion of dramatic reconstruction (albeit based on historical documents and supported by accompanying interviews with the surviving participants from the court case) had met with considerable resistance from the BBC's *Timewatch* series editor, Laurence Rees, later to take up the tools of reconstruction far more controversially himself (Bruzzi, 2006: 45-46). Within a couple of years the pressures for ratings and international sales made reconstruction virtually obligatory in history programmes. Such compromises are of the essence of television documentary and individual agency can often do little to resist them. The Crimean War was thus an example of following rather than prefiguring television fashion.

As an oral history of the war, *The Crimean War* focused on the experiences of eye witnesses who were often ordinary soldiers, sailors, nurses, reporters, civilians and so, from all sides of the conflict, rather than only Monarchs, politicians and Generals. The practicalities of the series – an oral history of a multinational war - meant that staffing *The Crimean War* required the employment of French and Russian speaking members of the core team. Television oral history, perhaps even more than any other television history form, necessitates multiple authorship, with technical, editorial and other skills. On this production I was credited as Series Producer and Mick Gold as Series Director, and the logistics of scheduling necessitated three films being simultaneously shot and then simultaneously

edited, with the consequence that, in post-production, Mick Gold wrote and directed the first, the present candidate wrote and directed the second and the Associate Producer wrote and directed the third. The Series Researcher, Georgina Pye and Picture Researcher Karla Bryan were also crucial contributors, and there was an Executive Producer, George Carey and two C4 commissioning editors involved in the process – Alan Hayling and Peter Moore. And as the series was a co-production for France's La Cinquieme and America's The Learning Channel there was also some post-post-production 'versioning' in response to specific national, institutional and demographic requirements.

As this was a three part series, the material filmed for each episode was all directed by Gold and shot by the cameraman and so the individual directors were actually assembling, with their respective editors, appropriate location footage, extracts from interviews and relevant archive material for their specific programme. The production team of the series also co-wrote and co-edited a book about the history of the war based on the same oral sources discovered and deployed for the series. The conventions of publishing and marketing necessitated that one of us took editorial credit, but once again the reality was much more collaborative. (Kerr, 1997)

Any analysis of creative agency in television thus needs to account for the contributions of the institutional spaces for authorship provided by the broadcaster, the production company or production department, the commissioning department, the programme genre and form (one-off or series/serial), and in my own case its identity as documentary or magazine programme, the presumed place in the schedule, the anticipated demographic of its audience, the budget, and so on.

In 1999, having moved as a freelance from MentornBarraclough Carey Productions to October Films, I was appointed Series Producer of four 30 minute biographies of black Britons for BBC Knowledge (now BBC4) entitled *Hidden History*, both

because of my experience producing a previous history series and because one of those four subjects was the Crimea heroine, Mary Seacole. Since this series was limited by very low budgets, digital rather than terrestrial transmission, thirty minute rather than one hour slots and inexperienced presenters, I subsequently attempted to secure a commission for an hour long, higher budgeted documentary about her. This was finally commissioned by C4 as *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* (C4, 2005, Output g) in the bicentenary year of her birth, and, being partly based on Seacole's autobiography, every word spoken by the actress playing her - in the intermittent, minimally dramatized, reconstructions that punctuated the documentary aspects of the programme (the conventional interviews with experts and expositional voice over narration) was a verbatim extract from that book. Seacole herself therefore is, in a sense, a co-author of the film. Similarly, a subsequent Samuel Johnson biography was constructed from autobiographical extracts from the lexicographer's (and others, including Boswell's) writings. Both these projects, then, developed from the interest in oral history begun in *The Projection Racket* and *The Crimean War*. But where those two projects used multiple first person testimony to 'document' the historical world, the Seacole and Johnson documentaries relied primarily on first person testimony of - and about - the subjects themselves.

Meanwhile, the Seacole documentary had reminded October Films that C4 was keen on anniversaries as pegs for programmes, but also familiarized us with the history of British slavery, specifically in Jamaica (Lee quoted by de Jong in Austin and de Jong, 2008: 168). 2007 was the bicentenary of the abolition of the British slave trade and in 2005 we came up with the idea at a development meeting at October Films. (Kerr, 2009 Output iv) A decade after *The Crimean War* series we attempted to apply the same, oral history and eye witness approach to a series for the same C4 History commissioning department about the final journey of the last legal British slaveship.

The Crimean War series widened the niche of programming for which I was considered eligible or employable by the industry, from media and arts programmes to history programmes. But this professional persona had to operate in an increasingly client-based and demand- rather than supply-led industry. (Ellis, 2000) Thus I was also the passive recipient (rather than the proactive initiator) of a series of film programme commissions from, first, C4 and, then, the BBC. This in turn led to a range of commissions of programmes to contextualise the screenings of acquired feature films and film seasons which C4 and the then new Film4 digital channel were planning. Apart from the obvious and implicit advertorial role of such commissions, the relation of such programmes to their parent channels was always closer than almost any previous productions I had been involved with and the degree of editorial independence or authorship - individual or institutional - that could be exercised was concomitantly diminished. Such commissions included making-of documentaries about Hollywood classics like *The Magnificent Seven* and *Some Like it Hot* and the research period of the latter turned up material which was to lead to another documentary, *Marilyn on Marilyn* (Output e).

Arguably, it is not the present writer's authorship but that of the entire team of collaborators and most significantly the film's posthumous co-author which might best explain both the critical and ratings success of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* (Output f). Furthermore, as films 'made in the cutting room' perhaps more than is true or many documentaries, authorship can equally, if not more unequivocally, be attributed to the editors of these two films, Dan Carey and OllyHuddlestone, and their archive researchers, Matt Haan, Louise Smith, and Alastair Siddons.[13] Furthermore, archive-based oral histories pose particular problems for documentary theory. As I argue in the following section of this Commentary, they raise fundamental questions for documentary authorship.

[13] As evidence of their individual 'creativity' Carey has composed, mixed and/or produced numerous music albums and Siddons has subsequently directed three feature films.

The voice-over narration - seen by many scholars as *a* (if not *the)* locus of authorship, or signature (Nichols, 2000, Bruzzi, 2006) - of most television documentaries is often constructed in a collaboration between the producer, director, executive producer, commissioning editor and, because of its writing or re-writing during post-production, the editor. On *The Crimean War* the voice-over narration was expository - objective in Nichols' sense of voice-of-God narration (Nichols, 2001: 105-109) - partly to distinguish it from the multiple off-screen voices reading extracts from the eye witnesses' letters, diaries, memoirs and newspaper reports that comprised the series' oral history of the war. Of course, that narration then had to be read in the recording studio by a narrator who brought her own voice to the mix. Thus the attribution of individual authorship is once again inadequate to the institutional, occupational and technological realities of television production. But if this is the case of all narrated documentaries, how much more complex is that of those whose own subjects' narrated them?

The three documentaries submitted here which I both produced and directed, *Nobody's Perfect, Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie*, are all based on archival material and the latter pair are particularly problematic in auteurist terms. *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* involved filming no new interviews at all and only a few minutes of new footage was shot for and included in either film. Thus the conventional locus of creativity in many auteurist analyses – production itself, rather than pre-production (research and writing) and post-production (editing, music, narration etc) – can be virtually omitted from consideration. This implies that the auteur is rare indeed in the archive-based documentary. Bruzzi does discuss the exceptional documentary work of directors Esther Shub and Emile de Antonio, but they remain exceptions, albeit pioneering ones. (Bruzzi, 2006: 15-36).

While *Marilyn on Marilyn* avoids expository, voice of God narration, opting instead for half a dozen on screen captions, and raises the question of authorship through its reliance on two pre-

recorded sound interviews with the star, *Billie on Billie* not only deploys pre-recorded sound interviews but also extracts from Holiday's autobiography read by an actress, an autobiography furthermore that was itself ghost-written. [14] These latter extracts were then voiced in post-production by one actress, as was the narration, by another, narration which was itself written in collaboration with the editor, the BBC commissioning editor and the October Films executive producer. I will discuss one way of re-conceptualising the authorship of this kind of archive-based documentary filmmaking later.

The success of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and its sequels rekindled my interest in oral history and this too may have eased the commission of both *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* and *Samuel Johnson: The Dictionary Man*. In the event, the former was radically transformed in pre-production negotiations with the commissioning editor for History, Ralph Lee, and subsequently with the director, Sonali Fernando, into a heavily dramatised documentary, and the second by the intervention during post-production of the BBC's Commissioning Editor. In this latter case a documentary commissioned by one BBC executive precisely because it proposed an appropriately alphabetical non-linear structure, was compelled to become a conventional biographical narrative by a different executive uninvolved in the commissioning. And it wasn't only the alphabetical structure that suffered at the hands of what we considered insensitive executive producer intervention. When we were unable to find a first person account of an episode in Johnson's childhood we wanted to include, we were simply advised to 'make it up'.

Similarly, on *The Last Slave*, the first person narrative account left by the freed slave - who was, after all, the co-protagonist - was barely mentioned in the final film. Thus a documentary which was once intended to be based on one of only a handful of surviving 'slave narratives', had, by the final cut, seen that

[14] This autobiography, Lady Sings the Blues (1956) was co-written with (or more likely ghost-written by) William Duffy.

freed slave's voice all but muted by instead giving voice to a charismatic descendant – a journeyer in his ancestor's footsteps. (Kerr, 2009, Output iv). Of such moments of agency, for good and ill, are the structures of broadcasting – and the culture industry itself – punctured and populated. If these are the spaces for authorship, they are highly contested.

4: Documentary Practice, (auto)biography, authorship and shared textual authority.

'In the documentary the basic material has been created by god, whereas in the fiction film the director is the god' - Alfred Hitchcock (Truffaut, **1969: 110).**

Documentary theory has long had an intrinsic problem with authorship. Grierson's famous definition fails to conceptualise the precise role played by the 'creatives' providing that 'treatment'. Similarly, Nichols' description of documentary as a "discourse of sobriety" (Nichols, 2001: 39, 54-55) is implicitly prohibitionist, puritanical in its interdiction of the inebriatingly subjective.

The above epigraph expresses Hitchcock's tongue-in-cheek distinction between filmic fiction and non-fiction. But it also reinforces the two normative modes with which Nichols characterises classical or canonical documentary – the Observational, which is, in a sense, God's world unmediated by (a camera-) man's intervention, and the Expository, which Nichols associates with the deployment of an omniscient, voice-of-God commentary (Nichols, 2000/2006). Nichols' other four documentary modes are Participatory, Reflexive, Poetic and Performative. Of these, only the Poetic and the Observational, at least in their ideal forms, prohibit interviews – indeed the interview has become all but ubiquitous in mainstream documentary. Nichols has diagnosed this as a problem for both documentary theory and practice, because, 'The sense of a hierarchy of voices becomes lost' (Nichols, 2005: 25). [15]

[15] See Cobley (2001: 94-107) for a discussion of hierarchy of voices in the classic realist text, a concept that can easily be adapted and applied to the casting of supporting interviewees in expository documentary.

Recently however that hierarchy of voices has begun to be challenged. In 2004, documentary theorist Michael Renov described what he called 'the recent turn to filmic autobiography' as 'the defining trend of "post-verite" documentary practice...' (Renov, 2004: xxiii). Subsequently, Renov went further still, suggesting that 'the very idea of autobiography challenges/reinvents the VERY IDEA of documentary' (Renov, 2008: 40). Here the *subject matter* of the film and the *subject making* the film, the matter and the maker, are one and the same. Indeed, a number of recent theatrical documentaries, because of their status between biography and autobiography, have prompted the construction of an entirely new conceptual category, deploying archival film, often in the form of home movies, to document the lives of their human subjects. Examples include the found footage of the Friedman family in *Capturing the Friedmans* (Jarecki, 2003), of Jonathan Caouette and his mother in *Tarnation* (Caouette, 2003), of Louis Kahn in *My Architect: A Son's Journey* (Kahn, 2003) and of Timothy Treadwell in *Grizzly Man* (Herzog, 2005), all of which provide key sequences in their respective films.

Bruzzi also deploys the term performative to describe documentaries in which the filmmakers themselves appear and perform roles in the text – citing the work of Nick Broomfield, Michael Moore and others (Bruzzi, 2006). Indeed Bruzzi notes the common criticism of performative documentary directors (or author-performers as she calls them) of getting between the actuality and the camera, of not allowing the subject matter to 'speak for itself' (2006: 198). But as she points out it is often too easily assumed that the repression of the author is a necessary condition for the capture of authentic documentary footage. Bell has also discussed documentary and specifically found footage filmmaking using precisely these terms (Bell, 2004a: 22). Interestingly, meanwhile, Bruzzi's notion of the performative refers to the presentation of self – otherwise designated as 'the autobiographical turn' - in recent documentary (Bruzzi, 2006: 185-218). Here Bruzzi discusses Nick Broomfield as a 'star

director', the epitome of the performative documentary auteur, and applies Wollen's auteur-structuralist perspective to distinguish Broomfield from 'Broomfield'. But the director 'performing' as a putative 'presenter' on screen is not quite the issue in some of the examples from my own practice submitted here. Thomas Austin (2008: 51), discussing *Grizzly Man*, a film attributed to the auteur Werner Herzog, asks what happens to authorship when a documentary re-contextualises footage originally shot by the now dead subject, for their own unrealised documentary purposes, in a subsequent film.

Austin characterises *Grizzly Man* as exhibiting a form of 'dual' or 'double authorship', a combination of sometimes 'competing' voices. A different approach to the multi-vocal nature of documentary filmmaking is Lebow's, citing another of Renov's formulations, 'assisted autobiography' (Lebow, 2008 xxxiii). She adds a category of her own, 'posthumous authorship' (Lebow, 151): in films displaying this trope, 'the death of the author is no post-structuralist axiom; it is the very condition of the film's production' (Lebow, 153). Here Lebow is offering a way of conceptualising the death of the 'assisted autobiographer', the collaborator whose autobiography is then completed by their 'assistant', posthumous colleague and implicit biographer. In the case of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and its sequels this constitutes what Foucault or Barthes might have called the death of the co-author.

Discussing Myerhoff and Littman's *In her Own Time* (1985), which she describes as by (and about) Myerhoff but co-directed by Littman, Lebow writes that there is no clear author as the credited filmmaker is self-effacing but the original filmmaker died before authorship was accomplished. For Lebow, such films are 'made by a ghost on whose reputation the film rides' (Lebow, 2008: 155) But if *In Her Own Time* rides on Myerhoff's posthumous reputation, how much more does *Marilyn on Marilyn* ride on Monroe's? The recording of Monroe's answers to interviewers' questions provides the narration for the

documentary, but it also orchestrates its direction. The (co-)director's job was perhaps to contribute to the arrangement of that orchestration since, unusually, this narration, at least in its unedited form, long pre-existed the making of the documentary.

These concepts are all germane to my own practice, but it is Renov's term 'shared textual authority' (Renov, 2004:222) which describes what he calls the 'shared camera' of domestic ethnographic filmmaking, that is perhaps most pertinent. Renov had previously argued that the trope of the 'shared camera' effects 'an erosion of textual authority or directorial control ((which)) is endemic to domestic ethnography…' (Renov, 1999: 147). Hagedoorn, following Renov, argues that *The Maelstrom*, *Grizzly Man* and *My Architect*, by virtue of their shared textual authority, all destabilize notions like biography and autobiography (Hagedoorn, 2009). The implication of Hagedoorn's work – and of Renov's - is that authorship is destabilised too, but neither develop this notion. [16]

However Hagedoorn does argue that the practice of found footage filmmaking complicates the identity of the biographer in such films. 'Through its prominent use of found footage, *The Maelstrom*problematizes the notions of both autobiography and biography in documentary filmmaking… No explicit 'voice-of-authority' commentary (whether written or spoken) is included in *The Maelstrom'*. (Hagedoorn, 2009: 187) Rather than defining *The Maelstrom* as biographical or autobiographical, Hagedoorn describes it as sharing textual authority, as a 'collaborative autobiography'. (Hagedoorn, 2009: 190) She deploys this concept to describe documentary work where 'two or more parties are included in the production of an autobiographical text through the process of shared textual authority…' (Hagedoorn, 2009: 190) But of course in the case of *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie*, far more than two

[16] See *Cinema's Alchemist: The Films of Peter Forgacs* (2012) edited by Renov and Nichols for the latest discussion of these films. Lebow has also edited a new collection of essays on first person filmmaking, *The Cinema of Me: The Self and Subjectivity in First-Person Documentary Film* (2012).

people were engaged in their production, not to mention determinants beyond the agency of individual programme-makers. Two of 'my' documentaries, submitted as outputs here, (though that possessive pronoun remains problematic), particularly bear out the proposals of Renov and Hagedoorn.
Marilyn on Marilyn is a kind of 'compilation film', (Bruzzi, 2006: 26) constructed almost exclusively from archival footage. Unlike the films of others mentioned above, however, it was not constructed from footage shot by only one or two previous filmmakers (like Treadwell, the Friedmans, Caouette etc) as the films discussed by Hagedoorn were. Instead, it is a collage of many different kinds of film – newly shot material, stock footage, home movies, screen tests, out takes from newsreels, and so on. Where the films directed by Jarecki, Kahn and Herzog all made use of footage shot (or, rather, directed) by others (in the cases of Jarecki and Herzog's films by their subjects themselves), I refer here not to *Marilyn on Marilyn*'s visual components - which comprise a wide range of found footage – but to its audio track, specifically its voice-over. This was constructed from the editing together of extracts from two non-broadcast interviews, conducted for magazine articles and recorded on reel-to-reel tape recorders towards the end of Monroe's life. These interviews, for *Life* magazine and *Marie Claire* (Paris) by Richard Meryman and Georges Belmont respectively, provide some of the key documentary material for the film and are, arguably, where Renov's notion of 'shared textual authority' applies to *Marilyn on Marilyn.*

As Renov has pointed out, autobiography is a form 'in which the author, the narrator, and the protagonist are identical'(Renov, 2004: xi). One way of approaching *Marilyn on Marilyn* is thus as a work in which the narrator and protagonist are identical but conventionally, at least, the author is not. And yet I want to suggest here - followingRenov's and, more specifically, Hagedoorns's conception of 'shared textual authority' - that while Monroe neither personally filmed nor recorded any of the sounds or images in *Marilyn on Marilyn* she was, in some sense,

'recruited' by the film as a kind of posthumous collaborator. Renov notes that 'the word 'autobiography' is composed of three principal parts – 'auto', 'bio' and 'graphy' – which make up the essential ingredients of this representational form: a self, a life and a writing practice' (2004: xii). *Marilyn on Marilyn* is thus a form of filmic 'writing' about the 'life' of a specific - although, in a sense, fictional - 'self': Marilyn Monroe. Like several of the films Renov discusses, *Marilyn on Marilyn* is also based on interviews, but I didn't conduct them, nor were they filmed.

Despite the assumption that (auto)biography is suffused with representations of the self, documentary film autobiographies have usually downplayed the affective or individual experiences of the humans that are their subjects in favour of allegedly objective observation. This should not, however, be allowed to conceal the intrinsically subjective aspect of all more conventional documentary forms. Corner argues that autobiography involves subjectivity presented subjectively, in contrast to the conventional 'objectivity' with which documentary treats its 'subjective' interview material in the normative expository heirarchy of voices. (Corner, 2006: 125-128)

Bruzzi (2006) discusses archive filmmaking and 'compilation' films in some detail. But the archival material she discusses is exclusively visual, since the documentary pioneers were working in the silent era. Bruzzi usefully characterises two common modes of archival usage, with the former 'not asking the spectator to question the archival documents but simply to absorb them as a component of a larger narrative', noting that in such archive-reliant modes the 'provenance' of such footage is rarely an issue. The provenance of the archival sound recordings is explicitly revealed in the inter-titles at the beginning of *Marilyn on Marilyn*, but we are not, as viewers, encouraged to be entirely credulous of them. Discussing *Marilyn on Marilyn* in her book, *The Many Lives of Marilyn Monroe*, Sarah Churchwell (2004: 107/8) argues that,

'The film opens, cannily, with a preamble that raises the question of her relationship to her own words and to the truth.... In other words, even Monroe's speech is (rightly) problematized by the film from the beginning, in raising the question of how deliberately she presented her 'self' to her audience; of the way in which answers were elicited by the simple fact of being interviewed, by a self-conscious presentation of her identity as a performance; and of whether she might be lying.'

Bruzzi's second category of archival usage concerns the use of found footage in the kind of documentary where 'the derivation of such archive is a significant issue and which frequently uses such footage dialectically or against the grain.' (Bruzzi, 2006: 26) *Marilyn on Marilyn* attempts to use found footage and amateur film in ways both poetically evocative (rather than prosaically illustrative) and against the grain – at least the grain of expectation - using outtakes rather than already-edited sequences from newsreels, snatched home movies rather than polished feature film clips. One potential avenue for such usage, if the expository 'objective' route is not taken, is that of exploring subjectivity, memory.

In a recent essay on biographical documentary, Corner notes that 'Given the rich readability of the face, it is not surprising that biographical documentaries typically do a lot of 'face work,' combining facial images with different kinds of speech and music....' (Corner, 2002: 99) The face of a film star like Marilyn Monroe is, at least superficially, a quintessentially readable entry point, the default image for such a documentary. But Corner also notes the importance of recorded voice in giving the 'viewer' access to subjectivity, not least in counterpoint to conventional voiced-over commentary. (Corner, 2002: 99)

In *Marilyn on Marilyn* 'recorded voice' or, more precisely, the pre-recorded voice of Monroe, is transformed into 'voiced-over

commentary' and this, by upsetting the conventional hierarchies of sound and image in documentary, including biographical documentary, inevitably complicates its status. Jeffrey K. Rouff, writing about the 'Conventions of Sound in Documentary' (in Altman, 1992: 222) outlines the conventional hierarchy of voices as follows: 'The clarity of sound in documentary usually depends on the degree of control that the filmmaker has over the profilmic events. Voice over narration allows for maximum control over sound quality…' Of course, when voice over is recorded not in a sound booth but as an audio interview on location on a reel to reel tape recorder, such assumptions are overturned. Indeed, I want to argue that *Marilyn on Marilyn* disturbs the conventional distinction between on-screen interviewee and filmmaker voice-over, both formally and technically. Thus when Rouff suggests 'The lack of clarity of the (observational) sound undermines the communicative intent of these films' (Altman, 1992: 224) *Marilyn on Marilyn* seems to reverse Rouff's rule. The very lack of clarity and the apparent 'amateurishness' of the recording of Monroe's voice actually reinforces its power as voice-over, appearing to give us access to her inner voice, in an intimate, as if unmediated, confessional manner.

Discussing the celebrated Zapruder 8mm footage of the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas, Bruzzi suggests that, 'The discrepancy between quality and magnitude of content and the Zapruder film's accidental nature make it particularly compelling.'(Bruzzi, 2000: 13) Such discrepancy applies equally to amateur footage of Kennedy's equally iconic 'contemporary' - Marilyn Monroe. Indeed, the discrepancy Bruzzi refers to remains as applicable to sound recordings as recorded images. The home movie, non-professional quality of Zapruder's images finds an echo in the metallic, slightly distorted sound quality of the reel-to-reel recordings of Marilyn Monroe's voice answering questions for a magazine interview – rather than for broadcast.

For Bruzzi, amateur footage (and, by extension, non-professional audio recording) offers 'an alternative point of view, a perspective that is partly predicated upon the absenting of the film's auteur' (2006: 18). Rather than claiming a status for myself as an auteur, absent or present, I want to argue that *Marilyn on Marilyn* recruited the late actress's voice to 'share textual authority', not just as a posthumous narrator but as a kind of audible 'silent partner' in the film and specifically in the narration, an unwitting co-author and posthumous auto-biographical collaborator. It is thus primarily with Monroe, as well as with her two interviewers, and finally with the literally anonymous makers of the archive footage re-used in the film that I and the other programme-makers of *Marilyn on Marilyn* share textual authority.

But what does it mean for a documentary's 'voice' or more specifically its voice-over to be delegated to such a 'shared' author? In her chapter on 'Narration', Bruzzi discusses the conventional assumption that'...voice over narration (is)...arguably the most blatant example of intervention on the part of the documentary filmmaker' (Bruzzi, 2006: 46). She goes on to consider that 'whereas in a fiction film the voice-off is traditionally that of a character in the narrative, in a documentary the voice over is more usually that of a disembodied and omniscient narrator,' (Bruzzi, 2006: 47) In *Marilyn on Marilyn*, we attempted to avoid this, not to extinguish our own presence from the film (which was made, almost entirely, in the cutting room) but in order to allow Marilyn's own voice to narrate the film, hence the decision to constrain the conventionally omniscient filmmaker's verbal guidance to the minimum number of on screen captions (the minimum acceptable to the BBC that is – whose executive producer had initially urged we also use traditional, 'expository' voice-over commentary).

Bruzzi cites Mary Ann Doane's remark that'it is precisely because the voice (in a documentary) is not localisable, because

it cannot be yoked to a body, that it is capable of interpreting the image, producing the truth' (Doane, 1980: 43, cited in Bruzzi, 2006: 63). The only exceptions to this rule that Bruzzi discusses are the 'performative' documentaries of Michael Moore and Nick Broomfield. But *Marilyn on Marilyn* and *Billie on Billie* seem to me to warrant consideration as exceptions too. For, like Bruzzi's auteur examples, they could be said to fracture 'the tacit documentary 'pact' that the voice-over will remain objective' (Bruzzi, 2006: 63)

Bruzzi usefully identifies two distinct strategies for female narration since the 1990s – as either objective voice of God or as subjective voice of the filmmaker. However *Marilyn on Marilyn* and to a lesser extent *Billie on Billie* require a third category, that of the posthumous narrator, neither the director herself nor the omniscient narrator in the audio booth. Significantly, perhaps, Bruzzi also notes how an equivalence is often assumed between a woman's voice as physical utterance and as metaphoric access of her inner self (Bruzzi, 2000: 58) and that very sleight of hand was one of the strategies of *Marilyn on Marilyn,* aiming tocreate an impression of an intimate interiority about one woman's inner self or selves by virtue of 'shared textual authority'. Not through literally sharing the camera with her, or indeed the microphone or tape recorder, but nevertheless by allowing her voice to tell her own story – and excluding any other such voices. This is not to deny, of course, who finally controlled the selection and juxtaposition of extracts of that voice's utterances. But then this also remains the case in Renov and Hagedoorn'scanonic examples.

If the voice on the audio track can provide an illusion of unmediated access to an inner self so too can the image. In an essay on self-inscription in first person films Renov describes how filmmaker Faith Hubley offers 'visual correlatives for elusive interior states' (Renov, 2008: 42) in her *My Universe Inside Out.* He goes on to suggest that if Greirsonian documentary actuality is, by definition, exterior, objectively

observable, then autobiography's terrain is interior, subjective and ultimately invisible. Thus, for Renov, correlatives for subjective interiority on the visual track can function to reinforce the status of the speaker's voice on the audio track as somehow objective. Yet of course, in *Marilyn on Marilyn*, that voice is that of the subject herself, Marilyn Monroe.

How then does the image track of *Marilyn on Marilyn* attempt to sustain the illusion of such interiority? Jerome Rafferty, discussing Chris Marker, has claimed that 'the far flung documentary images of *Sunless* are assembled as an autobiography – the form has no subject, except the consciousness, the memory of the man who shot it - yet Marker attributes this consciousness to the invented 'SandorKrasna', removes it from himself to a yet more spectral entity.' (cited in Bruzzi, 2006: 67) In *Marilyn on Marilyn* the documentary images are also assembled as the autobiography of a consciousness, a memory - but not that of the filmmakers who compiled it, nor of the two journalists who recorded the interviews which provide its voice, nor indeed of the many anonymous filmmakers whose stock footage of Los Angeles is included, but of the woman who 'narrates' it. Like Krasna, however, she too is in some senses a fictional character, the actress Marilyn Monroe, also known as Norma Jeane Baker. As Renov puts it, '...the subject in documentary has, to a surprising degree, become the subject of documentary' (Renov, 2004: xxiv), Thus the double or indeed multiple authorship of *Marilyn on Marilyn,* its 'shared textual authority', not only disturbs the conventional attributions of authorship in documentary film, but also the very objectivity of the exterior reality being documented. In the Library Catalogue of Middlesex University *Marilyn on Marilyn* is listed as having four authors – Monroe, Marilyn; Kerr, Paul; Belmont, Georges; and Meryman, Richard.

Conclusion

In the more than thirty years since the publication of the first of the outputs submitted here, both the fields of academic writing about film and television and the practice of television documentary production in the UK have changed almost beyond recognition. The former, three decades ago, was populated by a mere handful of journals in this country - the contributors to which were virtually all known to each other. Today there are dozens of such publications and the numbers of academics writing and teaching about film, television and media in this country is very large indeed. The latter field has been equally dramatically transformed, as three channels have been replaced by hundreds, though the number of new UK produced television documentaries and specifically one-offs – neither formatted series episodes nor reality shows nor docusoaps – may have actually decreased and certainly has done on a programme per channel basis (Bennett, Strange, Kerr and Medrado, 2012). But whether or not the quantity of outputs in both fields has expanded, the evaluation of the quality of that output is much more contested in spite of peer reviews, the RAE and the REF on the one hand and reviews, audience figures, profits and prizes on the other.

The outputs submitted here inevitably reflect the periods and contexts when and where they were produced and my development - from full time archivist and freelance critic and sometime academic writer to professional practitioner to full time academic - within those contexts and with the respective institutional support and collaborators employed in them. This commentary has reinserted these outputs into their contexts and demonstrated an, albeit retrospective, coherence to their engagement with ideas about authorship and points of origin. Further, that reinsertion is into academic debates in which my work not only participated but whose assumptions it sometimes challenged, complicating ideas of individual authorship with the specifics of industrial film and TV fictional and factual

production on the one hand and problematising both directorial agency *within* and documented actuality's authority *over* documentary texts on the other. Meanwhile, the writing (and teaching) about film and television produced during the 1970s and 80s contributed to the British television culture in which it was, albeit briefly, possible to make educational programming about film and television (and indeed other media) that provided me with an entrée into the industry. Subsequently I worked in Arts and History documentaries and - when and where possible - explored the possibilities of oral history in those two documentary genres. Examples of that work are offered here as texts that can, I have suggested, be productively analysed through the lens of shared textual authority, a concept that reopens vexed but still urgent questions about authorship and the orchestration of documentary voice(s). To summarise, the publications presented here challenge attributions of unique individual agency through case studies of the complexities of specific film and television industrial productions, while the documentaries challenge the unequivocal authority of either observational documentary reality or the omniscient expository documentarian's univocal representation of it, through the theory and practice of shared textual authority. My conclusion is that these productions and publications contributed in a small way to the creation of a culture in which assignations of individual authorship to audio-visual productions are increasingly contested and contentious.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alleque, L, Jones, S, Kershaw, B Piccini, A (eds) (2009) *Practice-as-Research: In performance and screen* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Altman, R (1992) *Sound Theory Sound Practice*, London: Routledge

Alvarado, M and Buscombe, E, (2008) *"Cultural Strategies: Publishing at the British Film Institute."* In Focus: 47:4 (summer 2008): 133–138.

Annan, N. (1977) *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting*. London, HMSO.

Austin, T and de Jong, W, (2008), *Rethinking Documentary: New Perspectives and Practices*

Maidenhead: Open University Press

Barthes, R (1977) *Image Music Text* London, Fontana

Bell, D (2006) Creative film and media practice as research: In pursuit of that obscure object of knowledge *Journal of Media Practice* (2006) 7: 2, 85-100 London: Intellect

Bell, D (2004) Shooting the Past? Found Footage, Filmmaking and Popular Memory, in *Kinema*, Spring 2004.

Bell, E and Gray, A (2007) History on Television: charisma, narrative and knowledge, in Helen Wheatley (ed), *Re-Viewing Television History* London: I.B. Tauris, 2007

Bell, E and Gray, A (eds) (2010) *Televising History: Mediating the Past in Postwar Europe*. London: Palgrave MacMillan

Gray, A and Bell, E (2012). *History on Television*. London: Routledge

Bennett, Andrew ((2005) *The Author*, London, Routledge

Bennett, T (ed.) 1990, *Popular Fiction: Technology, Ideology, Production, Reading,* London & New York: Routledge.

Bennett and Kerr, (2012) A 360° Public Service Sector? The Role of Independent Production in the UK's Public Service Broadcasting Landscape, in *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media* (Ferrell Lowe, G and Steemers, J (eds) RIPE 2011 Nordicom: University of Gothenburg

Bennett, J Strange, N Kerr, P andMedrado, A (2012). *Multiplatforming public service broadcasting: the economic and cultural role of UK digital and TV indies.* (AHRC/Royal Holloway/University of Susssex/London Metropolitan University

http://cowboysorindies.co.uk/2012/09/21/multiplatform-psb-report/

Blanchard , S and Morley, D *What's This Channel Four? An Alternative Report*, London: Comedia 1982,

Bolas, T *Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies* London: Intellect 2012

Born,G.(2005) *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC*. London: Vintage.

Brandt, G *British Television Drama* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Britton, A 1978/79; "The Ideology of *Screen*," *Movie* 26 (Winter 1978-79): 2-28.

Bruzzi, S (2000) *New Documentary: A Critical Introduction* London/New York: Routledge

Bruzzi, S (2006) *New Documentary* (2nd edition) London/New York: Routledge

Burke, Sean (1998) *The Death and Return of the Author: criticism and subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thompson, R J and Burns, G (eds) (1990) *Making Television: Authorship and the Production Process*. New York: Praeger Publishing 1990

'John Ford's Young Mr Lincoln. A collective text by the Editors of Cahiers du Cinema', translated by Helene Lackner and Diana Matias, Screen, v 13 n 3, 5-44 (Autumn 1972)

Caughie, J (1981) *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*, London: BFI /Routledge 1981

Caughie, J (2000) *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism and British Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Churchwell, S (2005) *The Many Lives of Marilyn Monroe*, London: Granta

Cobley, P (2001) *Narrative*, London: Routledge,

Cook, P (1985), (ed) *The Cinema Book* London:British Film Institute

Cooke, L (2003) *British Television Drama: A History* London:British Film Institute

Corner, J (2002) 'Biography Within the Documentary Frame: A Note', *Framework:* 43:1 2002)

Corner, J (2006) 'A fiction (un)like any other'. Critical Studies in Television 125-128

Creeber, G, (1998) *The Television Genre Book*, London: BFI (2nd edition, London: Palgrave MacMillan 2008)

Dowmunt, T (2003) A Whited Sepulchre, *Journal of Media Practice*, 4: 1, 1 March 2003, pp. 17-26

Doyle, G and Paterson, R (2008), Public Policy and Independent TV Production in the UK, *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 5 (3): 17-33.

Duffy, W and Holiday, B, *Lady Sings the Blues* New York: Harlem Moon (2006)

Dupin, C (2006) "The Postwar Transformation of the British Film Institute and its Impact on the Development of a National Film Culture in Britain," *Screen* 47, no. 4 (2006): 443–44.

Eckert, C 1973; ' The English Cine-Structuralists*Film Comment,* May-June 1973 New York

Ellis, J (1999) *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty* London: I.B. Tauris

Ellis, J (2011) *Documentary: Witness and Self-Revelation*, London: Routledge

Feuer, J, Kerr, P and Vahimagi, T *MTM: Quality Television,* London: BFI 1984

Foucault, M 'What is an Author?' (1969), in Harari, J V., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979

Gerstner, D A &Staiger, J, (eds) *Authorship and Film,* London/New York: Routledge 2002;

Goodwin, A Kerr, P & MacDonald, I (eds) (1982). London: BFI *Drama Documentary*

Grant, B K, (2008). *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader* Malden, MA, USA/Oxford, UK/ Carlton, Australia: Blackwell (2008)

Grierson, J (1933), 'Documentary (2)': *Cinema Quarterly*1.3 (1933): 135-139.

Hagedoorn, B. (2009). '"Look what I found!": (Re-)crossing boundaries between public/private history and biography/autobiography in PéterForgács' The Maelstrom'. *Studies in Documentary Film*, 3(2), 177-192.

Hagedoorn, B (2007) 'Shared Textual Authority in the Found Footage Documentary: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis of The Maelstrom, Grizzly Man and My Architect.' Research MA Thesis. Utrecht University, Utrecht, 2007.

Harvey, S 2009: 'To Be An Author Or Not To Be?' *Journal of Media Practice* 10: 1 pp. 81-85

Hayward, P (1998) *Picture This: Media Representations of Visual Art and Artists*, Luton: University of Luton Press

Henderson, B (1973) Critique of Cine-Structuralism (Part11) *Film Quarterly* 27: 2 (Winter 1973-74) 37-46

Hill, J and McLoone, M (eds) (1996) *Big Picture, Small Screen: The Relations Between Film and Television*, Luton, John Libbey

Holmes, S (2005) *British TV and Film Culture of the 1950s: Coming to a TV Near You* London: Intellect

Kerr, P (1979/1980) 'Out of What Past? Notes on the B Film Noir', *Screen Education* 32/33

Kerr, P (1982) 'Classic Serials - To Be Continued' *Screen* 23: 1

Kerr, P (1983) 'My Name is Joseph H Lewis' *Screen* 24: 4-5

Kerr, P (1991) 'Opportunity Knocks?' *Screen* 32: 4

Kerr, P (ed) (1986) *The Hollywood Film Industry* London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Kerr, P (1996) 'Television Programmes about the Cinema: the Making of Moving Pictures' in *Big Picture, Small Screen: the Relations Between Film and Television*, (John Hill and Martin McLoone, eds) Luton: University of Luton Press

Kerr, P (ed) (1997) *The Crimean War* London: Boxtree/MacMillan

Kerr, P (2008) 'Introduction: thinking outside the box' *Screen* 49: 3

Kerr, P (2009) 'The Last Slave (2007): The Genealogy of a British Television History Programme' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 29: 3

Kerr, P (2010) 'Babel's network narrative: packaging a globalized art cinema' *Transnational Cinemas* 1: 1

Kerr, P (2011) '"A Small, effective organization": The Mirisch Company, the Package Unit System and the Production of *Some Like it Hot' in Billy Wilder. Movie-Maker: Critical Essays on the Films* (Karen McNally, ed)Jefferson, USA and London: McFarland

Kitses, J (1968) *Horizons West,* London: British Film Institute

Kuhn, A (2009) Screenand screen theorizing today, *Screen* 50:1 Spring 2009.

Lebow, A (2008) *First Person Jewish* Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press

Lebow, A (2012) (ed) *The Cinema of Me: The Self and Subjectivity in Documentary*

Film New York/Chichester: Wallflower/Columbia University Press

Lee-Wright, P (2009) *The Documentary Handbook* London: Routledge

Levi-Strauss, C (1978) *Myth and Meaning* London/New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul,

McArthur, C (1972) *Underworld USA (Cinema One)* London: BFI

McNally, K (2010) *Billy Wilder, Movie-Maker: Critical Essays on the Films* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland

Miller, T (ed) (2009) *The Contemporary Hollywood Reader* London/New York: Routledge 2009

Mulvey, L & Sexton, J (2007) *Experimental British Television* Manchester University Press

Newcomb, H and Alley, R (1983) *The Producer's Medium* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Nichols, B (2001) *Introduction to Documentary* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Nichols, B (2010) *Introduction to Documentary* (2nd edition) Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Nichols, B. (1988). 'The Voice of Documentary'. *New Challenges For Documentary* .

Nichols, B and Renov, M (2012) *Cinema's Alchemist: The Films of Peter Forgacs*Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Nowell Smith, G and Dupin, C (2012) *The British Film Institute, the Government and Film Culture (1933-2000)* Manchester University Press

RAE2008 UoA 66 subject overview report http://www.rae.ac.uk

Rascaroli, L (2009) *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film* London and New York: Wallflower

Renov, M (1993) (ed) *Theorizing Documentary* London/New York: Routledge

Renov, M (1999) Domestic `Ethnography and the Construction of the 'Other' Self in Renov, M and Gaines, JM (eds*) Collecting Visible Evidence*, 140-155 Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Renov, M (2004) *The Subject of Documentary*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Renov, M (2008) First person films: some theses on self-inscription in *Rethinking*

Documentary: New Perspectives and Practices (Austin, T and De Jong, W (eds)

Root, J *Open the Box: About Television*, 1986 London: Comedia

Rosen, 2008; 'Screen and Film Theory in the 1970s,' in Lee Grieveson and Heidi Wasson, eds.,*Inventing Film Studies* Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Rosenthal, A. and J. Corner, Eds. (2005). *New Challenges for Documentary*. New York, Manchester University Press

Rouff, J K (1992) 'Conventions of Sound in Documentary', in *Sound Theory Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman. London, BFI Film Reader/Routledge

Sarris, A 1962, 'Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962', *Film Culture* 1962/63

Sarris, A (1968) *The American Cinema*: *Directors and Directions 1929-1968* New York: DaCapo Press

Saussure, F (1977) *Course in General Linguistics*, Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1977.

ScaifeGott, Sir Benjamin (1032) *The Film in National Life*. Commission on Educational and Cultural Films

Silver, A and Ursini, J (eds) (1996) *Film Noir* New York: Limelight

Brown, A R and Sorensen, A (2008) 'Integrating Creative Practice and research in the Digital Media Arts' in *Practice-Led Research, Research-led Practice* (Hazel Smith and Roger Dean, eds) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Tunstall, J *TV Producers* Abingdon: Routledge (1993)

Truffaut, F 'A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema', *Cahiers du Cinema* 31 (1954).

Truffaut, **F** (1969) *Hitchcock,* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Tulloch, J (2002). *Television Drama: Agency, Audience and Myth* Abingdon, Routledge

Walker, J (1993) *Arts TV: A History of the Arts Television in Britain*, London: John Libbey and Company

Wees, W C. (2002) The Ambiguous Aura of Hollywood Stars in Avant-Garde Found-Footage Films' *Cinema Journal* 41: 2 Winter 2002)

Wright Wexman, V (2002) (ed), *Film and Authorship*, New Brunswick, New Jersey/London: Rutgers University Press

Wicking, C and Vahimagi, T (1979*). The American Vein: Directors and Directions in*

Television London/New York: Dutton

Wollen, P (1968) *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* London: BFI

Wood, R (1968*) Hitchcock's Films* London: Zwemmer/New York: Barnes

Wood, R (1989) Hitchcock's Films Revisited New York:Columbia University Press

Wyver, J 2007 *Vision On: Film, Television and the Arts in Britain* Wallflower Press

Zoellner, A (2010) "The Changing Face of UK Documentary Production: Commerce, Reflexivity and Professionalism",*Journal for the Study of British Cultures.***17**.1: 69-80.

Zoellner A (2009) "Professional Ideology and Programme Conventions: Documentary Development in Independent British Television Production",*Mass Communication and Society.***12**.4: 503-536.

FILMOGRAPHY

Television Programmes

Cat Among Lions: The MTM Story (TV Programme) Illuminations. C4 10 December 1984

Moving Pictures, (Television programme) BBC and Barraclough Carey Productions. BBC2, 1990-1996

Who's Crying Now? (Television programme) Barraclough Carey Productions. BBC2 19 December 1993

The Civil War (Television programme) Florentine Films. PBS 23-27 September1990

Timewatch: The Projection Racket (Television programme) MentornBarraclough Carey. BBC 2, 5 November 1995

The Crimean War (Television programme). C4, 9 November to 23 November 1997)

Hidden History (Television programme) October Films BBC Knowledge September 2000

Guns for Hire: The Making of The Magnificent Seven, (Television programme) October Films. C4 13 May 2000)

Marilyn on Marilyn (TV Programme) October Films. BBC2 28 December 2001

Nobody's Perfect, (TV Programme) October Films. BBC2 16 April 2001

Billie on Billie (Television Programme) October Films 31 March 2003

*Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea (*TV Programme) October Films. C4 26

June 2005

Samuel Johnson: The Dictionary Man. (Television programme) October Films. BBC4 26 June 2006

The Last Slave (TV Programme) October Films. C4 11 March 2007

Films

The Usual Suspects, 1995. (Film) Directed by Bryan Singer. USA: Polygram Filmed Entertainment

The Magnificent Seven, 1959. (Film) Directed by John Sturges. USA: United Artists

Some Like it Hot, 1960 (Film) Directed by Billy Wilder. USA: United Artists.

Housing Problems, 1935 (Film) Directed by Arthue Elton and Edgar Anstey. UK: British Commercial Gas Association

Capturing the Friedmans, 2003, (Film) Directed by Andrew Jarecki. US: Notorious Pictures

Tarnation, 2003, (Film) Directed by Jonathan Caouette US: Wellspring

My Architect: A Son's Journey, 2003 (Film) Directed by Nathaniel Kahn, US: New Yorker Films

Grizzly Man, 2005 (Film) Directed by Werner Herzog , US: Lions Gate Films

In her Own Time, 1985 (Film) Directed by Lynne Littman, US: Direct Cinema Limited

The Maelstrom: A Family Chronicle, 1997 (Film) Directed by Peter Forgacs, Hungary/Netherlands:

My Universe Inside Out, 1996 (Film) Directed by Faith Hubley, US: Hubley Studios

Sans Soleil/Sunless 1983, (Film) Directed by Chris Marker, France: Argos Films

Babel, 2006 (Film) Directed by Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu. France/US/Mexico: Paramount Vantage

Young Mr Lincoln, 1939 (Film) Directed by John Ford. US: Twentieth Century Fox

The Silence of the Lambs. 1991 (Film) Directed by Jonathan Demme. US: Orion Pictures Corporation

Appendix A. Published academic outputs submitted

i) 'A 360° Public Service Sector? The Role of Independent Production in the UK's Public Service Broadcasting Landscape' (James Bennett and Paul Kerr) in *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media*, (eds Lowe, G and Steemers, J, RIPE@2011. 2012, NORDICOM at the University of Gothenburg)

ii) '"A small, effective organization": The Mirisch Company, the package-unit system and the production of Some Like It Hot', in *Billy Wilder, Moviemaker: Critical Essays on the Films*, (ed, McNally, K, McFarland, January 2011).

iii) 'Babel's Network Narrative: Packaging a Globalized Art Cinema', *Transnational Cinemas*, 1: 1 (February 2010, Intellect)

iv) 'The Last Slave (2007) The Genealogy of a British Television History Programme',*Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 29: 3(Sept 2009) pp 381-397

v) 'My Name is Joseph H. Lewis', Screen 24: 4-5 (1983)

vi) 'Out of What Past? Notes on the B Film Noir', *Screen Education* 1979/80, republished in *The Hollywood Film Industry: A Reader*, (ed Kerr, P BFI/RKP, 1986), *Film Noir Reader* (eds Silver, A and Ursini, J Limelight Editions, 1996) and*Contemporary Hollywood Reader* (ed Miller, T Routledge, 2009)

vii) 'The Making of (The) MTM (Show), in *MTM: 'Quality Television'* (edsFeu P and Vahimagi, T) 1984. London: BFI

viii) 'Drama at MTM: *Lou Grant* and *Hill Street Blues'*), in *MTM: 'Quality Tele* edsFeuer, J Kerr, P and Vahimagi, T) 1984. London: BFI

Appendix B. Broadcast television documentary outputs submitted.

a) *Timewatch: The Projection Racket* (Mentorn for BBC2 5.11.95) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Christopher Spencer

b) *The Crimean War* (Mentorn for C4 17.11.97-02.12.97, 3 x 1 hours) Series Producer (and Director, Episode 2): Paul Kerr; Series Director: Mick Gold; Assistant Producer: Teresa Cherfas; Researcher Georgina Pye.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pqik0WDMDco

c) *Guns For Hire* (October Films for C4 13.5.00) Producer: Paul Kerr Director:

Louis Heaton (Included as Special Feature on The Magnificent Seven Collection Box Set DVD. ASIN: B00005OA80). http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XVwW1Ygv-b8

d) *Nobody's Perfect* (October Films BBC2 16.4.01) Producer / Director: Paul Kerr

e) *Marilyn on Marilyn* (October Films for BBC2 28.12.01) Producer / Director: Paul Kerr

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tyWW0bDnY28

f) *Billie on Billie* (October Films for BBC2 31.3.03) Producer/Director: Paul Kerr

g) *Mary Seacole: The Real Angel of the Crimea* (October Films for C4 26.6.05) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Sonali Fernando

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RIrim4r-LbY

h) *The Last Slave* (October Films for C4 11.3.07) Producer: Paul Kerr Director: Julia Harrington

Conferences

2007

The Transnational Viewing Experience, Reading University 7 September 2007 Paper: 'Hill Street Blues to Holby Blue'.

2008

London Metropolitan University - DASS Conference on Methodological Innovation - Panel on 'Identity and Empowerment' – 26th June 2008: – 'Silent Voices/Absent Viewers'

Sounding Out 4 (University of Sunderland) Conference on sound and music in audio-visual media. - 4th-6th September 2008) 'Voicing Memory: Marilyn on Marilyn'

Kadir Has University, Istanbul - Sept 12th – 14th 2008 - Reel Politics: Reality Television as a Platform for Political Discourse: "Reality television and the demise of the 'real': A case study of how history is being evicted from the television 'house'."

Television, The Archive and the Document – Warwick University, May 22nd 2008 'Documentary and the Document: Notes Toward a History of a Television History Programme'

2009

MeCCSA Annual Conference, Bradford, January 2009. *'Voicing memory - 'Marilyn on Marilyn'*

'The Visual Archive: The Moving Image and Memory' workshop 28th-29th May 2009 CRESC The Open University: 'Speaking for Marilyn: Voice Over, 'found sound' and 'shared textual authority''

Visible Evidence XVI, August 13-17, 2009, School of Cinematic Arts, USC, Los Angeles: Listening to Marilyn: Voice over, 'found sound' and 'shared textual authority'

Documentary and Intimacy symposium, Film Studies, University of Surrey16th September 2010 'Marilyn on Marilyn – An essay on Intimacy'

University of Lincoln : Televising History Conference, 22nd-25th July 2009:'The Last Slave: The genealogy of a television history programme'

American independent Cinema Conference. Liverpool John Moores University, 8-10 May 2009, 'The Mirisch Company, the Package-unit System and the Production of Some Like it Hot'

2010

Television without Borders. Co-producing/ international sales and the global television market, Reading University July 2nd 2010:

The Transnational Cinema in Globalising Societies, UNNC-Universidad Iberoamericana, Puebla, 2010 Mexico, Aug 29-31 2010'Babel, International Co-production and Network Narrative' -

Acting with Facts, Reading University, September 2010 'Some facts about producing TV with facts and actors: A TV CV'

MeCCSA Annual Conference, LSE 6- 8.1.10 'Moving 'Moving Pictures': A case study of a television series' shift from in-house, 'producer unit' to independent 'package-unit' production'.

BFI Media Studies Conference, National Film Theatre, London. 7.7.10: 'Developments in UK TV Production'.

Documentary Now 2010, Birkbeck, London 16.1.10: 'Found Footage, Documentary Voice and Shared Textual Authority'

2011

Transnational Cinemas Symposium, Portsmouth University, 13.2.11
'Babel's Network Narrative: Packaging a Globalized art Cinema'.

Beijing 2011 –The New Landscape of Global Communication.
An International Conference Organised bySchool of Journalism and Communication, Renmin University of China and theChina Media Centre, University of Westminster, Beijing 1st – 3rd July 2011. 'Circulating authorship and authenticity as global brands: the case of Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu'

2012

Transformations in/of Broadcasting University of Leeds, 12-13 July 2012 'The Only way is Ethics'

Cowboys or Indies, National Film Theatre, 20.09.12 'The Only way is Ethics: British Television Documentary, Public Service Broadcasting and Independent Production' (Royal Holloway, University of London and AHRC)

Channel 4 Television and British Film Culture, National Film Theatre, 2.11.12 'Who Called the Shots? Producing cinema programmes for C4 in the Nineties and the Noughties.' (University of Portsmouth)