

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

BBC Experiments in local radio broadcasting 1961-62

Linfoot, M.

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Media History, doi: 10.1080/13688804.2018.1487780.

The final definitive version is available online:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13688804.2018.1487780>

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

“BBC Experiments in local radio broadcasting 1961-62”

Dr Matthew Linfoot

Introduction

There is a prevailing narrative about BBC Local Radio, which runs as follows. The BBC came up with the idea of the service as far back as the mid-1950s, partly to prevent commercial companies from creating their own stations and thus ending the BBC monopoly in sound broadcasting.¹ When local radio eventually launched in 1967, it required the purchase of VHF radios to be heard, but the initial slow acquisition of these receivers by the audience demonstrated the lack of a proven demand for the service.² Furthermore, the stations were poorly funded, and hampered by the needle time restrictions on the use of recorded music.³ The original remit of the stations was to include provision of community output, but this aspiration was particularly flawed. The centrist tendencies of the BBC and the need to maintain high editorial and journalistic standards were at odds with genuine open access programmes.⁴ Within a decade, local radio was subject to severe financial cuts, which gradually eroded community involvement during peak time listening, in favour of topical sequence programmes.⁵ In addition, while the story of BBC Local Radio might not have garnered particular controversy, there is attached to it a certain sobriquet of ‘parish pump’ radio, which was often caricatured for poor quality and output of little interest, for example ‘Radio for the Parish Pump’. (*The Guardian* August 7 1970)

In response I would argue this narrative for BBC Local Radio requires revision for a number of reasons. Local Radio is a bona fide example of how the BBC has adapted to changing circumstances, how it has interpreted its remit as a public service broadcaster to serve audiences on a local level and in doing so, how it has evolved new practices in

production. The result is a different approach to an on-air aesthetic, a ‘local radio’ sound. However this has not been achieved effortlessly nor without an element of trial and error.

This paper explores the origins of the service, focusing on a series of ‘off air’ experiments in 1961-62, held to coincide with the Pilkington Committee on Broadcasting. These demonstrate the core dilemmas the BBC faced in how it approached the formulation and creation of local radio. Some of these problems were successfully addressed by the time the BBC launched the first stations in 1967. Others have proved harder (indeed impossible) to solve, but I will show that these experiments played a significant, and, thus far, unrecognized role, in how the BBC successfully won the argument to run local radio. In doing so, it is possible to understand and critique the dominant view of how local radio has thus far been received, or indeed ignored.

Context

Hewison makes a valid point about how theoretical definitions of ideas and culture are subsequently developed into institutional practice. The example he cites is the creation of the Third Programme in the 1940s, but the same principal can be applied to local radio.⁶ The impetus for local radio in the UK came from several sources: at an institutional level within the BBC and inspired by changes in society, politics and culture, which formed an external context. In many ways, both of these are underpinned by on going debates about the very nature of the BBC’s role as a public service broadcaster during the late 1950s, which becomes a fundamental part of BBC policy regarding the extension of sound broadcasting. Loviglio has demonstrated, in the context of network radio in America in the 1930s and 40s, how radio could offer listeners a new way to engage with the shifting boundaries of public and private space,

and an opportunity to take advantage of ‘the fantasy of social mobility’.⁷ Local broadcasting in the UK, could be said to offer a similar prospect – for audiences to use the sound medium provided by the only existing national broadcast institution on UK soil to engage with each other and the broadcaster for local benefit or social gain.

Before exploring the internal/external nexus in more detail, it is important to recognize the significance of technological developments. The possibility of broadcasting to be more localized and targeted, based on small scale geographical locations, was made possible by Very High Frequency (VHF). The BBC had been experimenting with VHF since 1946 and made plans for a national VHF network. Indeed, the Beveridge Report in 1951 had recommended that the BBC began experiments in local broadcasting using the new frequencies.⁸ Instead of doing this, BBC engineers continued to develop the BBC’s VHF network of transmitters, using them to supplement the three national services (Home, Light and Third Programme), which were broadcasting on MW and LW.⁹ So initially, the new technology was harnessed as a way of freeing up wavelength capacity elsewhere. But its real potential was in the provision of new services, and in the possibility to redefine the public broadcasting space.

On an internal, institutional level, the potential offered by VHF came at an opportune moment for the BBC, as it had begun to toy with the idea of local broadcasting, as part of a wider review of its sound output. The key player was Frank Gillard, then based in the West Region, and regarded as the eventual founding father of local radio. In January 1954, Gillard was granted a two-month study visit by the Board of Management, to see university and other local stations in America.¹⁰ Gillard always credited this trip, and at

least one further visit in 1959,¹¹ with leaving a powerful and lasting impression on him and his thoughts on local broadcasting.

There were also two important perceptions that helped local broadcasting gather traction within the BBC. One was the acknowledgement, privately, that existing sound broadcasting was too London-centric, as this report into local broadcasting from 1959 points out:

there is moreover a deep and widespread feeling ...of suspicion and resentment against metropolitanism, London-based culture, centrally-controlled policy, uniformity of taste and conformism of opinion and corresponding belief in diversity and freedom and the value of reflecting the smaller communities.¹²

Second was the fear that the BBC might lose its monopoly of sound broadcasting to commercial competitors, as had happened to television, if it did not try to launch local radio first. An analysis of internal BBC documents shows that this ‘pre-emptive’ strike theory was not the sole justification, but it is true that senior executives within the BBC used the fear of commercial competition as a means of persuasion that the BBC ought to embrace local broadcasting sooner rather later.¹³

These internal drivers for local broadcasting merged with external forces in a dynamic confluence between broadcaster and audience in the 1950s as notions of community and neighbourhood radically changed. As cultural historian Robert Hewison puts it, at the core of the community was ‘a sense of the personal, the concrete, the local; it is embodied in the idea of first, the family, and second, the neighbourhood.’¹⁴ But in post-war society, these traditional networks were under threat from a range of factors. Chief among them was the impact of large-scale re-building and reconstruction after the Second World War, which meant established communities were facing a fundamental

threat in the face of physical demolition and reconstruction. Post-war reconstruction and development was challenging social cohesion and units of the population, from the family to the neighbourhood. It is no coincidence that during the same period, there was emerging interest in capturing the ‘orality’ of different communities, with the portrayal of everyday life on television and other media. Popular depictions of ‘everyday life’ such as the long-running BBC radio serial, *The Archers*, and on television, *Coronation Street*, captured the imagination of their respective audiences, demonstrating the appetite for domestic dramas that portrayed a sense of community and belonging for its fictional dwellers.

This is a crucial spur for local broadcasting, I would argue. If interest in everyday life could work in a dramatic way, imagine what the viewer or listener might have also gained from hearing real people, neighbours, friends, family, engaged in issues, dramas and interests common to all? Frank Gillard summed up how the service might sound, in his phrase: ‘aiming to present on the air, and in many different forms and through a multitude of local voices, the *running serial story* of local life in all its aspects.’ (‘Radio Station in Every City’ *Yorkshire Post* December 11 1963; author’s italics) This was very reminiscent of an ‘everyday story of country folk,’ which was the billing used for *The Archers*.

The potential for local broadcasting could never lay claim to altering the course of social reconstruction, but instead, I argue, local radio could articulate that change, by providing a place where people could have a dialogue, share their experiences and concerns, debate the issues, think about the past and the future. In other words, changes in society created a need, almost a problem, that local radio could solve. Identifying the

means to create this narrative, to tell this story and what it might sound like was a large part of the challenge faced by Frank Gillard.

The Experiments

The opportunity for the BBC to put their case to run local broadcasting came with the Pilkington Committee on Broadcasting 1961 - 62, which was debating issues around radio and television services. Specifically these included the potential for 'pay-TV', a fourth television channel and extending the hours of broadcast, but as Curran and Seaton point out, in essence Pilkington was dealing with the cultural state of the nation.¹⁵ One of the committee members was Richard Hoggart, whose own work had many resonances with the narratives emerging from social dislocation and change. *The Uses of Literacy* depicted a Northern working class lifestyle not too dissimilar from the fictional world of Weatherfield. Here too were found a warm-hearted, honest homogeneous community, with its own traditions and rituals, colourful characters and hardships. But alongside this picture, there were the threats posed by self-improvement, education, affluence and the accompanying cheap and shallow proliferation of mass entertainment.¹⁶ The latter element especially became a pre-occupation of Pilkington.

Hoggart might have been a potential convert to the notions of local broadcasting but Frank Gillard recalled that the Committee were not initially receptive to his ideas: 'they were distinctly chilly to the BBC's local broadcasting proposals.' (BBC Local Radio; 30th Anniversary Programme 1997). 'I came out feeling it [local broadcasting] was a lost cause.'¹⁷ This spurred Gillard on to propose a series of 'dummy' stations, which would not actually be broadcast, but which would replicate what local radio might sound like.¹⁸ These sixteen trials, which ran between March 1961 and May 1962, were recorded and excerpts were played to the Pilkington Committee to demonstrate the

potential for local broadcasting.¹⁹

More than this, I suggest, these trials enabled the BBC to try out various notions of what local broadcasting might sound like, and explore key practical questions. These issues included staffing requirements, working practices and skills needs. There was the question of the content of the output, and what it would sound like. On another level, the stations needed to tackle the problem of how to secure genuine community involvement and this in turn brought into question the size of the station and the optimum transmission area. The overarching question remained about the very function of local broadcasting: was it to reflect the interests and passions of a community or to build community? The research presented here will answer this, based on the large amounts of paperwork generated by the trials,²⁰ including evaluations and reports, held at the BBC's Written Archive. There is also reference to the small amount of surviving, original audio, available at the British Library.²¹ Despite the fact many hours were recorded, the only remaining examples known about are two 40-minute compilations (one focussing on the Stoke-on-Trent experiment, the other featuring examples from a range of locations), plus a three minute excerpt of Frank Gillard addressing a news conference.

Staffing a station

As Hendy identifies, there are three defining tasks of radio: to find voices or sounds, to structure this into a narrative and the desirability of finding 'liveness' or topicality.²² All three characterise the aspirations of the local radio project, not least in the type of individual needed to become the producers of this material. The experiments showed that the kind of radio professional required by local broadcasting would be someone very different to the traditional employee of either the BBC networks or regions.

This was demonstrated by the unsuccessful Durham trial, where poor training on the equipment meant the first day ‘was really rather a fiasco.’²³ Some of the announcers were not suitable to be heard on air, and only three out of a team of 11 clearly stated they wanted to work in local radio.²⁴ Further demands came from the new methods of production required by local radio, which in turn were to characterize the aesthetics and sound of local broadcasting.

An example of this was the ability to respond in a more immediate way to breaking stories. This was made possible by having ready access to portable tape recorders and using a radio car, a vehicle equipped to record and broadcast live from a location. The use of mobile broadcast units was familiar in the Regional centres, but there was recognition that a modified version could be used in every local station as a means of achieving quick, direct contact with the audience. Some argued that there was no need for a radio car if there was a tape recorder to hand, but Gillard pointed out that the car brought immediacy to an event, even if it sounded rough around the edges.²⁵ This need for ‘liveness’ validates one of Hendy’s prerequisites of radio.

The basic template for the staffing arrangement catered for 15 personnel per station.²⁶ Some pilot projects used fewer staff, such as Bristol, where it was concluded that more staff would have meant a ‘richer, fuller day’s broadcasting.’²⁷ Others had too many staff, for example Dundee, where people staying on after their shifts had finished created confusion.²⁸ By July 1962 it was calculated that each station would need a Station Manager, one station organizer who would take on the role of scheduling, four programme assistants who were producers essentially, plus various other assistant roles, secretarial support and an engineer.²⁹ This came to 13 in total, but it made no provision for dedicated news staff.

In terms of the schedule, there was no expectation to provide a full-day service on a local station – but during the experiment, the original goal of three hours original programming per day soon rose to five.³⁰ In attempting to define the broadcast day, I would argue Gillard was applying Scannell’s model, establishing a temporal rhythm for a local radio schedule that matched the temporal rhythm of daily life.³¹ This invariably meant broadcasting programmes at breakfast, lunchtime and early evening, but as Gillard recognized, the fact that cars did not have VHF radios fitted would be a serious impediment to the effectiveness of ‘drivetime’ programmes. The gaps in the daily schedule were filled with network output, as a sustaining service, but this juxtaposition between local and non-local could result in alienation for the listener.³²

Programme Content

Another important challenge for the experiments was to try and define what the output of a local station might sound like, in terms of programmes and content: the trials needed to experiment with genres and formats, to work out what might be suitable and what was not successful. The provision of news as a cornerstone of the local station was crucial, especially given its key role in articulating the narrative of local life. However, while the Regional centres may have operated efficiently for gathering news on a broad geographic scale, no such structure existed on a local level, as one news reporter from the experiment in Stoke, Lincoln Shaw, recalled on BBC Radio Four, over 45 years later:

‘When I arrived I was told a news service would be provided, and it turned out to be carbon copies of stories that had been in the paper the day before, brought in by an elderly freelance who thought that’s what we wanted. Of

course we didn't.' (BBC Radio Four: *Archive Hour* 'Close to Home' 10 November 2007)

Gillard's November 1961 report predicted that news agencies would quickly spring up to fill the gap, to serve local stations and that opportunities for freelancers would also increase.³³ Another option would have been to work with local newspapers to provide the news. But then what would happen with a scoop - would the paper hold onto it for their next edition? Also many local newspapers were involved in bids to run their own commercial station – which could create a clash of interests.

As another local radio pioneer Robert McLeish writes, a good radio producer is part of the community, and this is certainly borne out by the evidence, especially when it went wrong.³⁴ In Dumfries, the output sounded too much as though the BBC had 'come to the town' to do programmes *about* it, not rooted *in* the community, largely because the staff were not local and were unfamiliar with the area.³⁵ The Durham project came in for criticism over its news coverage: it missed the big local story, which was the rise in coal productivity and the impact on miners' wages, preferring instead to lead with the problem of dirty milk bottles.³⁶ For stations covering larger metropolitan areas, there was the problem of making the content relevant to the whole audience. For example the internal report on the three-day experiment in London, in February 1962, pointed out that a minor criminal raid in Wallington simply would not interest the listener in Chigwell.³⁷

In terms of broader programming, it became clear early on that elaborate documentaries, familiar on the networks, were unlikely to be viable for local broadcasting, for reasons of cost and resources. That put the emphasis on live

programmes and shorter, pre-recorded ‘packages’, which were easier and cheaper to produce, with the portable tape recorders.

The BBC’s internal analysis reveals blunt criticism of the early attempts at local broadcasting. The first experiment in Bristol had programmes such as *Your Evening Out*, which Assistant Director of Sound Broadcasting Richard D’A Marriot said had ‘too much information’³⁸ and *What’s On?*, which was ‘too long a list.’³⁹ *It’s My Advice* and *Thought for the Day*, both needed more local angles.⁴⁰ While the schedule for the London station demonstrated much more variety, programmes like *Coffee Break* also suffered from a lack of local material. *What’s On in London* was ‘dull’, *From the Council Chamber* ‘failed lamentably,’ but on the plus side, *Thought for the Day* was well-presented and *My Choice* had a good format.⁴¹

A further comparison comes from analyzing some of the surviving audio of the experiments, which demonstrates a perceptive treatment of local issues, as told by ordinary people. In Hull, there was a location interview with a fish worker’s wife who lived with their eight children in a two-room cottage. The reporter described their poor living conditions in measured, objective tones, then asking practical questions about how she managed. It painted a very realistic picture without recourse to sentiment. The next section featured a studio interview with the Hull Corporation Housing Manager, as the announcer said “it is our policy to hear every side of both questions.” [sic] The Housing Manager explained that the family, the Lowthorpes, should have put their names on the housing waiting list sooner, but in any case their street had been identified for slum clearance and would be pulled down early the following year.⁴²

From a contemporaneous perspective this is a notable example of balanced journalism: robust and impartial questioning, but at the same time hearing a personal story of social regeneration that resonated with aspects of what it meant to live in this area. This an important, but rare, example that showed the programme makers beginning to understand how local radio could convey a sense of place and community, through the use of location sound and speech, part-scripted and part spontaneous.

Overall, however, I would argue that the written archives show how the BBCs struggled to capture distinctive and coherent descriptions that rooted the trials in their specific locations, relying instead on vague ideas of generic localness. As illustrated above, this may in part have been due to the inexperience of the producers and their own lack of local knowledge. But it also highlighted two other, related, issues: that of the best size and transmission area for a local station and how to define community involvement.

On the first point, the original goal was a chain of relatively small operations, focused on a variety of location ‘types’. These included metropolitan urban settings, traditional market towns and their outlying areas and rural/agricultural shires.⁴³ Estimates of the exact number of stations needed to cover England varied from 70 to 90.⁴⁴ Overall, the experiments had attempted to replicate this variety of station types, in England, Scotland and Wales.⁴⁵

However discussions about locations concentrated largely on technical and geo-physical attributes. In Gillard’s *Interim Report*, it was only Para 30 (out of 32) that finally tackled the concept of community. Gillard shied away from actually defining what ‘community’ could mean, preferring instead to ‘enunciate’ what it *might* be.⁴⁶ From a

layman's perspective, he wrote, community might arise from common industry, commerce or communications, or where local newspapers were distributed.⁴⁷

P A Findlay, Secretary of the Local Broadcasting Committee, made an attempt at defining community, using London as an example. Most of the audience must spend their time living or working in that community and it should be of such a scale that the population was familiar with the events and places talked about on air.⁴⁸ That still did not tackle the issue of whether local broadcasting was intended to define community or build community; instead Gillard suggested that where a sense of community was lacking, local broadcasting, should help to unify it. In practical terms, that meant allowing access for local communities to play a part in making programmes for local stations, especially if they were to be able to provide the space for the narrative of local lives. However, the opportunities for genuine interaction with listeners were limited in the experiment, so it was difficult to explore the mechanics of the concept fully. One option was to get contributors on air using the telephone – which Gillard had heard used in America but telephone lines came under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and they were reluctant to allow their phone lines to be used to put callers live on air, fearing lack of control and abuse of the system. Gillard was determined to keep pressing for it as he saw great potential for phone debates.⁴⁹

Another form of access would be to allow minority groups and local figures to put their arguments or cases forward in their own programmes, a kind of 'Hyde Park Corner of the Air.'⁵⁰ Again, guidance might be needed on how to distinguish those groups, which were mainstream and reputable from those who were not.⁵¹ There were some notable achievements in reflecting existing communities, for example a community programme called *With the West Indians* on the London experiment, which was well-received.⁵²

However, this is another example of how BBC had still not got a clear concept of how the issue of genuine access to its airwaves was going to work in practice.

Reaction to the experiments

Although the closed-circuit experiments were not broadcast, they were still used as a means of publicity by the BBC to press their case for creating local broadcasting.

Journalists were invited to come and sit in on some of the trials, and listen to output – either ‘live’ or to edited highlights. Contemporary press coverage highlights two key concerns.

One is the quality of what was being produced and therefore the intrinsic assertion of whether local affairs merited radio output. For example, reporting from the Stoke trial, *The Times* felt that ‘the day has been a mixture of the good and the abysmal in entertainment, with the topical news and the discussions emerging as by far the most satisfactory.’ (‘Mixed results in Potteries radio test: is there enough material?’ *The Times* October 20 1961) Commenting on the Durham station, *The Guardian* noted that a light music programme was interrupted to bring news from the magistrates’ court in Durham where the Chair of the Bench told four drunken men they were ‘not welcome in this respectable city’. This had more than a hint of the ‘parish pump’ about it but then it conceded ‘it would be presumptuous of outsiders to criticise such material.’ (‘Dummy run for radio Durham: propaganda and Pilkington’ *The Guardian* January 16 1962) A fine line emerges between what could be considered genuine local interest, and that which was trivial and perhaps risible. Accusations of the ‘parish pump’ in a derogatory sense have dogged local radio ever since, a reputation that clearly began during the experiments.

The other predominant concern of the press was whether the BBC was pushing local radio purely to prevent commercial competitors from getting there first. As I've argued above, the risk of commercial competition was not the only motivation for creating local radio. However, this needs to be placed in the context of the fact that local newspaper groups were split on the issue. Some local papers were part of the business interests lobbying Pilkington against the BBC, and proposing their own local broadcasting companies, albeit on a much more modest scale. Other local papers were happy to let the BBC run local broadcasting. The BBC had stated, at least internally, that there was a clear argument against local newspapers running local broadcasting – the risk of the local media monopoly.⁵³ The irony that it was acceptable for the BBC to maintain their monopoly of sound broadcasting was not commented on. Furthermore, the potential for working collaboratively with local press, to produce a plurality of local media, was left under explored in the experiments.

Conclusion

Ultimately the experimental trials had the desired effect on the Pilkington Committee, in that it recommended that the BBC be given the opportunity to run local broadcasting, commending the fact that 'its conception of the service is much further ranging' than the commercial alternatives.⁵⁴ This attitude towards the potential evils of advertising is one reason Curran and Seaton argue that Pilkington was essentially patronizing towards the mass audience, alongside the way it endorsed the BBC's popular music policy, which was clearly out of date with the listeners, and condemned commercial television for exploiting the 'ill-informed' working classes.⁵⁵

In terms of local radio, I would go further and argue that Pilkington was disingenuous in other respects. First, there was no real evidence put forward by the BBC or anyone else

that there was a demand for local radio, from an audience perspective. There were certainly enough public bodies and commercial companies willing to present testimony or opinions on the subject (for and against), and that interest, I would suggest, supplanted real demand. The Committee report virtually said as much: 'if people do not know what they are missing, they cannot be said not to want it.'⁵⁶ The BBC was able to exploit Pilkington's patrician thinking to its own advantage.

Second, Pilkington, as an industrialist, was more likely to have been impressed with the intricate planning and military campaigning that was Gillard's forte, than sociological arguments about building communities. Gillard was able to demonstrate the depth and extent to which the BBC had thought about the *modus operandi* of the service.

However, as I've argued, by referencing the internal reports and the surviving archival audio, the sustainability and efficacy of the concepts behind the service, especially concerning community access, participation and engagement, was not really the focus of the experiments.

In the event, the subsequent White Papers on Broadcasting from the Conservative government omitted local radio.⁵⁷ Yet during the intervening five years, before the project was authorized by Wilson's Labour government (almost as a by-product of the reorganization of the networks), Gillard continued to review his plans and hone his ideas. But it was only when the first stations were broadcasting their first live transmissions to real audiences that some of the more integral potential hazards of local radio could be fully addressed.

Word count: 5,688

Notes

- ¹ Briggs *Competition* 637 - 638
- ² Crisell *Local Radio* 24
- ³ Starkey *Local Radio* 23
- ⁴ Lewis and Booth *The Invisible Medium*, 95 - 96
- ⁵ Crisell *Radio*, 129; Gray and Lewis *Community Broadcasting* 158
- ⁶ Hewison *Culture and Consensus*, xv
- ⁷ Loviglio *Radio's Intimate Public Network*, xvi-xviii
- ⁸ Lewis and Booth *The Invisible Medium*, 26
- ⁹ Curran *A Seamless Robe* 156 - 158
- ¹⁰ BBC Written Archive Centre (hereafter BBC WAC) R2/7/1
- ¹¹ BBC WAC R1/27/1
- ¹² BBC WAC R34/1585/1
- ¹³ BBC WAC R1/96/9
- ¹⁴ Hewison *In Anger*, 177-78
- ¹⁵ Curran and Seaton *Power Without Responsibility*, 175
- ¹⁶ Hoggart *The Uses of Literacy* 39
- ¹⁷ BBC WAC Oral History 14 July 1983
- ¹⁸ BBC WAC Oral History *ibid*

¹⁹ BBC WAC R102/52/1; R102/68/1 The trials took place as follows: 1961: 22 March, Bristol; 10 May, Portsmouth; 20 June, Norwich; 18 July, Hull; 24 August, Dundee; 5 – 11 September, Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch; 19 – 21 October, Swansea; 21 November, Wrexham; 29 November & 12 December, Portsmouth (as part of a BBC exhibition); 1962: 15 – 18 January, Durham; 15 – 17 February, London; 20 – 22 March, Dumfries; 5 – 7 April, Isle of Wight; 11 – 14 April, Vale of Evesham; 30 April, 1 – 2 May, Llyn Ac Afrom. Merseyside was scheduled for the end of June but cancelled due to the publication of the Pilkington Report.

²⁰ BBC WAC R102/72/1; BBC WAC R102/71/1

²¹ National Sound Archive ST 29018; LP 27013; National Sound Archive *Local Radio Experiments* T 37230

²² Hendy *Global Age* 73

²³ BBC WAC R102/68/1

²⁴ BBC WAC R102/68/1

²⁵ BBC WAC *ibid*

²⁶ BBC WAC R34/1585/1

²⁷ BBC WAC R102/52/1 Vol I

²⁸ BBC WAC *ibid*

²⁹ BBC WAC R102/71/1

³⁰ BBC WAC R102/47/1

³¹ Scannell *Radio Times*, 15

³² In Bristol, staff worked two shifts, 6.15am to 2pm, and 1pm to 7.50pm BBC WAC R102/71/1; while in London, staff worked in 12 hour shifts on a three-day rotation, BBC WAC R34/1644

³³ BBC WAC R102/72/1

³⁴ McLeish *Radio Production*, 249

³⁵ BBC WAC R102/68/1

-
- ³⁶ BBC WAC R102/68/1 There was one highlight though: ‘An amusing and racy interview with a Chester-le-Street man who keeps lions in his backyard’.
- ³⁷ BBC WAC R34/1644/1
- ³⁸ BBC WAC R102/52/1
- ³⁹ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁴⁰ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁴¹ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁴² National Sound Archive T 37230
- ⁴³ BBC WAC R102/72/1
- ⁴⁴ BBC WAC R102/43
- ⁴⁵ BBC WAC R1/98/1 Plans for experiments in Londonderry and Belfast were made but not realized.
- ⁴⁶ BBC WAC R102/71/1 author’s italics
- ⁴⁷ BBC WAC R102/72/1
- ⁴⁸ BBC WAC R34/1644/1
- ⁴⁹ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁵⁰ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁵¹ BBC WAC ibid
- ⁵² BBC WAC R102/52/1
- ⁵³ BBC WAC R102/43
- ⁵⁴ Home Office: Committee on Broadcasting 1960 842
- ⁵⁵ Curran and Seaton 175; 179
- ⁵⁶ Home Office: Committee on Broadcasting 1960 842
- ⁵⁷ Home Office: *White Paper* Cmnd 1770 HMSO 1962; *White Paper* Cmnd 1893 HMSO 1962

Bibliography

Briggs, Asa *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom Volume 5 Competition*
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995

Crisell, Andrew “Local radio: attuned to the times or filling the time with tunes?” in
Making the Local News: Local Journalism in Context, edited by Bob Franklin and
David Murphy 24-35 London: Routledge 1998

Crisell, Andrew “Radio” in *The Media. An Introduction* 2nd ed. edited by Adam Briggs
and Paul Cobley 121-134 Harlow: Longman, 2002

Curran, Charles A *A Seamless Robe – Broadcasting, Philosophy and Practice* London:
Collins, 1979

Curran, James and Seaton, Jean *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and
Broadcasting in Britain* 5th ed. London: Routledge, 1997

Gray, Peggy and Lewis, Peter “Britain: Community Broadcasting Revisited” in *The
People’s Voice: Local Radio and Television in Europe* edited by Nicholas Jankowski,
Ole Prehn and James Stappers 156 – 168 London: John Libbey, 1992

Hendy, David *Radio in the Global Age* Oxford: Polity Press, 2000

Hennessy, Peter *Having It So Good: Britain in the Fifties* London: Penguin, 2007

Hewison, Robert *Culture and Consensus: England, art and politics since 1940* London: Methuen, 1995

Hewison, Robert *In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945-60* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981

Hoggart, Richard *The Uses of Literacy* London: Harmondsworth 1958

Home Office: Report of the Committee on Broadcasting 1960 Cmnd 1753 HMSO 1962

Home Office: *White Paper* Cmnd 1770 HMSO 1962; *White Paper* Cmnd 1893 HMSO 1962

Lewis, Peter M and Booth, Jerry *The Invisible Medium: Public, Commercial and Community Radio* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989

Loviglio, Jason *Radio's Intimate Public Network Broadcasting and Mass-Mediated Democracy* Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 2005

McLeish, Robert *Radio Production* 3rd ed. Oxford: Focal Press, 1994

National Sound Archive: *Local Broadcasting* ST 29018

National Sound Archive: *Local Broadcasting Experiment at Poole* LP 27013

National Sound Archive *Local Radio Experiments* T 37230

Scannell, Paddy "Radio Times: The Temporal Arrangements of broadcasting in the modern world" in *Television and Its Audiences: International Research Perspectives: papers from the 2nd International Television Studies Conference* edited by Drummond, Philip and Peterson, Richard 15-31 London: BFI, 1986

Starkey, Guy *Local Radio, Going Global* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011

Stoller, Tony *Sounds of Your Life: The History of Independent Radio in the UK* New
Barnet: John Libbey, 2010

Willmott, Peter and Young, Michael *Family and Kinship in East London* London:
Harmondsworth, 1957

BBC Written Archive Centre, Caversham, Reading:

BBC WAC Oral History Interview: Frank Gillard 14 July 1983

BBC WAC Board of Governors Minutes 16 April 1959 R1/27/1

BBC WAC Report by DSB October – December 1961 3 January 1962 Board of
Governors' Papers R1/98/1

BBC WAC Board of Management Minutes 25 January 1954 R2/7/1

BBC WAC Area and Local Broadcasting: Report of a Committee to DSB 1 September
1959 R34/1585/1

BBC WAC memo from Derek McAllister to Maurice Ennals Subject: Radio London
Experiment 20 February 1962 Local Radio Experiments London 1962 R34/1644/1

BBC WAC Memo from P A Findlay to Members of the Local Broadcasting Committee
Subject: Local Broadcasting in London 23 March 1962 Local Radio Experiments
London 1962 R34/1644/1

BBC WAC BBC Memorandum: The Future of Sound Broadcasting – Local Radio
February 1961 R102/43

BBC WAC memo from DSB to CWR 'Local Broadcasting Plans' 26 September 1961
Local Radio Experiments Policy 1961-1962 R102/47/1

BBC WAC Comments from R D'A Marriott 5 April 1961 Local Radio Experiments
1961 Vol I R102/52/1 Vol 1

BBC WAC memo from AW Coysh to HSP 26 August 1961 R102/52/1 Vol I

BBC WAC memo CWR to DSB Subject Radio Bristol 21 March 1961 R102/52/1 Vol I

BBC WAC Memo from A W Coysh to head of Midlands Regional Programmes Subject
Local Broadcasting Exercise: Norwich 20 June 1961 Local Radio Experiments 1961
R102/52/1 Vol I

BBC WAC Memo from Secretary Local Broadcasting Committee to ADSB Subject
Radio Durham 22 January 1962 Local Radio Experiments 1961 R102/68/1 Vol II

BBC WAC Report on Radio Dumfries by John Gray 30 March 1962 Local Radio
Experiments 1961 R102/68/1 Vol II