1

Andrea Velich:

'Bridging Theoretical and Visual Gaps': The Representation of Iconic London Bridges and Other Emblematic London sites in British 'New Heritage' Films. ELTE BTK. SEAS. DES. 2017.01.31.

When the real is no longer what it used to be, nostalgia assumes its full meaning. Baudrillard 1988: 171.

Table of Contents:

1. INTRODUCTION (pp.1-2):

Old-fashioned and idealistic it might sound, but I strongly believe that history and heritage films should be thought-provoking and prepare us for further history research, should not only provide some easy entertainment, with 'an effortless nostalgic gaze' at the screen in the middle of a velter of bloodshed battle scene. History and heritage films should also make us (or teach us) think, stimulate our mind and imagination, should further our skills in logics, analysis, open our eyes to the world, should get us involved in real interdisciplinary dialogues. And last but not least should even improve our character.

So what is film, history film and how do (or don't) films in general work? What is the difference between a traditional British history film of the 1930s, a heritage film of the 1980s and a postmodern new heritage film of the 2000s? Why and how do historians and film scholars differ and debate about historical films' sources and historical accuracy? How do London-set new heritage films of the last two decades differ from traditional history or heritage films and how do we learn that we are in London? Is London just a 'prop', a background setting, part of the mis-en-scéne, or part of the visual or narrative frame? What roles does London play in film? Can the City stand alone for a metaphor? What iconic sites and emblems do filmmakers use to get us placed in London? Is it still the traditional core, the City of London or rather Greater London that the new heritage film is set in, and why does it matter and reflect change in the life of London? How would the traditional London skyline with St Paul's cathedral differ from the postmodern one with new city emblems like the Millenium

Bridge, 'the Gherkin' or 'the Shard' in film sequences and narratives? Why do we have Hugh Grant in so many postmodern new heritage films? These are just a few questions I will try to address below with firm interdisciplinary intentions and methods heavily relying on and quoting from the most recent publications of prominent scholars of various fields relating to film and history. I thereby attempt to reveal a few misunderstandings and to bridge as many gaps as possible between film and philosophy, film and history, film and municipal studies, historical and visual topography and social-economic history and film history.

As this is part of a book project but at the same it should serve a university textbook possibly and partly for both BA, and MA courses on the history of London, film and culture held at Eötvös Loránd University, it hopes to provide an overview of interdisciplinary discussions and debates around postwar British and London history and heritage film, not only to present the summary of my own individual research findings, which would be the other part of the final book entitled *Bridging Gaps:The Representation of London on postwar British history and heritage films.* So this chapter of the book aims to give a theoretical overview and framework for students specialised in English, history and/or film studies. As a historian and researcher of the history of London and also running seminars at Eötvös Loránd University (from now on ELTE) on the representation of British society and cities, especially on the representation of British history and London in British cinema in the past few years, I intend to highlight here from various perspectives how postwar London and Londoners (London places, spaces and non-spaces) are recently portrayed in the seventh art.

 My short case sudy below, after the theoretical interdisciplinary introduction, will also highlight the representation of some emblematic London sites including bridges in some British London-set films to illustrate the so-called postmodern shift in all aspects of history and heritage films. It will also attempt to show some gradual as well as some drastic changes turning London from a traditional postwar city (from the Victorian City of the flâneur) even in the late 20th century to become a buzzling and thriving multicultural world city, a City of transition represented by a growing number of 'non-places' (marking mostly various stations and airports, in-between places, not (yet) space-travel). Many of us today are frequent travellers, often or always on the way (whether on the road, rails or in the air as commuters, immigrants, tourists or world citizens, intellectual 'wanderers' etc.), we are in a permanent state of transition. However, the 21st century world city (and citizen) like London (Londoners) differs a lot from the 19th century city and the flâneur of Patrick Keiller's 1994 semi-documentary film on *London* and *Robinson in Space*.

So what happened in the last two decades, between the metaphorical travel of *Robinson in Space* (1994) and Danny Boyle's *Trance* (2012) and between the two postwar London Olympics (1948 and 2012) in England and especially in London and in the 21st century British film industry? Is there making any more traditional history film or heritage film today possible as in the 1930s or 1980s respectively? These are some of the questions raised below when chapter by chapter I try to highlight the main problem points, discussions, debates and possible dialogues between disciplines addressing issues around film based on some of the latest interdisciplinary literature of film, philosophy, history, culture and topography.

Chapter one will discuss some issues found at the border of film and philosophy mostly based on Prof Kállay's very clear summary presented on the ontology of film, film and philosophy published in the 2016 ELTE FSA Digital Textbook entitled *Film*

and Culture. The Second chapter discusses some issues arising on the border of film and history from several aspects including the main differences and problem points of historical and visual sources and historical accuracy (history and film) heavily borrowing from several books of James Chapman. The third chapter highlights some postmodern film and cultural theories on cities and the society of spectacle. It also tries to outline the so-called heritage film debate since the 1980s (at the crossroads of film and cultural politics), while the fourth chapter addresses issues of film and city topography including some concerns of architecture, aesthetics, places and spaces and of course time (film and topography plus architecture) among others. Chapter 5 is a case study how to connect some facts about the Thames, some London bridges and their representation in some British postwar films. I finally enclosed a bibliography, plus 'Appendix 1' on the brief timeline of London history from the Romans till 2012, 'Appendix 2' with the brief history of St Paul's cathedral, and 'Appendix 3' with John Stow's 1603 description of some London bridges. As John Stow is an original history record I marked his description from 1603 by red, as it is intended to provide a more advanced, MA level reading material.

2. FILM (ONTOLOGY) AND PHILOSOPHY REVISITED: (pp. 3-10)

Géza Kállay discussed the *Being* (ontology) of film in an essay in the ELTE FSA Digital Textbook *Film and Culture* (2016) under the title '*What is film?*' taking the question as a philosophical one, concerning the 'what-ness', the 'very being' of film.[1]

So what is film? Quoting Bordwell and Thomson, Kállay enlists numerous types and genres films fall into, usually according to their subject matter, specific medium and style, some of them originally borrowed from other aesthetic media (novel and drama). These types and genres include: documentary, newsreel, silent movie, action movie, adventure film, disaster film, spy film, superhero film, thriller, suspense movie, crime story ('whodunit', 'gangster film'), film noir, horror film, splatter, gore film, science-fiction, fantasy, comedy, slapstick, dark comedy, remarriage comedy, melodrama, family drama, history drama, romance, western, musical, animated film, cartoon, experimental film, etc.[2]

Genres are often mixed, (or in Kállay's term seldom 'pure') and their own conventions and style keep changing with the times. The main focus of my present research and of this textbook is on (British) historical films, often not even conventionally categorised by authors (unlike above) among the main film genres. However, Jonathan Stubbs in *Historical Film* (2013) claims that we should follow the guidelines of Brent Toplin (see on p.13), who, in 2002 described the history film genre most thouroughly.[3]

Kállay, in the same textbook also calls attention to the interesting divide between films that 'only' have a script, and those films whose origin go back to some already more or less well-known printed fictional stories, such as novels or dramas, as well as to today's multiple-mediality that films often have a counter-effect on the printed medium: a popular film is often remade into comic strips, children's books, whole novels or dramas. Eszter Szép wrote a detailed article about the parallel history of comic books and film in the same 2016 textbook, *Film and Culture*.[4]

Kállay claims, and I also hope to illustrate this below in a short overview, that theories about film are becoming just as numerous as in literary or cultural studies. These theories involve not only aesthetic concerns but also "psychological, sociological, educational, consumer, criminological, and political" issues, with special reference to

"authorship, genre, form, style, and representational politics" against the backdrop of "worlds of race, gender, class, region, age, religion, language, politics, and nation".[5]

I also agree with Professor Kállay, that theories are useful, "when they are drawn by insightful interpreters and good readers, they provide a matrix and a vocabulary with which one is able give voice to the usually inarticulate responses, the primary impressions, many of them only amounting to 'intuitions' one has, when she is initiated into a work of art. To follow our tuition for a given intuition can be of great value".[6] However, Kállay also warns us, that we should keep in mind that film as art is quite young, only about a hundred years old. The first movies of significance started to appear in the 1920s, when film-theory and serious writing about film began as well. "A totally new medium with immense potential, the movie gradually rewrote the map of traditional aesthetics. Questions about the status of film itself, especially whether it is an independent form of art and in what sense (one of the central questions of film-theory until the early 1960s), helped to re-examine the age-old question of 'what art is', a typically philosophical question. According to Kállay somewhat paradoxically, film, first promising light and popular 'entertainment', found itself more in the company of philosophy than several other 'respectable' art-forms, such as the novel, the opera, drama, etc., with much longer respective traditions".[7]

Kállay also draws a convincing parallel between film and drama on stage in Early Modern England between the 1570s and the early 1640s (the closing of the theatres), attended by practically all layers of society, when it was somewhere between 'high art' like poetry, and 'popular entertainment' like the famous bear-biting-shows in arena theatres as one of the chief fascinations with film, soon after its debut, was, that it had a similarly 'democratic' appeal: while art galleries, 'serious' novels, theatres, and operas tend to have a more 'elite' consumer public, lots of movies, not even requiring the knowledge of the alphabet, still appeal to large masses of people coming from all social strata. Kállay also acknowledges that nowadays, much has been done to dismantle the 'binary opposition' between 'high culture/art' and 'popular culture/art', resulting in the 'sugar-coating' of entertainment. Therefore, film's relatively easy accessibility (through seeing and hearing), and the hope of watching 'normal', 'realistic action' happening right in front of them may open more people up for aesthetic pleasure than other art forms.[8]

Béla Balázs, in his seminal *Theory of Film* (1952) compared film, and its effect to the printing press: "The discovery of printing gradually rendered illegible the faces of men. So much could be read from paper that the method of conveying meaning by facial expression fell into desuetude. Victor Hugo wrote once that the printed book took over the part played by the cathedral in the Middle Ages and became the carrier of the spirit of the people. But the thousands of books tore the one spirit, embodied in the cathedral, into thousands of opinions. The word broke the stone into a thousand fragments, tore the church into a thousand books. The visual spirit was thus turned into a legible spirit and visual culture into a culture of concepts. This of course had its social and economic causes, which changed the general face of life. But we paid little attention to the Fact that, in conformity with this, the face of individual men, their foreheads, their eyes, their mouths, had also of necessity and quite concretely to suffer a change. At present a new discovery, a new machine is at work to turn the attention of men back to a visual culture and give them new faces. This machine is the cinematographic camera. Like the printing press, it is a technical device for the multiplication and distribution of products of the human spirit; its effect on human culture will not be less than that of the printing press."[9]

A few years later, the other well-know theoretician of media, communication and visual studies, Marshall McLuhan called print a transforming and metamorphosing 'drug' that had the power of imposing its assumptions upon every level of consciousness.10 At the same timeThomas Doherty quoted the foxes and hedgehogs metaphore of Erasmus to carve out a place for film (print-history foxes who seek to master minutiae and macro-minded filmic history, hedgehogs who want to illuminate the values, morals and assumptions that shape the world.11

According to Kállay "the theoretical endeavour to 'define' what film is has been motivated by two central questions: what differentiates film from other artistic forms, and how does this difference relate to the understanding of being human, how does the moving image contribute to the aesthetic and epistemic assessment of the human being?"12 Kállay in *Film and Culture* (2016) gave a very clear summary of the six main approaches to film (of course, along his warnings that other divisions and labels are very much possible). I would like to quots these following 6 approaches from Kállay below:

(1) **the psychoanalytic-psychological-cognitive approach**, influenced by Sigmund Freud and later by Jacques Lacan, wishes to understand film in relation to human thought, claiming that the cinema reproduces and helps us relive and re-examine our chief cognitive processes;

(2) **the semiotic-semiological approach**, which, under the spell of structuralism (Ferdinand de Saussure's 'linguistic turn', Umberto Eco's semiotics) has treated film-'texture' as a very complex system of signs, where each sign has value and function with respect to the whole system,

(3) **apparatus theory** (social criticism of ideologies) claiming, chiefly on the basis of Karl Marx, Michel Foucault and Louis Althusser, that, like everything else in society, film is ideological and political through and through and both the overt or covert 'ideologemes' behind film-making, as well as the effects (moving) images make or made on various layers of society should be meticulously examined; are close to other society-based – rather than individual-based – approaches in cultural and literary studies such as cultural materialism, New Historicism, or postcolonial theory;

(4) **feminist and queer theories**, can be characterised more through subject matter than method; the chief theoreticians (Laura Mulvey, Ruby Rich, Clara Clover, Alexander Doty, etc.) study the construction of gender roles, the building up of masculine and feminine, gay and lesbian identities and their social implications in film, and they use psychoanalysis, apparatus theory, etc., or a fruitful amalgam of all these as 'tools';

(5) **the phenomenological approach**, most informed by the 'father' of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl and his followers (e.g. Maurice Merleau-Ponty), with its most influential exponent, André Bazin, investigates both the experiential and the experimental features of film, claiming that the camera 'brackets' (puts on the periphery) our usual, ordinary vision of the world, it reshapes our familiar relationship with things and persons external to us through temporary estrangement, and thus shows us in our 'life-world', i.e. in the world we inhabit as ambiguous and contingent beings;

(6) **the post-analytical philosophical approach** has been worked out, taking Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* as a starting point, by Stanley Cavell; it focuses on our sceptical attitude to the world as a direct consequence of our

separateness from the Other and how film is able to expose this, as well as how it may help us acknowledge and overcome, through meticulously watching small gestures shown to us, this separateness; both characters on the screen and we, the witnesses and the 'critics' of film are presented as struggling for the voice, for expression, which should happen in taking full responsibility for the uses of our language.

Kállay adds, "that according to subject matter, we may further distinguish auteur theory (concentrating on the film-director's personal vision behind the film), narrative film theory (close to narrative theories of prose-fiction but applied to film), Malcolm Turvey's revelationism claiming that through close-ups, slow motion, time-lapse photography and editing, film can reveal features of reality that are 'invisible' to the human eye, i.e. it can only see these aspects of the world with the help of the camera. (Turvey claims that four theorists and film-makers started the revelationist tradition: Jean Epstein (1897–1953), Dziga Vertov (1896–1954), Béla Balázs (1884–1949), and Siegfried Kracauer (1889–1966), and there are several sub-trends of all the above mentioned approaches."[13]

Int he field of film and history James Chapman mentions several possible ways to examine films (and thus the world through it) History films can be seen as records of the past, cultural artefacts or economic commodities, or we can examine the film making process, the social composition and tastes of cinema-goers or study films as social documents (as reflections of the values and attitudes of society in which they were produced and consumed).[14] As we shall see below (p. 7) most scholars agree (but fewer consumers understand) that history and heritage films are more about the present, the reflection of our age than the past they hope to learn about.

 Kállay quoting Cavell states that film investigates the world by making us hear what we are inclined to say, when, and how, by creating a situation when we, in darkness, are alone with the world, having to concentrate on it (unless we leave the show) from the outside. "The screen is the frame of the world, it is a shape, a mould of it and since what I see is not aware of my presence, I am sitting there 'unseen' by this world; the screen makes me 'invisible'. I become aware that I am watching past events which took place without me: I am an invisible outsider who is now given the chance – each time I watch the movie, always mechanically, stubbornly appearing to me in exactly the same way – to bear witness to these events. I am in a position of estrangement and I am invited in simultaneously: film takes the world away from me in order to hand it back, in a certain shape and mould, so that I may regain it."[15]

Jacques Derrida mentions the problem that film is characterised by the constant recycling of images, or 'a textual labyrinth panelled with mirrors'.[16] Kállay admits that films are notoriously difficult to talk about as you see something but when you also wish to say something about a picture, already a new one appears before you. Therefore, films are not easy to remember in detail and you cannot 'quote' film on the printed page: all you can do is to put still images (photos, after all) into your discussion. Or you start narrating the action, the plot, the story, which will, of course, always fall short of what the film is *really* about in its visionary, in many senses *magic* ways. "The best way, Kállay suggests, is to start to talk about film is to take a short, relatively independent episode and describe it in as many details as you can, trying to pay attention to 'everything', even to those features which are not directly visible but only implied. This is a far more laborious exercise than one thinks but this is the first step in trying to regain the world we keep losing all the time in ordinary perception as well. Film *is* who we *are* in film, through film, inside and outside of the world at the same time."[17]

James Chapman (2005) issued another important warning that it is impossible to be entirely objective about cultural artefacts such as films, and, "while discussions are based on empirical analysis of the films rather than the author's own subjective response, readers will nevertheless identify the films of which the author is particularly fond. However, Chapman adds, perhaps this is no bad thing, as good scholarship should be tempered with passion."[18] Today, it seems that a generation of students and scholars has emerged who set out to offer a new method of reading films: one that moves towards seeing film not only as a genre-dependent *text,* but also as a rich *map* of socio-cultural, political, economic and, of course, architectural discourses. This is supported by a number of encyclopaedic literatures dedicated to the specificity of urban location portrayed in film within a global context.[19]

Films might simply be difficult to talk about, especially at the audience/student level, and thus there is a growing gap between film theory, criticism and classroom discussion, it is a sad fact that people and students often just watch films in a more and more passive and effortless manner, and finally have little or even nothing to say about it. Therefore with the help of this interdisciplinary summary on film and history, I intend to help students to recognise the necessity to learn both about film theory, history and London history, about marked changes in the topography and demography, about various social classes and problems in England and London, to learn some historical facts of some famous London landmarks on the one hand, and approach film theory and history through this interdisciplinary perspective to enable students to interpret and talk about new London-set heritage films more freely and easily, not just get literally and symbolically lost 'in the cinematic city'. Most probably it is difficult to relate to a film or a discussion about it, if somebody can neither recognise, or identify with any of the plot, the mis-en-scéne or the characters on the screen, nor would know the context, the age, the theoretical-cultural or social-economic framework. This book chapter thus intends to be an encouragement to risk to learn to apply theories (and risk our opinions) from various disciplines and aim at an interdisciplinary dialogue.

On the other hand, I cannot help noticing a growing disillusionment even among talented and ambitious students and scholars of humanities to get involved in constructive, progressive and fertilising interdisciplinary dialogues, to try to bridge some gaps. As I consider teaching and research a service and I hope to present this textbook as a progressive example to help more dialogues to unfold on the one hand between history, culture and film, and on the other hand between theory and practice, researchers and lecturers, as well as students respectively. I am very grateful for the encouragement of my colleagues, bosses (heads of DES and directors of ELTE, SEAS), as well as for many of my BA, MA and doctorate students and of course for my family to support me to risk launching an interdisciplinary dialogue and to take the first steps on this bridge as part of the ELTE SEAS *Film and Culture* specialisation programme.

We are reaffirmed by two famous film theoreticians, Pierre Sorlin and Marc Ferro among others, that films tell us more about the times in which they were produced than the times represented on screen.[20] Ken Loach, one of the best-known British film directors, who is mostly known for his socialist-realist dramas the last 50 years including *Kes* (1969) and most recently *I, Daniel Blake* (2016) put the same idea differently: "the only reason to make films that are a reflection on history is to talk about the present".[21] Mark C. Carnes also argues that 'historical' films are chiefly important for what they say about the era in which they were made.'[22] It is a truth universally acknowledged – amongst historians as well – that a historical feature film

will often have as much to say about the present in which it was made as about the past in which it was set. The idea, that films 'reflect' the societies and cultures in which they are produced and consumed is far from being a revelation.

However, as Guy Debord writes, we live in an age and society of the 'spectacle.' Debord emphasised in *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967/1992) "for one to whom the real world becomes real images, mere images are transformed into real beings tangible figments which are the efficient motor of trance like behavior. Since the spectacle's job is to cause a world that is no longer directly perceptible to be seen via different specialized mediations, it is inevitable that it should elevate the human sense of sight to the special place once occupied by touch; the most abstract of the senses, and the most easily deceived, sight is naturally the most readily adaptable to present-day society's generalized abstraction." This is not to say, Debord adds, however, "that the spectacle itself is perceptible to the naked eye even if that eye is assisted by the ear. The spectacle is by definition immune from human activity, inaccessible to any projected review or correction. It is the opposite of dialogue."[23]

Debord also warns that the spectacle's function in society is the concrete manufacture of alienation. Debord says "that economic growth corresponds almost entirely to the growth of this particular sector of industrial production. Debord adds that if something grows along with the self-movement of the economy ,it can only be the alienation that has inhabited the core of the economic sphere from its inception."[24] The spectacle divides the world into two parts, one of which is held up as a selfrepresentation to the world, and is superior to the world. The spectacle is simply the common language that bridges this division. Spectators are linked only by a oneway relationship to the very center that maintains their isolation from one another. The spectacle thus unites what is separate, but it unites it only in its separateness.[25]

James Chapman cites Siegfried Kracauer's basic notion that films provide insights into the collective unconscious of their audiences.[26] In totalitarian regimes such as Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, propaganda films used historical stories to make explicit parallels with the present: *Jew Süss* (1934) and *Alexander Nevsky* (1938), for example, were consciously allegorical films whose meanings were apparent to audiences at the time. Elsewhere the meanings have often been implicit: it has become commonplace, for example, to relate the ideological themes of the Hollywood western to the social and political concerns of twentieth century America.[27]

As it might be often disillusioning to face reality in, people intend to escape into the past by watching history and heritage films. However these are not really about the past (not really based on deatailed research from history records but rather invent characters to attract wider audienes and the longer they are seen in series, the more they need to 'spice' the narrative mostly with frequent sex scenes, with gossips, intrigue, manipulation and of course with violence (as we often subconsciously associate history with tears and blood). The invented characters are also often unproportionately blown up to overshadow prominent figures, even the monarchs of the era (eg. in *The Tudors*, 2007-2011, *Elizabeth, the Golden Age* (2007), the *White Queen* series, 2013). The spectator may relate to them at the subconscious level with 'minimum effort' but so get finally disappointed, disillusioned as history on film recently provides us little scholarly challenge and satisfaction. I agree with Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno that films often produce boredom because they don't demand any effort, no independent thinking is expected from the audience, "anything calling for mental effort is painstakingly avoided".[28] However, they might

just subconsciously satisfy other needs, their subconscious hunger for 'spectacle' described above by Guy Debord.

In the following I intend to summarise some film theories, outline the main differences between history and heritage films, their subgenres and debates about historical accuracy, the difference between written and visual (cinematic) histories, and then focus mostly on London-set synchretic history and heritage films. Film genres slowly get more mixed, film narratives 'get lighter' to appeal for wider audiences to make more profit. This process in history and heritage film making is even reflected by the new term (coined by Belen Vidal in 2012) applied recently: synchretic heritage films.

Belen Vidal originates this new 'syncretic' heritage product from some star television writers such as Andrew Davies, Michael Hirst and Aby and Peter Morgan, eg. *The Iron Lady* (2011, dir. Phylidda Lloyd, screenplay: Aby Morgan) *The Tudors* (2007-11, screenplay: Michael Hirst), *The Queen* (2006, dir. Stephen Frears, screenplay Peter Morgan) or *Suffragette* (2015, dir. Sarah Gavron, screenplay: Aby Morgan) just to name a few films based on their screenplays.29 Their popularity and connections both in the world of film and tv both in Britain and abroad might promise fairly easy success and profit for filmmakers if they use their screenplays. So why should filmmakers invest in more history research, when 'market demand dictates otherwise'? Even when Philippa Gregory, the most prolific historical novel writer claims she always researches the era her novels are set in, she has and takes the liberty of inventing characters, whose presence, actions, lives or deaths distort the 'original story' we learn in history textbooks or from primary history sources, chroniclers, eye-witnesses and statutes of the day. But Gregory emphasises how exciting this new approach from the perspective of minor or invented characters is.

I hope to prove below that films (especially successful British or Anglo-American new synchretic heritage films) as part of their successful recipe in the last two decades extensively use both postmodern and traditional London settings, emblems and landmarks as part of their narrative and mis-en-scéne. This might simultaneously reflect growing globalisation and affluence and the transformation of the original 'heritage' term (coined by Charles Barr in 1986 during the restrictions and 'film austerity' years of Margaret Thatcher) into a new term labelled as synchretic new heritage film.

A growing number of film plots, sequences take place at transitory 'non-places' stations, airports, bridges as we shall see through a few examples in chapter 5. These 'in-between' places can reflect and respresent several city specific phenomena from the growing social divide and immigration, from multiculturalism to alianation, from people's separation and solitude to happy reunion and also new, alternative family models. They can even remind us of various networks (including the world-wide-web), of (city, life and discipline) junctions and of hubs as in *Trance* (2012, dir. Danny Boyle) and thus people can more easily relate to these 'non-plased sequences' subconsciously as we live in an age and world of fast-paced transition and we are often, or always in a hurry and on our way both literally and metaphorically.30 It is very difficult to arrive somewhere, get peacefully settled and have a permanent peace of mind as in the past, often represented in history and heritage films by strolling in the garden, or by riding in the peaceful English countryside. People, as we shall see, either get too nostalgic about the past or escape otherwise and get lost in the buzzling and spectacular, but often empty 'brave new world' of the capital.

Global cinema relies on multinational funding, production, and distribution, in contrast to national cinema, where national funding, national culture, and a national audience were in place and taken for granted. Paradoxically, it is the development of globalization that has led to a more thorough interest in the conditions of national cinema.31 This might apply for cinematic cities as well, which are globalised and multicultural, but at the same time marking unique national identities topographically, represented by unique London wards (districts), suburbs like Whitechapel, associated with crime and Jack the Ripper, and local communities (eg. the multiculturalism of Brixton and Camden town just to name a few), which are easy to use emblematically in films.

Filmgoers on the one hand consume films from all over the world, but particularly Hollywood cinema. Filmmakers' narratives, and their thematic and aesthetic sensibilities are influenced by films from outside their national cinemas. More often filmmakers are trained abroad and multi-national funding is tied to multi-national narratives, forcing filmmakers to tell stories about border-crossings like in Sofia Coppola's *Lost in Translation* (2003). These films highlight different kinds of cinematic spaces: eg. the borderlands, the makeshift refugee camp, and the global city.32 Film protagonists thus often cross bridges literally and symbolically, which I intend to examine in a short case study on the representation of London bridges in new London-set postwar British heritage films below (see chapter 5).

On the other hand, as Julianna Pidduck writes, in the late 1990s and early 2000s (also called 'Noughties') there was a marked shift in the British heritage film, filmmakers intended a widening of the heritage appellation by primarily locating films in present-day London. It is clear if we think about titles like *About a Boy* (dir. Chris and Paul Weitz, 2002), *Love Actually* (dir. Richard Curtis, 2003), *Closer* (dir. Mike Nichols, 2004), *Notes on a Scandal* (dir. Richard Eyre, 2006) among others, which examine the City in different ways, focusing on class, cultural difference, sexual deceit and reconstituted family structures within a middle- or upper-middle-class framework.33

At the same time by focusing on some well-known London places, emblems, and some 'in-between', or transitory places, otherwise referred to in the terminology of Marc Augé as 'non-spaces' (like airports, tube and railway stations etc.) in contemporary alternative synchretic heritage films I intend to prove that the decline and disappearance of the British postwar consensus of the welfare state and their implications with the growing social gap seem to be reflected in and at the same time unintentionally supported by these films portraying people always on the go, (or the run), symbolised by walking along the spectacular river Thames or often crossing one of the London bridges with the spectacular London skyline in the background. At the same time fewer and fewer people are peacefully sitting on old-fashioned London park benches symbolising the traditional English countryside, park, landscape. Our protagonists are always on the move, instead of traditionally small-talking or gossiping in their local communities like in films set in the 1970s or 1980s (eg. in *East is East* (dir. Damien O Donnell, 1999) or in *Billy Elliott* (dir. Stephen Daldry, 2000) respectively, they very rarely stroll or sit down leisurely-pleasurely like they used to in the countryside, and if they do, they sit down on a city bench, the way they sit can tell a lot about recent social changes, too.

In Barbara Mennel's words globalization manifests itself in cities, especially in the large global metropol. It affects "major metropolitan centers of international finance and business, cities like Tokyo, New York, Paris, Hong Kong, and Berlin" on the one hand, but also the "spaces and places between and beneath major urban centers" on the other.34 Postwar traditional history films of the 1930s and heritage films of the

1980s (mostly set in the countryside) have been overwritten by the globalised postmodern 'new heritage films' often symbolically set in the global city and capital, London. While history and heritage films with the privileged 'Englishness' or more specifically 'a distinctive Southern take on white, middle-class Englishness', at the expense of other national (Scottish, Welsh, and Irish) and regional identities within the UK were explicitly 'consensus-seeking' as they highlighted the 'elements of national character that were regarded as binding the community together instead of being class-conscious like 'kitchen sink' dramas.35

Crossing bridges (and boundaries) in films by protagonists in any city might as well be interpreted by the help of Victor Turner's 'liminality' theory, bridges might mark changes, transitions, rites of passage, or states between changes etc. There is a further marked contrast between people's expectations when arriving into a city to get settled, to feel at home, or temporality (just as in the case of millions of city commuters, who are always on the way and when crossing the Thames through one of London's railway bridges to get to work from south London into the City, they arrive to London, but it is a different arrival from the one we feel when 'coming home').

However, it seems in our fast-changing postmodern world that we are mostly and maybe always on the way and there is no fixed place to arrive to. When briefly meeting friends, partners, colleagues (or maybe even enemies) in films, protagonists often seem to meet on the riverbank (in London, it is obviously the Thames), or in parks, but our isolation and alienation in/from the city itself is often marked and symbolised in films by two iconic English objects/emblems, highlighted mostly by London-set films. These include a single bench on Primrose Hill (standing alone but having a nice London City view at least), almost the only place on the big screen, where one is left alone with his or her emotions and thoughts either happy or lonely. The other one is a dilapidating, unused boat mostly shown either on the riverbank or on the sea-shore, but clearly symbolising decay, the end of the glorious days of the British Empire marked by the navy, ruling the seas. All what is left now, is a single unused boat in bad condition, where eg. the protagonist of the coming of age story, *This is England's* (2006, dir. Shane Meadows, taking place in the early 1980s, during the Falkland wars), Shaun either plays as a lonely teenager shooting arrows (like a modern-day Robin Hood) on the shore, or throws the national flag into the sea in the final sequence as part of the narrative frame proving his hard-gained maturity and independence, ridding himself of the influence of violent and nationalist Combo or of other rebellious, but more peaceful punks represented by Woody and his gang.36

Endnotes for Chaper 2, Film and Philosophy Revisited:

1. **Kállay 2016: 5.**
2. **Bordwell -- Thompson qtd in Kállay 2016: 6. History films are often not enlisted among the conventional genres still they are strongly represented in film scholarship, also IMDB has history as one of the 26 genre categories. Stubbs 2013:11.**
3. **Stubbs 2013: 14.**
4. **Kállay 2016: 6. cf. Szép, Eszter. *Sequential Arts: Moments from the Parrallel History of Comics and Film* in *Film and Culture* 2016. 196-209. (eds.) Jászay, Dorottya – Velich, Andrea.**
5. **Miller and Stam qtd in Kállay 2016: 7.**
6. **Kállay 2016: 7. cf. Yvette Bíró *Hetedik művészet/(Seventh Art)*. Budapest: Osiris, 2004.**
7. **Bordwell and Carroll qtd in Kállay 2016: 8.**

8. **Kállay 2016: 8.**
9. **Balázs 1952: 39-40.**
10. **McLuhan 1969: 175.**
11. **Doherty qtd in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 25.**
12. **Kállay 2016: 8.**
13. **Kállay 2016: 9. cf. Miller and Stam; Livingston and Plantinga 294-545 qtd in Kállay 2016: 11.**
14. **cf. Chapman, James. *Film and History*. New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2013.**
15. **Cavell qtd in Kállay 2016:12.**
16. **Derrida 1981: 195.**
17. **Kállay 2016:13.**
18. **Chapman 2005: 11.**
19. **Koeck – Roberts 2010: 6.**
20. **Sorlin – Ferro qtd. in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 4.**
21. **Loach qtd in Chapman 2005: 1.**
22. **Carnes qtd in Chapman 2005: 1.**
23. **Debord 1994: 18.**
24. **Debord 1994: 88.**
25. **Debord 1994: 29.**
26. **Kracauer qtd in Chapman 2005: 1.**
27. **Chapman 2005: 1.**
28. **Horckheimer -- Adorno 1986: 137.**
29. **Vidal 2012: 33.**
30. **Barr qtd in Leggott 2007: 81.**
31. **Mennel 2008: 196.**
32. **Mennel 2008: 197.**
33. **Pidduck 2004: 171.**
34. **Mennel 2008:198.**
35. **Hill 1980:15.**
36. ***This is England*, 2006. dir. Shane Meadows. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0480025/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1.Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.05.**

3. <u>**HISTORY AND FILM/a:**</u>
   <u>**HISTORY FILM: GENRE AND SUBGENRES (pp.12-13)**</u>

First I would like to highlight a few scholarly attempts to define history and heritage films, their genres and examine their main differences. According to Kara McKehnie there are partly synonymous, partly overlapping terms for describing *history or historical films*, from *period* to *biopic*, from *monarchy* to *costume drama*, from *quality* history to *heritage films.* History film is concerned with actual historical figures, while the costume film is set in a recognisable historical period, but with fictional characters.[1] Period films are not even considered historical films as they just happen to be set in the past: the personal narratives could just be as well set in the present or in another time.[2]

The genre label 'historical film' is one of several – others include 'costume film', 'period film' and 'heritage film' – used to describe films whose narrative is set wholly or partly in the past. Although the precise meaning of these terms is contested, particularly 'heritage film' which is a critical label rather than one that has wide currency in the film industry itself, there is a broad consensus among most, though not all, scholars that a historical film is one that is based, however loosely, on

actual historical events or real historical persons. Thus the historical film is a narrower category than the costume or the period film, both of which are terms that denote narratives set in the past but that are not necessarily in themselves 'historical'. This definition presupposes that there is a difference between 'history' and 'the past'. Below I will use the definition of James Chapman (2005) taking history to mean 'the recorded past' or 'the past that we know'.3

As not everything about the past is or can be known, then it follows that history is an incomplete record of the past. It also follows that a historical film is one that is based on the recorded past. The historical film thus includes films based on historical events such as *The Charge of the Light Brigade* (1968, dir. Tony Richardson), and *A Night to Remember* (1958, dir. Roy Baker about the sinking of the *Titanic* in 1912). It also includes biopics ('biographical pictures') about real historical persons. 4

In British cinema most biopics have tended to be about celebrities, ie. about either monarchs (*The Private Life of Henry VIII*, *Tudor Rose*, *Victoria the Great*, *Alfred the Great*, *Mary, Queen of Scots*, *Lady Jane*, *Mrs Brown*, *Elizabeth*) or other famous national figures such as statesmen, generals and adventurers (*The Life Story of David Lloyd George*, *Nelson*, *The Iron Duke*, *Drake of England*, *Rhodes of Africa*, *The Prime Minister*, *The Young Mr Pitt*, *Lawrence of Arabia*, *Becket*, *Cromwell*, *Young Winston* etc). However, the historical film in this definition does not include films that happen to be set in the past but are predominantly fictional narratives. Thus it excludes the cycle of Gainsborough costume melodramas of the mid-1940s (*The Man in Grey*, *Fanny by Gaslight*, *Madonna of the Seven Moons*, *The Wicked Lady*, *Jassy*) and the acclaimed literary adaptations by film-makers such as David Lean (*Great Expectations*, *Oliver Twist*, *A Passage to India*) and Merchant-Ivory (*A Room With A View*, *Maurice*, *Howards End*, *The Remains of the Day*).5

Historical film (like other film genres) is an imprecise genre whose boundaries are difficult to define. *Henry V* (1944, dir. Laurence Olivier) for example, could be classed both as a historical film (chronicling Henry's campaign in France culminating in the Battle of Agincourt) and as a Shakespearean adaptation. What about fictional films that include real historical characters (*eg. Shakespeare in Love,* 1998, dir. John Madden) or that are set against a background of real historical events (*Hope and Glory,* 1987, dir. John Boorman)? The difficulty of assessing the relative balance of fictional and historical elements in a narrative is exemplified by looking at a film such as *Fire Over England* (dir. William K. Howard,1937). This was one of a cycle of expensive historical and/or costume films produced by Alexander Korda after his success with *The Private Life of Henry VIII* in 1933. It was based on a historical novel by A.E.W. Mason set at the time of the Spanish Armada in 1588. The film is a mixture of fact and fiction. The principal protagonist, naval lieutenant Michael Ingolby (Laurence Olivier), is an invented character, and his mission to rescue his father from the Spanish Inquisition is a fictional adventure story rather than one that is based on any recorded events. However, the film also features real historical characters in major roles, especially Queen Elizabeth I (Flora Robson), the Earl of Leicester (Leslie Banks) and King Philip II of Spain (Raymond Massey), and its climax is the defeat of the Armada.6 The *Historical Association* commissioned a review of *Fire Over England* from two historians published in the British Film Institute's educational journal *Sight and Sound*. Professors Hearnshaw and Neale accepted that "the main narrative of the film was avowedly fiction and must be judged by standards similar to those we apply to historical novels".7

It is often thought (among others by James Leggott) that while British cinema has a prestigious tradition of realist drama, it has been poor at mythologising the worlds around us, a feat achieved by Hollywood, which created iconic genres (westerns and

gangster movies) from the experiences of agricultural labourers and immigrants of early 20th century.[8] Last year, in the ELTE FSA digital textbook *Film and Culture* I intended to prove that the English 'monarchy' film, as a historical subgenre was created by the British film industry to mythologise the English and British past and monarchy.[9]

Jonathan Stubbs relying on Brent Toplin in *Historical Film* (2013) enlisted the following 9 characteristic features of history film:
1. Cinematic history simplifies historical evidence and excludes many details.
2. Cinematic history appears in three acts featuring exposition, complication and resolution.
3. Cinematic history offers partisan views of the past, clearly identifying heroes and villeins.
4. Cinematic history portrayes morally uplifting stories about struggles between Davids and Goliaths.
5. Cinematic history simplifies plots by featuring only a few representative characters.
6. Cinematic history speaks to the present.
7. Cinematic history frequently injects romance into the stories, even when amorous events are not central to this period of history
8. Cinematic history communicates a feeling for the past through attention to details of an earlier age.
9. Cinematic history communicates as powerfully in images and sounds as in words.[10]

Endnotes for Chapter 3/a: History Film: Genre and Subgenres:

1. McKehnie 2002: 217.
2. McFarlane -- Crofts qtd in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 27.
3. Chapman 2005: 2.
4. cf. Heritage, Stuart. *Hollywood's obsessions with biopics must be stopped before we get Madonna The film.* In *The Guardian.* 2016.12.13. https://www.theguardian.com/film/shortcuts/2016/dec/13/hollywood-obsession-biopics-must-be-stopped-madonna-the-movie-trump
5. cf. Gainsborough pictures films. imdb. Web. Retrieved:2017.01.12. http://www.imdb.com/company/co0103051/
6. *Fire over England.* dir. William K. Howard,1937.imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.02. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0028872/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1
7. Hearnshaw-Neale qtd in Chapman: 2005: 2.
8. Leggott 2007: 53.
9. Velich 2016: 210-226.
10. Toplin 2002: 12-15. qtd in Stubbs 2013:14

3.FILM AND HISTORY/b:

WRITTEN AND VISUAL HISTORIES (pp.14-16):

We have very different opinions about the value of both film/cinematic and history sources and records. Marnie Hughes Warrington for example claims "that written history is associated with positive qualities of rigour access to true meaning. Film is given secondary, derivatory status: its meaning is opaque, mediated and open to perversion. It rarely beats a good book and is, with few exceptions, execrable. Film is not the locus of analysis but a redirection towards the analysis of written history".[1]

Derrida put it differently when wrote "that written histories are as much textual labyrinth panelled with mirrors as are filmic histories flattened out".2

Simon Schama, on the other hand, shares with Rosenstone the dislike of dismissive attitudes towards film as history and argues for its acceptance as a revival of an ancient oral and performative tradition of history making. While their moves to link film history to an ancient pedigree are admirable, the results are doubly unsatisfactory. Rosenstone argues "that it is too easy to consider oral and performative filmic history as a limited, primitive throwback, and the dichotomy of visual and written history remain unexamined".3

Toplin warns historians to be aware of the dangers of too much tolerance and thinks that they should rather stand up for the ideals and rules of traditional scholarship.4 Elliott quots Hughes-Warrington's *Selling History (*2007) on the one hand, "that films often serve an economic, not academic function, and commercial imperatives most often fuel cinematic rewrites of history. Complex economic and social issues are pureed into easily digestible bits of information intended by Hollywood's most thought-after demographic: the lowest common denominator."5 As success is defined mostly by profit and US reception, it is equally important, according to Martin A. Hipsky, "that heritage audiences in America are composed of those in search of 'the cultural capital' to which they believe their educational background entitles them. Heritage films made in the 1990s thus became more 'painterly' to serve American audiences, as well. This is particularly noticable in the use of tableaux".6

On the other hand Elliott quots and agrees with Lacan that "what is imaginary about any narrative representation is the illusion of a centred consciousness capable of looking out on the world, apprehending its structure and processes, and representing them to itself as having all of the formal coherency of narrative itself. But this is to mistake a 'meaning' (which is always constituted rather than found) for 'reality' (which is always found rather than constituted)".7

According to Hayden White "within the narrative form, we can see further points of convergence between film and History, such as when we view history as a closed process, or as cinema defines its narratives, 'a closed series of events'. Film tries to use images to tell a story that might or might not have happened, but which draws on a line of logic inferred from the images and soundtrack which culminates in a sense that a story has been told and completed. The plot places us at the crossing point of temporality and narrativity: to be historical, an event must be more than a singular occurance, a unique happening. It receives its definition from its contribution to the development of a plot."8

Elliott quots Thucydides saying "that in history we use set speeches some of which were delivered just before and others during the war and find it difficult to remember the precise words used in the speeches, so the method often is to make the speakers say, what, in the chronicler's opinion, was called for in each situation. The area of most obvious convergence between History and film comes when we consider the personal involvement of the historian/filmmaker in composing (shaping) their history/plot, a process of assembly which establishes a dialogue with the historical past/the story. It is in fact precisely the acknowledgement of this element of selection in narrative that we come to the second area, montage, since narratives are contrued not only by the choice of the original material but by the way that they are pieced together."9

If History consists of a selection of facts, then the Histories which we are engaged in writing depend not only on which facts have been selected, but also the way in which they are pieced together. An event does not only depend not only on its objective existence but on its being retold, second that it is created from its montage, the way in which the moments are linked together. The placing of sequences together is playing on an imagined line of causation, which Kuleshov has shown is able to court an association of images in order to link sequences together, causal sequences which were not present at source.[10]

If we apply Bazin's principle of 'total cinema' (ie. montage is unrealistic, as it 'distorts' reality thereby denying the viewer the 'total image') to the representation of historical records within a narrative sequence, then we find that we must side with the critics of historical film, who lament the betrayal of the official version of history.[11] The influence of the montage at the editing level, as well as the process similar to Eisenstein's montage-association on the symbolic and intertextual level, is in fact a testament more to the power of the narrative cinema, than to a delibarate infusion of ideology on the part of the filmmaker. It implies consequently both a more active mental attitude on the part of the spectator and a more positive contribution on his part to the action in process.[12]

Filmmakers trying to bring to life a historical past are frequently prone to reflect the cultural, political and social trends most prominent in the climate of the film's production.[13] According to Pierre Sorlin History is a society's memory of the past and the functioning of this memory depends on the situation in which the society finds itself.[14] Film is a historical document of the time of its production rather than a genuine attempt to narrate history, which leads to the potentially patronising position on account of which instead of listing historical inaccuracies, we should be praising a description of 'how men living at a certain time understood their own history.[15]. Elliott quots Marc Ferro, who in (*Cinema et Histoire)* enlists four distinct ways of looking at history through film: from above, from below, from indside and from outside.[16]

According to Jeremy Black in the public forum (ie. outside academia) history is often not the measured, footnoted and written form, but rather that public history and collective memory have begun to merge at what were once clearly divided tangents. In considering public history, J. Black argues, "it is not easy or helpful to distinguish between history and memory: the public use of history is frequently a matter of collective memory and its uses."[17]

J. H. Plumb writes in *The Death of the Past* (1969) "that the past is always a created ideology with a purpose, designed to control individuals, or motivate societies or inspire classes. The job of History, therefore, was to dissolve and weaken the past and to replace its simple, structural generalisations with properly disciplined understanding."[18] According to Hannah Arendt "the tussle of claim and rejection, in which heritage was invoked as whatever one likes or hates, was invalidated by the catastrophic events of the 20th century. In her *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) Arendt reflected on the irruption of anti-semitism, imperialism and totalirianism in a world that had so recently seemed assured of its own progressive enlightment. Then she concluded that we can no longer afford to take something, which was good in the past and simply call it our heritage, to discard the bad and simply think of it as a dead load which by itself time will bury in oblivion. The subterranean stream of western history has finally come to the surface and usurped the dignity of our tradition. This is the reality in which we live. And this is why all efforts to escape from the grimness of the present into nostalgia for a still intact past, or into the anticipated oblivion of a

better future, are vain."[19] Similarly Walter Benjamin states "that the past historically does not mean to recognise it 'the way it really was'. It means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up a moment of danger".[20]

Endnotes for Chaper 3/b: 'Written and Visual Histories':

1. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 24.
2. Derrida qtd in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 25.
3. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 25.
4. Toplin 1996: 2.
5. Elliott 2011: 25.
6. Hipski 1994: 99.
7. Lacan qtd in Elliott 2011: 16.
8. White 1990: 51.
9. Elliott 2011: 18-19.
10. Cf. Kuleshov effect. http://www.elementsofcinema.com/editing/kuleshov-effect.html. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.08., Elliott 2011: 20.
11. Bazin 2002: 35.
12. Bazin 2002: 35.
13. Elliott 2011: 22.
14. Sorlin 1980: 16. cf.
15. Sorlin 1980: 16.
16. Ferro qtd in Elliott 2011: 24.
17. Black 2005: 9.
18. Plumb 1969: 5.
19. Hannah Arendt qtd in Wright 2009: xii.
20. Benjamin. 1936. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.04.

3. **FILM AND HISTORY/c:**
   HISTORY FILM AND HISTORICAL ACCURACY (pp. 17-18):

There is a lot of debate about the extent history can be 'distorted', rewritten for the sake of a good story, eg. 'a good melodrama'. Chapman reminds us that from an educational point of view it is dangerous to link a famous incident in English history with a purely fictitious character.[1]

As the historical film cannot always easily be defined simply in terms of its narrative, therefore, other features of the genre must be taken into account. A common characteristic of the historical film, for instance, is its tendency to assert its own status 'as history' through the use of devices such as voice overs and title captions to establish the historical context of the narrative (date, place, events and so forth). There is also a tendency, in British examples of the genre, to assert the historical authenticity of the film. This is evident at several different levels: in the production and promotional discourses around the films (statements by the film-makers, publicity materials and so forth) and in their *mise-en-scène* (especially sets, dressings and costumes).[2]

Stella Bruzzi speaks about the significance of the coordination of costumes with the dominant colours of the lighting and mis-en-scéne, so that clothes change colour (whilst maintaining the same design) as the characters move from room to room. Peter

Greenaway commented on this in connection with his film *The Cook, the Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* (dir. Peter Greenaway, 1989): "The people in the film are part of a swaggering society and wear clothes to identify themselves and set themselves apart."3

There is the question of priority of the clothes versus the narrative, ie. whether filmmakers create looks that complement the narrative, character and stars or the clothes themselves are the spectacle and the prerogative of the couturier. Hollywood's play safe attitude to fashion differs from the European art cinema tradition making fashion into an integral part of the overall look of the film, which was genuinely treated as another art-form in its own right, incorporated into the cinema but not reduced to an ornament or an accessory.4

The historical film often quotes both from historical and visuals sources. Individual shots are often composed to resemble visual records of the past: for example Charles Laughton's entry scene was compsed to remind us of Hans Holbein's portraits of Henry VIII (*The Private Life of Henry VIII,* 1933, dir. Alexander Korda), or Cate Blanchett (*Elizabeth,* 1998, dir. Shekhar Kapur) resembles Nicholas Hilliard's picture of Elizabeth I. The historical film thus deploys visual style to create a sense of historical verisimilitude. This verisimilitude (meaning 'the appearance of being real') differ from non-historical costume films such as the Gainsborough melodramas, which made no pretence of historical authenticity, and which displayed signifiers of the past in a highly eclectic way.5

Professional historians are rarely satisfied with the results of filmmakers' efforts to represent the past. For a long time, indeed, many historians had little time for the historical feature film and were interested only in actuality and documentary film that had more obvious 'use value' as primary sources, but recently with the new internet generation at university, we are more and more ready to research feature films and series on our resarch field. In the 1930s, when the Historical Association sponsored an investigation of the use of films for the teaching of history, it was mainly concerned with educational films for showing in the classroom. They declared that 'history was being exploited by the type of historical film shown in the cinemas' and that the result was 'a sin against truth'. They urged that film producers should not sacrifice great historical happenings to the imaginary needs of 'telling a sequence', nor pervert history for the sake of box office returns. The liberty of the artist to present scenes beautifully and dramatically does not carry with it a licence for falsification.' It recommended, furthermore, 'that a competent historian be called in for consultation before production, in order to give an opinion whether the general impression produced by the film was likely to be reasonably accurate'.6

The charge that historical feature films misrepresent history in the interests of telling a story has persisted ever since. The points of contention between historians and film-makers often focus on the most pedantic details, and the exchanges, according to James Chapman, can even be highly amusing. In general, however, it is those feature films that challenge received wisdoms about the past which come in for the most severe criticism. This is particularly so with films about the kings and queens of England, and is exemplified by the controversies over two films released 65 years apart. *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (dir. Alexander Korda, 1933) and *Elizabeth* (dir. Shekhar Kapur, 1998) were both highly publicised films, championed for the cultural and economic prestige they brought to the British film industry. In both cases, however, historians objected to the films' representation of their royal protagonists. In *The Private Life of Henry VIII* it was the question of the king's table manners that provoked censure. Alexander Korda, for his part, claimed that he had tried to give the 'atmosphere of the epoch' and asserted what has become the standard response of

film-makers to charges of historical inaccuracy, but to judge this effort by the standards of history books, or even historical novels, is certainly an unjustifiable point of view.[7]

This exchange took place in the letters columns of the *Daily Telegraph*, which also led the attack on *Elizabeth* (1998) some six and a half decades later. In this case the controversy centred on the film's suggestion that the 'virgin queen' was in fact nothing of the sort. 'To question Elizabeth's virtue 400 years after her death is not just a blackguardly slur upon a good, Christian woman, but an insult to our fathers who fought for her', an enraged editorial declared. 'It should rouse England to chivalrous anger.' The newspaper cited a leading Tudor historian, asserting that there is no doubt among serious historians that Elizabeth I died '*virgo intacta*'. The director replied that 'her virginity is a matter of interpretation'.[8] I wrote a case study on the *White Queen* (10-part BBC series in 2013) contrasting the past as we know from 15th century history records, Philippa Gregory's historical novels and the BBC series.[9]

While there is consensus among filmmakers on the necessity and marketability of visual period accuracy, the role of 'the historical truth' within the film's narrative and its parameters has always been met with a more ambivalent response from critics and audiences. Whatever the current fashion in monarchy films, the expectation is always that it will represent history 'as it really happened,' but the key to convincing audiences that historical truth is being represented appears to lie in the film's ability to reproduce the look of the period accurately.[10] This might be partly explained by Guy Debord's theory that our society is based on visual culture, we live int a society of 'spectacle' (see on p. 7), and the fact that due to the internet we make less and less effort to learn facts about history, therefore we are inclined to judge things and films by the look.

Endnotes for 3/c: History Films and Historical Accuracy:

1. Chapman: 2005: 2. cf. Velich, Andrea. '*Az angol történelem tanítása történelmi és kosztümös filmekkel'* in *Kutatások és jó gyakorlatok a tanárképzés tudós műhelyeiből*. 203-214. (szerk.) Károly, Krisztina – Homonnay, Zoltán. Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó, 2016.
2. Chapman.2005: 3.
3. Bruzzi 1997: 10. cf. Street, Sarah. *Costume and Cinema. Dress Codes in Popular Film*. London: Wallflower, 2001.
4. Bruzzi 1997: 8., Street 2001: 1.
5. Chapman.2005: 3.
6. Chapman 2005: 4.
7. Korda qtd in Chapman.2005: 5.
8. 'Henry VIII on the Film: Vulgar Buffoon or Great King?' in *Daily Telegraph*, 3 Nov, 1933. 12. qtd in Chapman.2005: 5-6.
9. Velich 2016b 204.
9. McKechnie 2002: 218.

3. **HISTORY AND FILM/d:**
    THE HERITAGE FILM DEBATE (pp. 19-24):

Patrick Wright states that by the early 1980s, the British invocation of 'heritage' may have seemed completely detached from the memory of the Nazi Holocaust but it was nonetheless a present expression of discontinuity rather than its opposite. He quotes David Brett, who has more recently suggested that 'heritage' was a product of the

process of modernisation which, by eroding customs and expectations, forced us to rearticulate our sense of the past.[1]

Patrick Wright also argues that 'the critique of heritage' was sourced in metropolitan 'literary snobbery', fear of trade, a Puritan distrust of 'graven images' and with regard to the lavender bags and floral fabrics that travelled under the flag of heritage, possibly misogyny too. As an ecomuseum aims not to imitate or capture the past, but sets out to escape both nostalgia and 'the passive gaze of tourism' by establishing an interactive space between past and future. Its appeal to memory is a 'respose to the present', even as it also tries to escape from the condition he describes as 'presentism'.[2] Heritage is never nourished by continuity, it is a sign of rupture and a breach with the past. Heritage thus becomes an invitation for a collective anamnesis. The 'ardent' obligation of heritage, with its requirements for conservation, renovation and commemoration is added to the duty of memory with its recent public translation of repentance.[3]

Historically speaking the beginning of the *heritage* debate goes back to the mid 19th century, when in the 1860s the 'protection of the wildlife' legislation began, and when in 1865 the *Commons Preservation Society,* and then in 1877 the *Society for the Protection of of Ancient Buildings* were founded, or with the creation of the *Natinal Footpaths Preservation Society* in 1884*.* Preservationism played its part in a nationalisation of history, which enables the state to project an idealised image – never fully achieved – of its own order against a geographical and historical background of its own selection.[4]

A century later, we had the outbreak of the so-called *heritage film* debate that ensued amongst scholars of British film culture since the 1980s. It initially called attention to their political implications, with some commentators deeming them to be nostalgic and conservative within the context of reactionary Thatcherite ideology. But further analysis, prompted by gay and feminist readings, led to more nuanced and varied positions regarding their gender politics, their appeal to audiences, their umbilical link with the heritage industries, and their generic delineation and coherence.[5]

Ironically, as Sarah Street states that the Thatcher years provided the cultural-political background to the revival of British cinema in the 1980s. While Thatcher's commitment to the market economy offered little assistance to film producers, a fortunate combination of temporary tax incentives, the multiplex boom, and the international success of heritage costume films saved the industry from extinction. Since the Thatcher government left the film industry dependent on television, particularly *Channel 4*, it meant that many lower-budget films that found funding were critical of Thatcherism.[6]

Thatcher's regime was contradictory as the policy was both destructive of tradition and dependent on it in order to legitimise its upheavals in the minds of those affected. These tensions were central to the political climate of the early 1980s and they became all the more during the privatisations. Moreover the Thatcher austerity years had an inverse positive effect both on the quality of history-heritage films (getting more and more popular abroad as a form of escapisms into past glories instead of facing rising unemployment and the break-up of the postwar consensus of the welfare state) and thus heritage film costumes and mis-en-scéne became more and more elaborate and lavish. At the same time it had a benign effect on the socialist-realist cinema, traditionally one of the fields of cultural resistance since the 1960s becoming

more marked in the long ConservativeThatcher era. Thus there was a lucky double gain both in the heritage/popular and socialist-realist/auteur filmmaking.[7]

According to Claire Monk, in the 1980s the notion of 'quality' became the basis for the exportability of British cinema as it had been in the 1930s.[8] Although the number of feature films produced in Britain each year had been falling steadily since 1972, to an all-time low of just 24 films made in 1981, they picked up again in the mid 1980s, when, according to Sarah Street, the average number of films produced each year was more than double the output of 1981, partly due to heritage films.[9]

The term *heritage film* was first used by Charles Barr in 1986 in relation to the 1940s films dedicated to the 'rich British heritage'.[10] However, the term quickly became also associated with a certain type of *period drama* that came to prominance in the 1980s, typified by films such as *A Room with a View* (James Ivory, 1985) and *Howards End* (James Ivory, 1992). The heritage text was commonly understood as a film that drew upon a work of classic literature, dwelt upon the lives and properties of the upper classes, and was set roughly in the period between 1860 and World War II.[11]

The film marking the recovery of British cinema in the early 1980s was *Chariots of Fire* (Hugh Hudson, 1981), a period film based on the true story of the rivalry between two runners, who eventually won places on the British team for the 1924 Olympics. The film had many of the hallmarks which typified subsequent heritage films: precise and loving photography of sites of national heritage (in this case, Cambridge University), a focus on male rivalry and bonding, and a nostalgic view of the past. This film heralded the ascendency of the most dominant British genre for the following decade, quality historical films (often also referred to as heritage), including *Heat and Dust* (James Ivory, 1987), *A Passage to India* (David Lean, 1985), *Maurice* (James Ivory, 1987), *The Remains of the Day* (James Ivory, 1993) etc. These were box office hits both in Britain and America, continuing the profitable export of films which offered a particular construction of Englishness.[12]

According to Charlotte Brunsdon (2007) the following four markers of quality must be present in heritage films: a literary or history source, the best British acting, money (in lieu of an expensive look) and the heritage export appeal. Brunsdon also claims that the heritage industry may transform the past into a series of commodities for the leisure and entertainment market, but in most cases the commodity on offer is an image, a spectacle, something to be 'gazed at'.[13] History, the past, becomes in Fredric Jameson's phrase, 'a vast collection of images'.[14] According to Andrew Higson the past is displayed as visually spectacular pastiche, inviting a nostalgic gaze that resists the ironies and social critiques often suggested narratively by these films.[15]

John Fitzgerald emphasises that the use of a leading British stars (Hugh Grant, Jude Law, Judy Dench, Helen Mirren and Keira Knightly) is important, but there is also as much concentration on the mise-en-scéne as on the narrative.[16] According to James Leggott (2007) films like *Notting Hill* (dir. Roger Michael, 1999) or *Bridget Jones's Diary* (dir. Sharon Maguire, 2001) could already be labelled as 'contemporary' heritage films,[17] while Claire Monk even speaks about some anti-heritage films, ie. the parody of the expectation of a period film quoting *Jude* (1996, dir. Michael Winterbottom), which is based on Thomas Hardy's novel, *Jude the Obscure*).[18]

While discussing any type of heritage and history films, we should mention some overlap between heritage films and some of the postmodern literary or cultural discourse. Robert Rosenstone in *Visions of the Past* (1995) also emphasises that the

postmodern history film already openly refuses the pretense that the screen can be an immediate window onto the past, but rather foregrounds itself as a construction. Standing somewhere between dramatic history and documentary, traditional history and personal essay, the postmodern film utilises the unique capabilities of the media to create multiple meanings. Rosenstone (1995) also claims that postmodern history and heritage films are fragmentary, partial, playful, incomplete and are not meant to be seen as definitive statements on any topic, but as explorations, provocations, insights.[19]

Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen argued that history professionals need to work harder at listening to and respecting the many ways popular history makers traverse the terrain of the past that is so present for us. But there is another challenge, that of explaining people's ambivalence towards history on film.[20] It might just be useful to remember Marshall Poe's remark that popularity itself does not bestow on a topic importance or seriousness.[21] Viewers are often described as being engaged in a form of 'escape' and consequently interested only in mere entertainment.'Mass artworks' are intentionally designed to gravitate in their structural choices, narrative forms, symbolism, intended effect and even in their content toward those choices that promise accessibility with minimum effort, virtually on first contact, for the largest number of relatively untortured audiences.[22]

Following the logics of Northrop Frye holding that 'the most obvious conventional fictions are the easiest to read, we can reach the same conclusion for films, ie. conventional films offer access with minimum effort and that they are accessible to mass, untortured audiences. By contrast, certain specialised skills are assumed to be required to access academic monographs. And sometimes, it is even assumed that with training, viewers will move beyond or outgrow film or some kinds of film.[23]

It is also often believed that where there is disagreement, a historiographer is needed to set things aright. However, historiography can also be used to illuminate, question and modify conventional and uncontested activities. And all historiographical assumptions are subject to change and open to question. It could be the case that viewers have more sense of historical films as representations than other history media such as museums or books. films might offer a more approachable route to the study of historiography than other media. [24]

According to Andrew Higson heritage film denotes the absence of political engagement, the past is no more than a look or style or a mass of material artefacts, heritage belongs the 1980s Britain providing an escape from the problematic expansion and rearticulation of British identity that was prompted by the immigration from past and present parts of the Empire a now Commonwealths.[25] Marcia Landy at the same time also warnes us that melodramatic history is socially pathological because it preserves ideal past worlds instead of creating new ones, ie. it renders viewers socially and politically inactive.[26]

Analysis of films representing history is as old as the medium itself, but in 1971 it was put on a new footing with the creation of a specialist journal *Film and History* stimulating literature and the John E. Connor Prize awarded by the Americal Historical Association in recognition of one of the founding editors of *Film and History* for outstanding achievement in historical filmmaking.[27] John E. O' Connor argued for the recognition of film as 'representation of history' and evidence for social and cultural

history, actuality footage as evidence for history and the history of the moving image as industry and art form.[28]

Marc Ferro already in the 1980s saw historical films as divided into those inscribed in the dominant currents of thought and those that propose an independent or innovative view of societies. And this gap has been growing ever since.[29] Aristotle already in his *Poetics* places the triumph of the narrative – the deviation from the 'official history' – far above the factual retelling of verifiable events claiming that the poet and the historian differ…(in that) one relates what has happened, the other what may happen. Poetry therefore, Aristotle concludes, is more philosophical and a higher thing than history, for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular.[30]

As a reaction to Robert Rosenstone in 1989 in the American Historical Journal, David Herlihy, O'Connor and Brent Toplin endorsed the distinction between history in images and history in words.[31] Hayden White even coined a term, 'historiophoty' in 1988 to distinguish the study of visual histories from written histories.[32] John Gaddis and David Christian likened histories to maps, as maps are conventionally on smaller scales than the phenomena they represent, maps on the same scale as the phenomena they represent are not very helpful, because to find a feature, we would have to walk as far on the map as we would in the world. Histories like maps can be similarly of different scales, they may be more or less detailed and can serve different purposes. The scales of histories are those of space and time.[33]

It is commonly assumed that films can offer viewers only an impoverished or compromised vision of history. Robert Rosenstone argued that the force of this assumption derives fom the lack of involvement of historians in film production and from the following six perceived shortcomings of mainstream historical films: their routine packaging of history as upbeat comedy or romance, their focus on the action of individuals to the exclusion of wider context, their focus on emotional dimensions of phenomena at the expense of their intellectual dimensions, their conflation of historical meaning with props, their avoidance of multiple points of view and inconclusive or contradictory explanations of phenomena and their purportedly poor information load.[34]

History is not just about events, it is about the relationship between those events, the order in which they are presented and the selection of emphases. Historians and historical filmmakers are thus 'stylists', whether or not they like to recognise it: they shape their works according to conventional story forms or forms of emplotment. History is not just about the relation of events but is also about the relation of various groups who hold, promote and contest the selection, connection and emphasis of events. The time paths of historical films fragment history into histories and foster awareness of their sometimes coalescing, sometimes competing forms and functions. [35] Another problem leading to further fragmentation and subjectification of the past, according to Brent Toplin is, that film scripts are only between 10-20 book pages, whereas printed, book, written histories are several hundred page long, so it is rather difficult to show all the details, to remain true to history or to the story.[36]

One of the functions most often connected with historical films is that of establishing, affirming or challenging national identity, however transnational dimensions of historical film production, promotion, reception and scholarship make them ill-suited to be lenses for national analysis. Drawing on historical reception studies, Hughes-Warrington highlights that other imagined communities, such as family, may occupy more of the attention of film audiences.[37]

Films may be historical in two senses: diegeses may draw viewers into an exploration of past activities and be drawn into viewers lives to delienate and secure understandings of their past.[38] Jean Baudrillard sees films as hyperreal, presenting a world that appears more legitimate, more believable and more valuable than the real.[39] Guy Debord writes in *The Society of Spectacle* (1967/1992) that the spectacle is both the outcome and the goal of the dominant mode of production. It is not something added to the real world not a decorative element. On the contrary, it is 'the very heart of society's real unreality'. In all its specific manifestations news or propaganda, advertising or the actual consumption of entertainment the spectacle epitomizes the prevailing model of social life. It is the omnipresent celebration of a choice already made in the sphere of production, and the consummate result of that choice. In form as in content the spectacle serves as total justification for the conditions and aims of the existing system. It further ensures the permanent presence of that justification, for it governs almost all time spent outside the production process itself.[40] Andre Bazin also argues that realism can never be found apart from the viewer's constructions of it. Realism is a matter of convention: the making and shaping of histories is formed by agreed ways of viewing the past.[41]

Robert Rosenstone, encourages us to openly admit, that historical films trouble and disturb professional historians.[42] Oliver Stone, in complete agreement with that, from the other side of 'the fence' told, that many historians come at filmmakers with an attitude of open hostility. It is as if history was their terrirory where filmmakers don't belong.[43] As money rules most film industries including historical filmmaking, it leads to the view that history itself is a 'story bin to be plundered' and a 'pliable commodity', in short, historical responsibility and the movie industry seem to be are incompatible.[44] Julie Jeffrey noted that the chief value of historical consultants may often only lie in their use as promotional 'window dressing,' connecting a well-known historian with a film may lend an air of authenticity and authority.[45]

Natalie Zemon Davies, the popular cultural anthropologist and historian, and a popular writer as well, claims that rarely does a historian find so perfect a narrative structure in events of the past or one with such dramatic popular appeal. Unlike in traditional and complex but often dry fact of history, the first problem with mainstream films is that they package history as romance or comedy, in which individuals escape from, or in the case of comedy triumph over a particular situation or problem. No matter how apparently tragic the setting, some form of positive outcome ensues, this is highly problematic especially in war, civil-war or other real crisis, tragic periods. Partly to escape this dilemma, mainstream film presents history as the story of individuals, but often the context, history is downscaled to improve the effect and reception.[46] Moreover, according to Hughes-Warrington, the dominance of World Wars, Holocaust, Hitler and Vietnam is blamed for high school graduates' apparent lack of knowledge and interest in other historical phenomena.[47]

Roland Barthes states that the individual self is more than 'a myth' that has become so much part of our cultural furniture that it has been naturalised.[48] Louis Althusser similarly argues that the human self is nothing more than an ideological, imaginary assamblage that society fosters to elicit subjection to the status quo. Biopics are getting more and more popular, and we might wonder why are both historians, and filmmakers and of course audiences so interested in the actions of named individuals that are taken to be single selves? Historians, like filmmakers, tend to use individuals to represent experiences of a wider group.[49] One reason for this might be rooted in the fact, that films are not only about stories (narratives), but among others, unlike

history books, films often highlight the emotional dimensions of human experiences.[50]

Films use the close-up of the human face, the quick juxtapposition of disperate images, the power of music and sound effect to heighten and intensify the feelings of the audience. Written history points to emotions instead of inviting us to experience it.[51] The look of the past takes precedence above the ideas, beliefs and actions of historical agents. According to Rosenstone as long as you get the look right, you may freely invent characters and incidents and do whatever to the past to make it more interesting.[52]

Guy Debord claims that the spectator's alienation from and submission to the contemplated object (which is the outcome of his unthinking activity)
works like this: the more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more readily he recognizes his own needs in the images of need proposed by the dominant system, the less he understands his own existence and his own desires. The spectacle's externality with respect to the acting subject is demonstrated by the fact that the individual's own gestures are no longer his own, but rather those of someone else who represents them to him. The spectator feels at home nowhere, for
the spectacle is everywhere.[53]

Natalie Zemon Davies to counterbalance the heritage emphasis on often 'spectacular mis-en-scéne' to substitute hard core history facts based on contemporary history records, argues, that it is unclear if any prop is necessary at all in historical filmmaking quoting the example of *Dogville* (2003, dir. Lars von Trier), which demonstrates, that spaces are designated by chalk markings showing us that there is more to history than its look.[54] Filmmakers, on the other hand, often just literally recycle images, feature films use the same icons time after time, and finally a film that departs from conventional iconic representation, tropes is likely to be judged unconvincing.[55] We just might sum up this part with Guy Debord's reminder that 'the spectacle is capital accumulated to the point, where it becomes image'.[56]

Endnotes for 3/d The Heritage film debate:

1.Brett qtd in Wright 2009: xii.

2. Wright 2009: xvi.

3.Wright.2009: xix.

4. Wright 2009: 45.

5.Leggott 2007: 81.

6. Street 2009: 115.

7. cf. Eric J. Evans. *Thatcher and Thatcherism*. London: Routledge, 2004.

8. Monk 2002: 184.

9. Street 2009: 114.

10. Barr qtd. in Leggott 81.

11. Leggott 2005: 82.

12. Street 2009: 115–116.

13. Brunsdon 2007: 23.

14. Jameson 1991: 66.

15. Higson 2006: 15.

16. Fitzgerald 2010: 2.

17. Leggott. 2007: 80.

18. Monk 2002: 193.

19. Rosenstone, 1995: 38.

20. Rosenzweig --Thelen qtd in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 1.

21. Poe qtd in Hughes-Warrington 2007: 2.

22. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 2.

23. Frye 1965: 3.

24. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 3.

25. Higson 2006: 27.

26. Landy 1996: 36.

27. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 4.

28. O'Connor 1990: 1.

29. Ferro, 1988: 161.

30. Aristotle qtd in Elliott 2011: 17.

31. Herlihy – O'Connor – Toplin. *American Historical Journal*. 1988/5.1186-92.

32. White. *American Historical Journal*. 1988/5. 1193.

33. Gaddis – Christian 2002: 32.

34. Rosenstone 1995: 49.

35. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 9-10.

36. Toplin 2002: 18.

37. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 10. cf. Váró, Kata Anna on national identity and British heritage film. 2015. DLA. Budapest
38. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 10.

39. Baudrillard 1988: 169.

40. Debord 1994: 6.

41. Bazin 2005: 12.

42. Rosenstone 1995: 45.

43. Oliver Stone: *Paste Imperfect* In *Cineaste* 1996: 33.

44. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 16.

45. Jeffrey, Julie. 'Amistad (1997): Steven Spielberg's true story' In *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 2001/1: 4.

46. Zeamon Davies 1983: viii.

47. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 23.

48. Barthes 1973: 11.

49. Althusser 1971: 152-6.

50. Hughes-Warrington 2007: 20.

51. Rosenstone 1995: 59.

52. Rosenstone 1995: 59.

53. Debord 1994: 30.

54. Zeamon Davis 1983: 2.

55. Walter Benjamin 1936. Web.

56. Debord 1994: 34.

3/e. THE FILM INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY (pp.27-31):

A sucessful film is to bring any country (here we are mostly concerned with Britain) employment and profits besides prestige and cultural influence. Economically, however, the strength of British movies has been steadily declining since the war. Hacker and Price claim, that given the place television and film hold in British society, the material shown should not be escapist fantasy. At the very least, even if British films merely reflect and don't examine moral and social values of the nation, they will foster a distinctive sense of identity and community, more ambitiously they may also try to encourage thought and emotion about issues which have a national context.[1]

Documentary filmmakers like Grierson, Jennings or Free Cinema had a huge impact on narrative cinema. But, according to Hacker and Price, British film, unlike British theatre or documentary, has never had its own distinctive directors of the calibre of Eisenstein, Ford or Bergman. Through their individuality and even interpretation of their cultural milieu, these types of directors furthered the development of a national film tradition. Britain never had such distinctive paradigms. Michael Powell and David Lean, arguably two of Britain's archetypal film directors have had only limited influence in their country.[2]

There is a fairly simple but a bit superficial explanation by the common English language for the easy success of American film culture in Britain. The latter part of 20th century is distinguishd by the replacement of centuries of Europe's cultural imperialism by America's. American culture is an optimistic, immigrant one capable of communicating on a very basic level to reach a wide range of peoples and reflecting the openness of its society. Film was the perfect medium for its dissemination (not surprisingly the culture was readily embraced by early cinema-going audiences).[3]

America has also had powerful economic advantages which have helped to mould its international dominance. With a domestic market equal to half the international cinema market, it has always been able to maintain a huge industrial base. Potential profits from domestic admissions alone enable Hollywood to make any investments it feels necessary, technical or artistic on a film. Britain, on the other hand, always had a much smaller public at hand, had top watch costs, thus it was hard to compete with the USA rivals.[4]

The steadily falling cinema audience has been of chief importance to the decline of British cinema. In 1945 there were 1585 million visits a year while 1984 saw the all time low of 55 million, in other words a drop from 30 visits a year to one a year per head of population. What was steadily destroying the cinema going habit, of course, was the introduction of tv, colour tv and then video (Britain developed in the 1980s one of the highest video-owning rates anywhere in the world) as an alternative to the big screen.[5] Of course then came the DVD and the internet era further multiplying options to watch films outside the cinema. The obvious question then arose, why people should go to cinema when they can see the film at home?

The oppositional films are part of a counter-culture reacting in various ways against the influences of Hollywood. We might term it 'independent', but that word (like any really) is open to misinterpretation. Unable to get finance for feature films these directors got refuge in tv (or in theatre). Many of their films have strong political, often left-wing undertones and are highly critical of Britain: eg. the films of Ken Loach, the satires of Lindsay Anderson, the films of Ron Peck (*Nighthawks*, *Empire State*), Mike Leigh, Stephen Frears etc.[6]

Kureishi, writer of *My Beautiful Laundrette* (dir. Stephen Frears, 1987) commented in an interview, that whenever a right wing paper calls one of their films sick, they know with Stephen Frears that they must be doing the right thing, and Kureishi added what Britain needs is irony, ambiguity and humour.[7] All the British arthouse film directors faced similar problems in their career, the lack of a strong creative identity in British film, finance, the influence of tv, the balancing of commercial films with the desire to make personal films, the perennial pull of Hollywood, still British filmmakers had the power to choose individual paths to pursue their careers.[8]

The fact that the historical film should provoke such controversy suggests that there is more at stake than just the issue of historical accuracy. The historical film raises questions such as whose history is being represented, by whom and for whom. The theme of identity is central to the genre: class, gender and specifically national identities are among its principal concerns. Sue Harper claims that films without national identity are dangerous corrupters of the public imagination, as such they had the effect of drugs or lying teachers. They also insisted that priority should be given to cultural quality and that "films should be of and for the British Empire, produced within the Empire, depicting its life history and high morality for which it stands."[9]

The historical film is not merely offering a representation of the past; in most instances it is offering a representation of a specifically national past. National histories are fiercely protected and contested. Nothing better illustrates this than the hysterical reaction in the British press to Hollywood films that distort the historical record of 'our finest hour' such as *Objective Burma!* (dir. Raoul Walsh, 1945) and *U-571* (dir. Jonathan Mostow, 2000). The scenario reports of the British Board of Film Censors provide a revealing anecdote of the extent to which the censors saw themselves as guardians of national history. When Columbia Pictures proposed a film based on Comyns Beaumont's notorious book *The Private Life of the Virgin Queen* in

1947 – a work claiming that Sir Francis Bacon and the Earl of Essex were Elizabeth's sons from a secret marriage – it received short shrift from the examiner who thought it 'a deplorable book in that it poses as historical truth'. 'It is known that some American films have twisted and adapted OUR history to suit THEIR needs,' the report went on, 'but it would be reprehensible if a British producer followed suit by basing a film on this travesty of history.'[10]

Yet, British film-makers have proved equally adept at adapting the past to meet their own cultural and ideological concerns. The subject matter of the historical film involves a special relationship with notions of nationhood and national identity. The British historical film offers a popular version of the past that promotes dominant myths about the British historical experience for lay audiences who do not comprise large numbers of professional historians.[11] The use of the word 'myths' in this context should not imply that historical films have no basis in fact, but rather that they tend to endorse narratives that accord with popular views of history. Thus British historical films present Britain as leading the resistance to tyranny and oppression (*Fire Over England*, *This England*, *Henry V*),dramatise British pluck and courage in adverse conditions (*Scott of the Antarctic*, *A Night to Remember*) and foreground notable British achievements in fields such as exploration (*Rhodes of Africa*, *David Livingstone*), aviation (*They Flew Alone*, *The First of the Few*), invention (*The Magic Box*) and sport (*Chariots of Fire*).

The central role of the monarchy in British history is attested to by the preponderance of films dealing with the 'private lives' of rulers such as Henry VIII, Elizabeth I and Queen Victoria. The favourite periods for producers of historical films, moreover, have tended to be those which give rise to narratives of national greatness: the Tudor period, which saw the emergence of England as a great power; the Victorian period, which saw industrial progress and imperial expansion; and the Second World War, which in the popular imagination remains 'our finest hour'. In contrast, there have been relatively few films about periods of internal conflict such as the Dark Ages (*Alfred the Great*) or the English Civil War (*Cromwell*, *To Kill A King*).[12]

Britain has even created a new iconic subgenre, 'the monarchy film' of the 1930s, something marketable all over the world, including the US. Alexander Korda (born Sándor László Kellner) wanted to create high budget quality 'history' films (to literally outshine low-budget quota films), which were international while based on national (English or British) history. The success of the monarchy film always lies in its fine duality: representing both a witty criticism of the monarchy and traditional national pride. The historical film, in common with all genres, is not a fixed, static entity, but rather one that is subject to a continuous process of change and transformation. It changes in response to a range of determinants: industrial, economic, social, cultural and political.

Films are classified as British according to the industry's own benchmarks (thus allowing the inclusion of MGM's *Beau Brummell* (1924, dir. Harry Beaumont), but ruling out Mel Gibson's *Braveheart,* (1995) and their narrative focus must be on an aspect of British history. Also they must be commercial feature films that had a full UK release.[13] For the 1930s and 1940s – the decades when cinema-going was, in A.J.P. Taylor's oft-quoted phrase, 'the essential social habit of the age,' the three most important producers of historical films included Alexander Korda (*The Private Life of Henry VIII,* 1933), Michael Balcon (*The Iron Duke,* 1941) and Herbert Wilcox (*Victoria the Great,* 1937*,* and *Sixty Glorious Years,* 1938). Alexander Korda was the pre-eminent

British producer of the decade and no study of the British historical film could omit *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (1933) which remains 'the archetypal film of the genre'.[14]

This is the film that is seen as making the breakthrough for British films in the American market, thus attesting to its economic significance for the industry. It also encapsulates many of the debates around the question of a national cinema: a film with a uniquely British subject that was written and produced largely by European émigrés. *The Iron Duke* is a rather less well known film that has not been given similar prominence in British cinema historiography as *Henry VIII*. It is a more overtly political film, using the story of Wellington at the Congress of Vienna to draw contemporary parallels with the Treaty of Versailles and the treatment of Germany after the First World War. Its explicitly pro-appeasement narrative largely reflects British public opinion in the mid-1930s. In contrast, Herbert Wilcox's two 'Victoria' biopics – *Victoria the Great* and *Sixty Glorious Years*, which are included together because they are, to all intents and purposes, two halves of one larger film – can be seen as calls for national unity in the changing political climate of the 1930s. Both films respond to contemporary political circumstances: *Victoria the Great* extols the virtues of constitutional monarchy in the wake of the Abdication Crisis of 1936, while *Sixty Glorious Years* is an anti-appeasement narrative whose release coincided with the Munich Agreement of 1938.[15]

The 1940s divide into the war and post-war years. For the war Chapman quots one now largely forgotten film (*This England,* 1941, dir. David McDonald) and one that is established within the canon of classic British cinema (*Henry V,* 1944, dir. Laurence Olivier). Both are propaganda films, but they use history in different ways. *This England* is a cheaply made historical pageant that uses an episodic narrative to invoke resistance to domestic tyrants and foreign invaders. It is an essentially defensive narrative that reflects the defiant mood of 1940. Laurence Olivier's film of *Henry V*, by contrast, is an expensively produced, Technicolor epic that interprets Shakespeare's play for 1944 as Britain is shown taking the offensive. Produced with the full support of the Ministry of Information, *Henry V* represents the most explicit example of a film that mobilises the past in response to the present for the post-war period.[16]

The 1950s, often characterised as the 'doldrums era' of British cinema, saw the onset of a long, slow decline in cinema-going. The film industry attempted to lure audiences back into the cinemas with size and spectacle. The two films representing the 1950s, although very different in narrative and visual style, were part of this strategy. *Beau Brummell,* produced in Britain by MGM, is an example of the 'Hollywood British' films of the decade. Its focus on personal ambition and desire and its colourful, expressive visual style are in stark contrast to *A Night to Remember* (1958), a sober, black-and-white reconstruction of the sinking of the *Titanic*, in which personal desire is subordinated to group effort. The two films also reveal significant differences in critical reception: while *A Night to Remember* was praised as a sincere and unsensational film in the best tradition of British film-making, *Beau Brummell* was universally denounced by British critics as an overblown travesty of history from an American company.[17]

The 1960s were a turbulent decade of fundamental and far-reaching social change that also witnessed rapid changes in British film culture, from the social realism of the 'new wave' to the colourful fantasy of James Bond. *The Charge of the Light Brigade* (1968, dir. Tony Richardson) is an explicitly anti-militarist film that uses the historic disaster to make a polemical attack on the British establishment and class system, and American involvement in the Vietnam War, but the film was not a popular success attributed to its fragmentary narrative.[18]

By the 1970s the British film industry was in a state of almost perpetual crisis: levels of production declined, audiences fragmented and American films dominated the box office more than ever before. *Henry VIII and His Six Wives* (dir. Waris Hussein, 1972), one of a cycle of historical biopics that exemplified the persistence of traditional filmmaking practices at a time when cinema audiences were dissipating. A film version of an acclaimed television serial, it was a sign of shifting cultural capital in the film and television industries.[19]

The success of *Chariots of Fire* at the 1982 Academy Awards in Hollywood seemed to herald a revival of fortunes for the British film industry. This film of British sporting triumph has been claimed by critics as both a leftwing and a right-wing text that, depending upon one's interpretation, can be seen as either a critique or an endorsement of the social and political values of Thatcherism.[20] In the 1990s *Elizabeth* was one of a cycle of films that revived the royal biopic, at a time when the British Royal Family was in crisis and badly criticised. As well as rehearsing familiar motifs of the tension between the public duty and private life of the monarch, *Elizabeth* is notable for its expressive visual style and its 'baroque mise-en-scéne'.[21]. We might cite here *The Madness of King George* (dir. Nicholas Hytner, 1994) as a similar example.

In the 'Noughties', what Sue Harper calls a period of tremendous global shifts, tremors and surprises, there has been a slight moving away from the traditional heritage film with only a few examples that might match the original definition, such as *Pride and Prejudice* (dir. Joe Wright, 2005) and *Elizabeth, the Golden Age* (dir. Shekhar Kapur, 2007).[22] Furthermore, according to Leggott, as British film culture has long known a strain of iconoclastic or deliberately 'inauthentic' approaches to history (from the avantgarde contribution of Derek Jarman and Peter Greenaway to the *Carry on* films etc), films like *Notting Hill* (dir. Roger Michael, 1999) or *Bridget Jones's Diary* (dir. Sharon Maguire, 2001) could be labelled as 'contemporary' heritage films. [23]

According to Julianna Pidduck *Elizabeth* (dir. Shekhar Kapur, 1998) marks a postmodern turn in the British period drama, allowing a playful, performative sensibility to overtake 'the realist mode'. Furthermore, contrary to a British heritage tradition premised on precise dialogue, pastoral mis-en-scéne and subtle dramas of love and class distinction, these Elizabethan films including *Shakespeare in Love* (dir. John Madden, 1998) employ the lexicon of corporeality and sensuality.[24]

These films all invoke parallels between past and present. Sometimes, as Ken Loach's remark suggests, this imparting of contemporary meaning into a historical film is entirely conscious on the film-maker's part. In other cases, there may not necessarily have been any such intent but, nevertheless, contemporary meaning has been read into the film by critics or historians. In such cases, of course, there is always an inherent danger that the meanings thus identified demonstrate the textual ingenuity of the critic in reading the film rather than the intent of those who made it. All textual criticism, of course, is interpretative. This is why any attempt to analyse the meaning of a particular film should be grounded in contextual as well as textual analysis. Essentially, this is what differentiates the approach of the film historian from other commentators whose interest lies solely in the aesthetic or formal analysis of films. [25]

Chapman argues, that the interpretative analysis of films becomes justified only when the historical circumstances of production and reception have first been established. Only in this way can we be certain whether the meanings

we read into the films were intended by the film-makers themselves or were identified by contemporaries. Otherwise the interpretation of films can become an arid intellectual exercise, designed more to demonstrate one's own familiarity with the latest fashionable trend in cultural theory than to shed any light upon the actual texts.[26] Chapman's approach and research method is empiricist. In addition to the films themselves, his primary sources include official documents, studio records, private papers, autobiographies, scripts, press books, trade papers and film journals, and reviews from a wide range of newspapers and periodicals. Each of his case study begins by placing the film concerned within the institutional and economic contexts of the British film industry at the time it was produced.[27]

Feature films are products of an industry whose primary motive is commercial and which is only secondarily influenced by cultural and artistic concerns. Sue Harper rightly reminds us that filmic representations 'are simply the traces left by the struggles for dominance during the production process – by the contest for creative control'.[28] In this regard it is significant, that the most influential figures in historical film production in British cinema have tended to be producers.
It takes a strong director, such as Tony Richardson (*The Charge of the Light Brigade,* 1968) or Shekhar Kapur (*Elizabeth,* 1998), to impose their own vision and style on a film. In contrast, directors like Victor Saville (*The Iron Duke,* 1934), David Macdonald (*This England,* 1941) and Roy Baker (*A Night to Remember,* 1958) were contract directors who saw their role as being simply to transfer the script to the screen.[29]

Vivien Sobchack draws a parrallel between early British history films producers (like Korda) with a sharp eye towards the American market and the Hollywood historical epic, which has also been criticised, despised, if not completely ignored by most "serious" scholars of American cinema and historiography. Its aesthetic extravagances are seen as essentially in bad taste and its historical depictions as essentially anachronistic, the genre is generally regarded as a suspect form of both cinematic and historical representation. Indeed, for those who have been culturally trained to value asceticism, caution, and logic, there is something uncomfortably embarrassing about the historical epic's visual and aural excessiveness, about the commercial hype that surrounds its production, about its self-promotional aesthetic aura, its fuzzy and emotional content, and its spectatorial invitation to indulge in wantonly expansive, hyperbolic, even hysterical acts of cinema.
As a film genre, the historical epic emerged with the medium itself.[30]

Endnotes for 3/f: THE FILM INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

1. **Hacker-Price 1991: 2.**
2. **Hacker-Price 1991: 3.**
3. **Hacker-Price 1991: 4.**
4. **Hacker-Price 1991: 5.**
5. **Film in Britain always had to compete with television, BBC and ITV had firm government support. Hacker-Price 1991: 9.**
6. **Hacker-Price 1991: 21.**
7. **Kureishi in *Film Comment* 1988/7-8. Web. http://www.filmcomment.com/archive/?y=1988**
8. **Hacker-Price 1991: 23.**
9. **Harper 2009: 9.**
10. **Chapman 2005: 5.**
11. **Chapman: 2005: 6.**
12. **Velich 2016: 210-226., Chapman: 2005: 6.**

13. Chapman 2005: 6. This excludes semi-documentary films such as Kevin Brownlow's *Winstanly* and television films such as Peter Watkins's *Culloden*.
14. Chapman 2005: 7, Velich 2016: 218.
15. Chapman 2005: 7.
16. Chapman 1998: 65.
17. Chapman 1998: 66., Richards 1992: 171.
18. Chapman: 2005: 9.
19. *Chariots of Fire*.1981, dir. Hugh Hudson. imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2017. 01.06. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0082158/, Chapman: 2005: 9.
20. Chapman: 2005: 9. Elizabeth marks the postmodern turn in heritage films as well. cf. Velich 2016: 219.
21. Harper 2009: 12.
22. Leggott 2007: 82.
23. Pidduck 2004: 15.
24. Chapman: 2005: 9.
25. Chapman: 2005: 10.
26. Chapman: 2005: 10. I apply similar approach in my seminars on *British Society in Contemporary Films*. cf. seas3.courses/velich.
27. Harper 2009: 10.
28. Chapman: 2005: 11. Chapman is interested principally in the so-called narrative ideologies: that is the attitudes, assumptions and beliefs that inform the filmic narratives.
29. Sobchack 1990: 24-49.

4. FILM AND MUNICIPAL HISTORY/a. LONDON-SET FILMS (pp.33-47):

According to Charlotte Brunsdon (2007) all films, that claim London as their setting must engage with this hegemonic discourse of location – with that river, that clock, that bridge, those buses and those taxis."[1] Brunsdon argues that landmark images, although they are images of place, mobilised to inform where a film is set, are in general not a part of the narrative spaces of the film. In other words, landmarks in film signify everything and nothing simultaneously, permitting us access and rapid cognition of the setting, period and sometimes even the genre, but ultimately adding nothing to the stories we are being told.[2]

Early scholarship on cities in cinema and literature has traditionally privileged the mobilities of the 'flâneur', the infamous stroller of the nineteenth-century European city, as the primary method of conceptualizing the representation of urban space. The image of the 'flâneur', of a lone male figure intoxicated by the sights and sounds of the modern metropolis, has persisted through the work of the quintessential theorists, novelists and poets of modernity, including Walter Benjamin, Honoré de Balzac and Charles Baudelaire, and has been taken up and revised by contemporary scholars such as Giuliana Bruno, Anne Friedberg and James Donald.[3]

As a counterexample, Matthew Taunton in *Fictions of the City* positions his work against the dominance of 'flânerie' when stating, 'urban experience is too often assumed to be characterized by the experience of losing oneself wandering in the crowd'.[4] Yvette Bíró, on the other hand, a well-known film scholar of Hungarian birth, being both a US and a world citizen, living both in Paris and New York City, in a 2008 interview given to Catherine Portuges called herself a 'wanderer.' Bíró added "that

although there was still of course national film production everywhere, over the last few years the 'wandering camera' has become far more frequent. This is another reason why the boundaries between fiction and documentary are called into question so much in the early 21st century. To discover what's new, anywhere – in Turkey, in Taiwan – is a fantastic contribution not just to culture but to our lives, to our attitudes. Biró claims that what's exciting in drama and film is that you can focus on a small, personal issue. By developing it, you reach out to something larger, more general".5

On the one hand the stability and symbolic leading position of London as the financial capital of the world was undermined in the last decade by two major events, the London terrorist attack in 2005 and the credit crunch of 2008, on the other hand the success of the 2012 London-held Olympic Games plus the redevelopment of the Docklands turning London into a postmodern world city helped to recover her prestige. The deadliest attack against London since the Blitz of 1940-41 took place on 7 July 2005, the terrorist attack with 52 dead (part of *War of Terror* labelled by George W. Bush) and one of its consequences was to degrade London's upheld capacity for accomodating and celebrating cultural and ethnic diversity and difference. Although Kerr and Gibson underline in their book how Mayor Ken Livingstone emphasized that no mosque was set alight or even had its windows broken in the immediate aftermaths of the bombings, still the type of unpleasant reactions experienced elsewhere as a consequence are underlining London 's great tradition of tolerance.6

The German newspaper *Der Spiegel* dubbed the 2008 London banking crises, the credit crunch, the worst financial crisis since 1929 with the short-term spectacle of mass redundancies in the City 'Iceland on the Thames'.7 Still, since 2009 the London skyline expanded, the City displays every sign of boom rather than bust in the vertiginous vertical expansion of her skyline, which en masse are so profound that it is no understatement to claim that they have altered its appearance and character permanently and irrevocably. Skyscrapers's nicknames like the 'walkie-talkie', the 'helter-skelter', the 'cheesegrater', the 'pinnacle', the new generation of City towers have risen to completion as if there had never been a banking crisis. 'The Shard' with its 72 habitable floors now reaches to 310 meters over London, allowing it for a brief time at least the title of the tallest building in Europe symbolising the fabulous wealth of the investor Qatari royal family.8

In 2012 London erected a symbolic tower, the 'Orbit' in her suburb, Startford. This traditionally poor suburb of East London was inhabited by bakers to provide bread for the growing population of the City in the early modern period, when in the 16th century London's population quadrapled from around 50.000 in 1485 to almost 200.000 by the death of Elisabeth I in 1603.9 (The London City authorities, the City Fathers of the Court of Aldermen and Common Council issued several patents or ban concerning the Stratford bakers to bring bread to London by carts in years of famine to avoid turbulence and conflict.10) The present-day East London location of the *Arcelor Mittal Orbit* (just referred to as the *Orbit*), a sculpture and observation tower on a colossal scale is highly symbolic as it marks the shift of the traditional core of London from the City(centre) towards East London. The Orbit, designed by sculptor Anish Kapoor and engineer/architect Cecil Balmonda with 114,5 meters, is the tallest work of public art in Britain and its original purpose was to mark the site of the 2012 London Olympics.11

What has endured and what has changed between the dreary, angry London of the late 1970s, early 1980s and the buoyant, bullish city of the early years of the 21st century? Transformations including the closure of the London Docks and the dismantling of the post-war consensus are finite and final, while others, like the

growth of a mature post-colonial, multicultural society and the adaptations that the city has made to accomodate the forces of globalisation will continue to shape London for decades to come.[12]

Transformation is often driven by cataclysmic disruptions like the Great Fire of London of 1666, or the Blitz of 1940-41, but more often the catalysts for development has been the result of social and economic transformations as in the years of peacetime prosperity following the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 or in 1918.[13] The 1986 'Big Bang,' the deregulation of the City's financial markets by the Thatcher government alleging that overregulation and the predominance of elite 'old-boy' networks were to blame for London's perceived decline as an international financial centre, and thus liberalization of financial markets would provide an immediate stimulus to financial trade has elevated London to the elite status of World City and concentrated untold wealth in the hands of a privileged few. On the other hand wholesale privatisation has altered every aspect of daily life for its ordinary citizens leaving in its wake social distress and inequality of the kind that the proponents of the welfare state had once mistakenly thought it possible to eradicate.[14]

LCC (London County Council) was created in 1889 and stayed in control of the capital until 1965 when it was replaced with GLC (Greater London Council) whose much larger geographical area reflected the city's growing influence over the surrounding region. GLC proved an obstacle to the Thatcher government, thus it was simply abolished in 1986 leaving the city defenceless against the free-for-all laissez-faire commercial explotitation in the same decade. Tony Blair took great care to create the new Greater London Authority (GLA) from July 2000 with greatly diminished ability to defy central government. Still Ken Livingstone (Mayor of London), the new American style executive mayor has been a painful thorn in the side of the Blair administration as the same Ken Livingstone (Red Ken) had been for Thatcher two decades before.[15]

Sir John Summerson's 'Georgian London of 1945' offered a new perspective of aerial reconnaisance to convey the scale of London 's growth. London in the late 1970s from above resembled a vast, shapeless city and although since the 19th century the Thames has been rigidly confined and embanked as it passes through the centre of London. Further east the crowded riparian strip has long been ruptured by the great artificial docks carved out of the poorest quarters of the city, although now only a very few large, ships are unloading there, in dramatic contrast to the forest of wooden masts that had huddled into the cramped confines of the Pool of London 200 years earlier.[16]

Freight ships disappeared from the Thames which is now straddled by an imposing flood barrier, while newer gargantuan container ships dock 20 miles or so downstream at Tilbury. Similarly about 20 miles from the City around Heathrow Airport new but already overcrowded motorway network, dramatic expansion is visible. The post-war imposition of the Green Belt, the M25 (London Orbital Motorway) was completed in 1986, then new outer ring, new spectacular bridge at Dartford were added.[17]

In 1958 St Paul's Cathedral was the tallest building in London, in 1981 Nat West Tower with its 183 meters is higher than St Paul's by 72 meters. 'London Eye' at 135 meters is the world's largest revolving passanger wheel making an idiosynncretic but highly popular addition to London 's skyline.[18] Docklands, Jubilee line were built for millenial celebrations, the former Bankside Power Station opposite St Paul's turned into new Tate Modern gallery, the regeneration of the Docklands, the 'Gherkin', 'The Shard' at London Bridge followed. The winter of discontent, the unrest that marks the final

months of the failed Labour Government of James Callaghan (with billboards: 'The City isn't working').[19]

As its older industries decline and its financial power grow ever more powerful, there is a sharp divergence in the fortunes of its citizens. Increasing unemployment combined with the 'rolling back' of state regulation and support and exacerberated by the inexorable rise in the cost of living in the city, intensify the economic ineqality and social stratification that had once appeared to be permanently diminishing. It also creates two wholly incompatible perceptions of the future of the city, one convinced that London has had its day and is now sinking into irreversible decline, the other equally certain that it has successfully cemented its place as a centre of the new world economy. As London left the 20th century, however, it is this latter view that has prevailed, and any contemporary visitor to the city can hardly fail to be impressed by its sheer self-confidence, despite the daily evidence that its overburdened infrastructure is close to collapse and the constant proof provided by every transaction that this is now arguably the most expensive city in the world.[20] London is now described as a 24-hour city caught up in an unceasing cycle of consumption..[21]

As the old industrial landscape is stripped away, the prostitutes and drug dealers that have blighted the area for years will be displaced to other less favoured London neighbourhoods. But as the relentless cleansing of the capital continues apace, it is becoming increasingly difficult to imagine where its black economy, its poorer populations will settle. Amidst the evidence of increasing diversity and heterogeneity, the truth is that contemporary London is simultaneously moving towards greater uniformity and homogeneity. London can no longer be usefully defined as a single entity even on a map, for surely Heathrow, Tilbury and South Mimms junction of the M25 and M1 are all legitimately part of the city they serve despite falling outside its adminstrative boundaries. Patrick Wright, the author of several books on London states that we cannot claim to know London.[22]

City film history is a relatively recent development, emerging out of the poststructuralist maze into which film studies strayed with a rather uncertain map but no shortage of signposts. The image of the modern city as conveyed by film has, of course, long been recognized, with the 'city symphony' already an acknowledged genre of the 1920s and 1930s. Even earlier, the films preserved as the Paper Print Collection at America's Library of Congress record both the street life and architecture of turn-of-the-century New York with extraordinary self-confidence. Yet none of this rich legacy of city films has cohered into a subject or a theme until recent years; and even when it has been broached in anthologies that are often structured by architectural concerns, London has figured significantly less often than those recognized capitals of modernity Berlin, Paris and New York.[23]

I would disagree (and try to prove in my short case study below)) with Sara de Freitas' statement in *Representations of Dystopia and the Film City of London,* that London has rather been represented cinematically as the paradigm of the antimodern, that, over a century, the city has seldom been shown in a positive light but rather as 'the archetype of the modern civic dystopia'.[24] The most recent BBC crime series *Luther* (2010-16) might justify this negative view, as *Luther* seems to present London as a city of modern dystopia, however, if we consider the image of London presented in new heritage films enlisted in chapter 5, in films like *Notting Hill, Love Actually*, *About a Boy, Trance,* etc. and in the *Bridget Jones* trilogy, we find a positive (even spectacular) image of the capital.

The two earliest surviving films made in and about London – Birt Acres and Robert Paul's *Arrest of a Bookmaker* and *Footpads* (both 1895) – are unlike films of the same vintage made anywhere else. Compared with Edison's vaudeville vignettes and the Lumières' genteel scenes of life in Lyons, both show violence as an everyday London experience. Indeed, the theatrical backdrop of *Footpads* seems to represent Piccadilly Circus at night, suggesting that assault is an ever present threat to West End revellers.25

A two-year research project, '*A City in Film: Liverpool's Urban Landscape and the Moving Image*', funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council from 2006 to 2008 evolved from an initial idea of Robert Kronenburg, Professor of Architecture at the University of Liverpool, to explore the relationship between film, architecture and the city through a focus on one city, Liverpool. In partnership with Julia Hallam from the Department of Communication and Media, the project matured to encompass the ways in which Liverpool had been depicted in film from 1897 to date, with a particular focus on illuminating the work made in or by filmmakers about the urban landscape.26

A strong motivation underlying the development of the 'City in Film' project was the necessity to create an easily accessible online catalogue of films made in and about the city held in a wide range of private and public collections on Merseyside. In 2010 the database held information on over 1700 moving-image items ranging from short sequences to feature films.27 As well as the usual search categories such as title, director, production company, date and genre, wherever possible films have been viewed and their spatial content and use analysed utilizing criteria developed by Kronenburg in previous architectural history projects. The categories of spatial use included public buildings and spaces, commerce, industry, education, health, law enforcement and military installations. These were identified to accommodate the changing functions of buildings and spaces over time as the city responded to the twin forces of economic and social modernization and redevelopment. Using these criteria, a fine-grained analysis was developed to show how the landscape of the city has been spatially depicted and imagined across all moving-image genres at different times. The database enabled a range of questions to be asked that interrogate specific issues such as how iconic buildings and vistas, present in many of the films, figure in the making and marketing of place, the ways in which these symbolic icons are depicted in relation to changing conventions of amateur, professional and independent film practices, and how the consumption of place is inextricably entwined with this iconic cinematic cartography.28

A parallel strand of work has explored the relationship between film language and architectural mappings of the design of buildings and spaces. Many events contributed towards the City of Liverpool's 800th anniversary celebrations in 2007 and its tenure as European Capital of Culture in 2008.29 Working with local amateur filmmaker, producer and collector Angus Tilston, Richard Koeck created a montage of the city's history in moving images, *Liverpool: A Journey in Time and Space* (dir. Tilston and Koeck, 2006), that was shown on the BBC Big Screen in 2006. Of the celebrated 'that the birth of cinema shared with other emerging modernist projects, such as psychoanalysis, nationalism, consumerism, and imperialism cinema's emergence as a quintessentially *urban* set of practices has ensured that the city and the moving image have, from the very outset, remained inseparable constituents of the modern urban imaginary. The fascination and spectacle of the moving image experienced by early cinema audiences drew its strength and affective potency from the technological, perceptual and spatial transformations that were shaping rapid

processes of urbanization in large parts of the industrialized world at the turn of the twentieth century.30

While it is undoubtedly the representational spaces of the montage-based 'city symphony' that have played the most prominent role in forging the aesthetic and formal convergence of the filmic and the urban in early moving image cultures, a reappraisal of actuality film shot in urban environments – for example, 'phantom rides' filmed from moving vehicles such as trams and trains – has demonstrated the capacity of film to prompt renewed critical engagements with the lived experiential spaces that have defined the everyday landscapes of cities. As writers and filmmakers such as Patrick Keiller (2003, 2004) have noted, the topographic nature of early actuality material has furnished a largely untapped urban archive by which to navigate the cinespatial geographies of historical urban landscapes. As such, and as increasingly acknowledged across a number of academic disciplines, geographies of film can inform new historiographical perspectives on architecture, space and the urban imaginary, and advance new critical insights into the geo-historical formation of urban modernity.31

In this regard, Nezar Al Sayyad's aim to make the urban a fundamental part ofcinematic discourse and to raise film to its proper status as an analytical tool of urban discourse' represents a timely response to the limitations posed by much of the extant research on film and urban space insofar as this can be said to overlook (or inhibit) critical observance of the spatially embedded geographies of film, as well as, more crucially, the inter-, multi-, and transdisciplinary contextual framings shaping current debates on the city and the moving image.32

Edward Dimendberg, in *Film noir and urban space* (2004), claims that treating the city as expression of some underlying myth, theme, or vision has tended to stifle the study of spatiality in film noir as a historical *content* as significant as its more commonly studied formal and narrative features.33 Drawing productively on the work of spatial theorists such as Henri Lefebvre, Dimendberg and others highlight the importance of *spatiality* as a point of critical departure in the study of the city and the moving image, reinforcing the central contention of the need to situate the textual and representational geographies of film within the 'material and symbolic' fabric of historicized urban spaces. Problematizing the spatial – that is, 'mapping' the social and cultural processes by which ideas, perceptions and lived experiences of urban space are made manifest 'across different cultural and social contexts ranging from the actual city to its representations'– is thus acknowledged as both a prerequisite to and analytical focus of recent and emerging studies into the dynamic and multifaceted relationship between the filmic and the urban.34

It might be necessary at this juncture to qualify the above assertion that the architectures of the moving image are in some way analogous to those of the city per se. Karen Lury, professor of film studies and the geographer Doreen Massey (Lury and Massey, 1999) observe how discussions of place and space in relation to film typically presuppose, by default, links between cinematic space and that of the city, particularly in relation to questions of mobility and transit.35 The well-established figure of the 'flâneur', for instance, represents an embodiment of the quintessentially mobile, spectacular gaze of the urban (invariably male) voyeur which would find its obvious parallel with the emerging technology of cinema: a medium which rendered accessible hitherto un-navigable spaces of desire, mobility and urban spectacle. Yet, as Massey notes that one might (perhaps should) point to that other set of mobilities – the massive mobilities of imperialism and colonialism – which were underway – beyond, way beyond, the little worlds of 'flânerie' – at the same period of history. Other

'spaces' too were mobile. Moreover, in terms of mobility, the urban 'flâneur' has arguably left less of a mark on the geographic and cinematic imagination of the modern era than those forms of convergent mobility.36

In probing the relationship between the city and the moving image, therefore, the question of movement and mobility – and, by extension, that of 'time' and 'rhythmicity'– reinforces the essentially dynamic, affective and 'emotional' properties of urban space.37 Less a fixed or static representational form (exemplified by the Cartesian projections of architects, cartographers and city planners), film has inaugurated radically new perceptions and experiences of urban environments. Early film audiences were confronted with a spatial and visual phenomenology analogous to that which characterized the 'perceptual paradigm' instilled by the expansion of the railways in the nineteenth century.38

However, the question of mobility in relation to the urban also prompts further areas of consideration, how – or indeed *where* – we might draw the boundaries (structural, cognitive, geographic) that define 'the urban' and, by corollary, its representation in film.39 The 'massive mobilities' of colonialism and imperialism, which Massey refers to, for example, highlight the extent to which the panoptic spatialities (what Shohat and Stam describe as 'the I/Eye of empire') architecturally embodied in the urban fabric of cities such as London, Liverpool or Paris – were instrumental in 'turning the colonies into spectacle for the metropole's voyeuristic gaze.'40

By way of illustration, the geographic 'heart' of Joseph Conrad's novella *Heart of Darkness* is as much London (or, more accurately, the Thames Estuary from where the narrator Marlow's tale unfolds) as it is the Belgian Congo. Early actuality films of London supported the imperial message by focusing on London's monumental and ceremonial spaces in which the spectacle of an 'exotic other' was ideologically inscribed at the heart of the urban experience. 'Projecting the urban', in this context thus entails the mediation of relations of power reinforcing the spatial, cultural and geographic domination of the metropolitan centre over the 'peripheral' landscapes of the other. This observation applies with equal validity within as well as beyond national boundaries: in the UK, for example, the dominance of London and the South East over the otherwise peripheral regions of 'the North' remains a perennial cause of contention. 41 According to Lefebvre we should not regard 'the urban' as a coherent object or 'accomplished reality', but rather as a central problematic articulating some of the key socio-spatial contradictions that have continued to emerge as the spatialization of modernity and the urbanization and cinematization of everyday life.42 Lefebvre also claims that the urban phenomenon is made manifest as *movement.* The urban is defined as a place where conflicts are expressed.43

Roland Barthes's argues, that it is not so important to multiply the surveys or the functional studies of the city, but we should rather multiply' the readings' of the city, we need to develop a more 'fuzzy' and multi-layered semiotics of space, place and urban memory.44 In this regard, in terms of a cultural politics of urban space, Lefebvre's dismissal of visual imagery such as photography and cinema as 'incriminated media' would appear to have some currency. This contention is premised on Lefebvre's critique of what he calls the 'illusion of transparency' in which space is assumed to be open, luminous and intelligible; an assumption informed by the privileging of the visual and optic over other senses: where there is error or illusion, the image is more likely to secrete it and reinforce it than to reveal it. No matter how 'beautiful' they may be, images fragment; they are themselves fragments of space.45 For Lefebvre, then, filmic representations of urban spaces are potentially problematic insofar as they compound rather than expose the 'illusion of

transparency' and the spatial contradictions it otherwise conceals. From this standpoint, images fragment space and contribute towards the increasing abstraction and spectacularization of society, a critical approach similar to that advanced by Guy Debord's seminal *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967/1992).[46]

One of the defining characteristics that is shaping current theoretical directions in research on cities and the moving image is a more rigorous engagement with ideas of space and place. The much discussed 'spatial turn' that has exerted a dominant sway over social science and humanities research over the last two decades has brought with it an increased awareness of the socially constructed attributes of space, and the open and dynamic nature of spatiality as a constitutive element in the formation of structures of identity, place, embodiment, relationality and mobility, as well as everyday patterns of social and cultural practice. The spatial turn has been met by an equally decisive 'cultural turn' in spatial disciplines such as geography and architecture. Scholars from both of these disciplines are recognizing the role popular visual culture such as film can play in critical analyses of the relationships between virtual and material spaces, a trend that has also left its mark on film and cultural studies research more generally.[47]

Given the diverse and multidisciplinary nature of perspectives in which 'turn to space' is increasingly evident, as a generic marker of a shift towards questions of spatiality in film and cultural studies research, precisely what is meant by this putative 'spatial turn' is becoming increasingly difficult to reliably gauge. There has, therefore, arisen an urgent need to re-engage more closely with the material and empirical spatial practices underpinning the cultural production of textualities and representational forms (in both urban and non-urban environments). Foucault suggests that '[s]pace was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic. If one started to talk in terms of space that meant one was hostile to time.'[48]

By contrast, for others writing from a Marxist background, space has proved far from marginal or theoretically suspect. Drawing on the work of Lefevbre and Jameson all emphasize the crucial importance of space in contemporary analyses of postmodernity, globalization, and what Jameson refers to as multinational, or late capitalism. Space, for these writers, represents a key factor in the epochal distinction between the modern and the postmodern.[49]

If we explore more closely debates in architectural theory and urbanism where cinema and the moving image have come to exert an increasingly pervasive influence in terms of both shaping understandings and perceptions of cities, as well as, in a more material way, shaping the design and aesthetics of the physical urban fabric of (post) modern urban landscapes.[50] There is evidence of a growing interest in the *filmic* properties of architecture and urban environments (see, for instance, AlSayyad, 2006; Koeck, 2008b). This latter trend in research on the city and the moving image prompts the development of new areas of consideration as to the ways film and moving image practices have historically informed our understanding of architecture and cities. The volume *Urban Projections* is intended to convey the range of interpretations and critical perspectives that are shaping the complex bi-directional relationship between material and immaterial structures of the urban imaginary.[51]

This scopic affinity between medium and place can perhaps be explained by the fact that the emerging modern city seemed to naturally complement the ability of the cinematic apparatus to capture the city's defining characteristics: its architectural forms, movements, illuminations, as well as, of course, its people. Moreover, the

urban landscape provided a readily available resource for filmmakers to work with; a factor that is often overlooked in the well-established canon of work and critical orthodoxies surrounding the relationship of the city and the moving image. Nevertheless, film, arguably better than any other medium, seemed to be able to engage with the city's physical disposition – its simultaneity, temporality and ephemerality – in ways that had hitherto been only imagined. This symbiotic relationship between two emerging phenomena of modernity – the city and film – manifested itself not only in terms of capturing the spaces in 'transition', but also in the form of screenings to an urban audience. Internationally such early projections of urban life were made possible by entrepreneurs and early film pioneers such as the Skladanowsky brothers in Germany, the Lumière Company in France, the Mitchell & Kenyon company in England, and Thomas Edison in the US to name but a few. The pioneering endeavours of these and other early luminaries gradually turned film from being a 'scientific curiosity' and fairground attraction to being a 'seventh art' that would eventually transform the appearance, geography, and socio-spatial organization of cities (in the form of, for example, nickelodeons, leisure parks, film theatres and such like).52

In this context it is worth noting that, compared to modern, Dolby-Surround-optimized cinema complexes of today, early theatrical screenings were characterized by a far more active engagement of the audience with the images projected on screen. It is perhaps only at special screenings of long-forgotten archive or amateur footage that an almost dialogic connection between the audience and the projected film can be observed. Particularly noteworthy in this regard are screenings of film footage that make use of original locations (either in the form of the location that is seen on the screen or the location of the theatrical event where the footage is re-screened), which is one of a series of 'cine-spatial strategies' that found application in recent years (Koeck, 2008a). Such practices of participatory and collective re-enactment restore a sense of authenticity and 'aura' which not only offers a visual connection with the history of the city, but also an embodied experience of lost spatial practices that provides a unique window into places of the past.53

While the screening of archive footage in the ways described above contributes to a shared experience of the event, it also raises questions about the collective nature, and as such the physical presence, of the city itself. The aforementioned dialogic relation between people and place serves as a reminder of how much this alliance has become absent in contemporary everyday practices that are, by comparison, today characterized by ever more *passive* modes of socio-spatial consumption. Archive film screenings and similar events create an embodied space of memory in which forgotten practices, affects and experiences of the past can – albeit as mediated forms of what MacCannell (1976) terms 'staged authenticity' – be recreated and thus re-embodied as a collective space of representation and urban spectacle. Moreover, such forms of cine-spatial urban engagement highlight the extent to which, 'our real experiences of cities are "caught" in networks of dense metaphorical meanings'.54

A few years after Ricciotto Canudo (1911), Louis Delluc (1920) voiced a demand for film being regarded as an autonomous art form that comes to terms with its very own means of design (e.g. light, decor, rhythm). He introduced the term *photogénie*, which Jean Epstein relates to the theory of a fourth dimension – the medium's ability to manipulate space and time. It could be argued that it is this concept of *photogénie* – essentially a characteristic that sets film apart from other arts – that creates the terms in which filmmakers are able to use architecture and urban environments in such a way that they 'are enhanced by filmic reproduction.55 Commenting on the same phenomenon, Patrick

Keiller notes that the 'newness of spaces of the cinema is a product'. Patrick Keiller draws attention to the 'new, virtual world of cinema', which in its early years was, in terms of the subject matters and portrayed locations, full of extraordinary experiences.[56]

This observation finds application also from the perspective of a viewer of early archive footage today. When viewing film footage of urban landscapes, such as those by the Lumière Brothers or Mitchell and Kenyon, the medium of film creates a *spatial depth* that is different to that of other forms of visual representation. The framing of the location, the lack of colour, the richness of the picture contrast, the movement of the shutter, and, not least, the unedited nature of the footage render real spaces in a new light that is specific to the *magical* and photogenic properties of early film.[57]

Although the first three decades of the twentieth century are often regarded as the Golden Age of architectural modernity proved to be simply unbuildable in a politically charged and economically devastating climate. During the same period the film industry, on the other hand, often employed directors and designers who were architecturally trained and able to create imagined architectures and urban environments that not only benefited from the lack of constraints which modernist urban designers were otherwise confronted with, but which were also remarkable in terms of the increasing precision that characterized the work of this new breed of film professional. The German film industry was one of the fertile grounds for innovations in production standards and trick photography, employing miniature models, double exposures and mirror techniques.[58]

In fact today a series of scholars rising with increasing frequency from architectural schools have begun to specialize in the analysis of *projected architecture and places* found in feature films, but also in documentaries, city symphonies and computer games (Thomas and Penz, 1997), which they regard as a rich source for the contextualization of the architecture of filmic space.[59] Recent publications in film and urban cultural studies, such as Barbara Caroline Mennel's *Cities in Cinema* offer a pedagogical model of, in essence, 'how to read a city' through film.[60] While many studies have established that film can reflect a postmodern architectural condition, in which the 'real' city is conceived as inseparable from, or a product of 'reel' urban projections – the virtual and material converging in a parallel space of 'cinematic urbanism'– it could, by contrast, be argued that the postmodern condition in an architectural context is essentially filmic. This is expressed in two ways, both of which have a physical, yet in design terms vastly different implication.[61]

First, as Guy Debord notes in *Society of the Spectacle* and later in his *Comment on the Society of the Spectacle* (1990), we live as spectators in an unreal society in which the individual is reduced to a passive consumer of, among other things, the commodified spectacle of urban space. This *unreality* is supported by an acute sense of social, spatial and economic instability of urban centres which, in a visual context, and through the use of light advertisement and illuminated façades, has had a profound impact on our perception of architecture. While the beginning of this phenomenon is rooted in the electrification and commercialization of urban space increasingly powerful LED technology and daylight projectors lead to the shaping of city façades by the means of light and moving imagery that transforms cityscapes without the requisite availability of natural illumination. In fact, the operation of electric advertisements in city centres is only

limited, if at all, by the opening hours of retail shops or the calculated timemargin necessary for the efficient functioning of profit-driven and increasingly privatized consumerscapes of postmodern cities.[62]

The word *psychogeography* was increasingly in vogue in 1990s London, but what does it mean? It originated in 1950s with the French avant-garde, and revolutionary group, the Lettrists who later became the Situationists, and it first appears in Guy Debord's *Introduction to a Critique of Urban Geography* (1955), where a compact definition is given: it is the study of effects of the geographical environment, consciously organised or not, on the emotions and behaviour of individuals.[63] Debord adds that the adjective psychogeographical has a rather pleasant vagueness and anyone reading recent usages would discover that it is about Jack the Ripper, the Kray twins, Hawksmoor churches etc.'Cognitive mapping' means the city in our head with the places that have special meaning for someone, and what might just be called local history. Chinatowns, cemeteries and red-light disctricts all have their own distinct auras and this is central to psychogeography. Zones and quarters of a city are made up of distinct psychic micro-climates, places attract and repel us, or feel psychically warmer or colder, in a way that can be mapped. This emotional effect of place can be extended to single buildings or even rooms.[64] The feeling of place is inseparable from the meaning of place. Classic urban psychogeography could almost be said to begin with Thomas DE Quincey and it can be traced through the Surrealists, Walter Benjamin and the Lettrists and Situationists. But London psychogeography over the past 25 years owes less to all this and more to Iain Sinclair, whose work is inspired by a completely different tradition that surfaced during the hippy era.[65]

The centre of London shifted eastwards during the later 1980s, initially during new excitement about the City financial district. The concomitant reiscovery of the East End – which was to many people exotically unknown and unmodernised territory – was a further impetus to psychogeography. Due to prevailing winds and cleaner air in the West, eastern side of the Northern hemisphere cities tends to be the poor side, which in turn makes it the 'bad' side. East London (after south London) had long been the centre of immigration, and it was also associated with Jack the Ripper and the kind of period crmininality that has long been part of London 's image abroad.[66]

'Unspoilt' took on its modern meaning around 1925 as a response to urban tourism. It is a key word for understanding the 20th century with its assumption that places are ruined unless they are not. Bali has become sg of a paradigm here. Alex Garland's bestselling novel *The Beach* (1996, dir. Danny Boyle) featured the ruin of Thailand and a group of people prepared to kill to keep a particular beach unknown. The notion of secret has, of course, been recuperated to give guide books.[67] The value of the urban secret changed from era to era. The great secret of the late 19th century as the extent of poverty and degradation, giving rise to revelatory books such as William Booth's *In Darkest London* (1880) cf Charles Booth's map of London poverty.[68]

It is harder to be lost now than it was when Walter Benjamin wrote: 'to lose one's way in a city, as one loses one's way in a forest, requires practice.[69] Mobile phones will recognise your location anywhere in the country. Virtually unchecked forces have reduced London to a city of tourist spectacle. Places change. But London is being razed by sg more radical, in the erasure of place by 'space'. Overcrowding, property prices, cramped flats unsuited to 'clutter' and a not-unrelated fashion for minimalism all combined to make space an ascendent concept by the late 1990s. Place has meaning, but space is an interchangeable commodity.[70] Marc Augé's book *Non-places*

citiques the spread of the non-place and suggests that contemporary life trends towards the condition of the corporate lobby, cafeteria or airport departure lounge.[71]

As an inescapable part of our everyday lifeworld, walking is an embodied practice with specific lived qualities. It is also a mode of experiencing place and the city, and in this context is an aesthetic and insightful spatial practice. Through everyday walking we develop a sense of (and for) place. The everyday practices of walking vary in their purpose, pace and rhythm, and nurture more or less creative and more or less critical relationships to urban space. Walkscapes are rhythmic. Walking practices are constitutive of 'place-ballets', as defined by David Seamon, choreographed wholes of multiple place rhythms. As such, they impact on the rhythmical continuums of urban places, influencing and suggesting their tempo. This paper takes a phenomenological stance on walking. It starts by unravelling aspects and attributes of its character and continues by focusing on the experience of walking in the city and its relationship to sense of place. It explores walking both as purposeful activity and as creative and critical spatial practice. It distinguishes between three modes of walking: the purposive, the discursive and the conceptual. All three are inherent temporal practices of place.[72]

Walking is a mode of experiencing place and the city. It is a multifaceted activity and a temporal practice, which has an impact on design; as such urban walking has yet to be fully understood and engaged with. As a 'lifeworld' practice, walking is an unconscious way of moving through urban space, enabling us to sense our bodies and the features of the environment. Walking is an experience we are not conscious of, ignoring its potential as an aesthetic, creative or simply insightful practice. [73]
It is while walking that we sensorially and reflectively interact with the urban environment, firming up our relationship with urban places. Walking practices and senses of (or for) place are fundamentally related, the former affecting the latter and vice-versa.[74]

Walking is an ordinary activity in our everyday life in the city. As a necessary practice, walking is almost instinctively performed in urban space. It is an unquestioned form of movement through the city, often unnoticed, and not regarded in itself as being a particularly singular or insightful experience. Yet, it is through walking that we immerse ourselves and dwell in the representational and lived world. Looking through the eyes of a phenomenologist, walking is an embodied practice that incorporates four noteworthy aspects. First, and foremost, walking is not only a bodily movement but a behaviour of our lifeworld routine..[75] Secondly, everyday walking is above all a natural act, commonly performed with an underlying natural attitude, an absence of conscious attention.[76] David Seamon drawing upon the work of Merleau-Ponty (1962) relates the notion of body-subject, usually described by such words as 'automatic', 'habitual', 'involuntary' and 'mechanical.'[77] These attributes define walking as an act that is routinely performed. To reflect upon walking as a lived experience, we need to isolate it from context and reality, almost as if we could objectify it.[78]

Transnational films integrate the topography of metropolitan areas with the transnational movement of characters. The flow of finances hardly provides material that can be translated into the visual medium of film, so transnational cinema shows metropolitan areas in different countries connected by the various aspects of globalization: labor migration, international tourism, transnational commodification, postcolonialism, transnational education, transnational capital, and the transnational sale of body parts. Connected by narrative topics and representations of the city as a space of alienation and solidarity, the films show the visible effects of globalization and its subcultural and submerged illegal underside.

Endnotes for 4: City, Film and Topography:

1. Brunsdon 2007: 23.
2. Brunsdon 2007: 38.
3. Taunton, 2009: 1.
4. Taunton 2009: 2.
5. Portuges. 2008. Web.
6. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 12-13.
7. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 15.
8. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/new-students/newsfeed/0000-student-life-new/london-skyscraper-nicknames-explained. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.28. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 15-17.
9. Beier-Finlay 1986: 1.
10. McDonnell 1978: 34.
11. http://arcelormittalorbit.com/ Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.10.
12. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 19.
13. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 20.
14. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 20.
15. White, Jerry. *The Greater London Council*, http://www.lse.ac.uk/geographyAndEnvironment/research/london/events/HEIF/HEIF2_06-08/greaterLondon/white.pdf. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.04. also Kerr-Gibson 2012: 22. History seems to repeat itself as strong mayors of London have always been sores in the monarch' s eye. cf. Velich, Andrea. *Henry VII and the Lobbies of the City of London*. in Aetas, 1994/4. 27-53.
16. Cf. *The Pool of London*, 1951. dir. Basil Dearden. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0042851/ Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.12. also Kerr-Gibson 2012: 24.
17. Cf. http://www.londontraffic.org/dartford/ Web. Retrieved: 2017.01. 08. also Kerr-Gibson 2012: 24.
18. Cf. https://www.stpauls.co.uk/ Web. Retrieved: 2016.11. 23., also Kerr-Gibson 2012: 25.
19. Cf. https://www.theviewfromtheshard.com/ Web. Retrieved: 2016.11. 24. also Kerr-Gibson 2012: 29.
20. Cathcart Borer 1978: 1, Kerr-Gibson 2012: 29-30. cf. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/london-is-the-third-most-expensive-city-in-the-world-to-live-in-just-behind-billionaire-playgrounds-10422924.html. Web. Retrieved: 2015.07.28.
21. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 31.
22. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 32.
23. Cunningham-Barber 2007:175.
24. Freitas 2007: 177.
25. Cunningham-Barber 2007: 177.
26. Koeck-Roberts 2010: 1.
27. http://www.liv.ac.uk/lsa/cityinfilm/catalogue.html. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.05.
28. Koeck-Roberts 2010: 2.
29. cf. Belchem, John (ed): *Liverpool 800: Culture, Character, History*. Liverpool: LUP, 2006. http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1338174.Liverpool_800.Web.Retrieved: 2017.01.14.
30. Shohat and Stam 1994: 100.
31. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 1.
32. Al Sayyad 2006: 4, Koeck – Roberts 2010: 130.

33. Dimendberg 2004: 9.
34. Dimendberg 2004: 108.
35. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 1.
36. Lury -- Massey, 1999: 231.
37. Wunderlich, 2008: 13.
38. Cresswell – Dixon 2002: 5.
39. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 1.
40. Shohat and Stam 1994: 104.
41. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 1
42. Lefebvre 2003: 16.
43. Lefebvre 2003: 174–5.
44. Barthes 1997: 171.
45. Lefebvre 1991: 96–7.
46. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 1
47. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 2.
48. Foucault 1980: 70.
49. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 2.
50. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 2.
51. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 3.
52. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 4
53. Highmore 2005: 5.
54. Epstein, 1924: 314.
55. Keiller 2002: 37.
56. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 5.
57. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 5.
58. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 6.
59. Mennel 2008: 15.
60. AlSayyad, 2006: 32.
61. Koeck – Roberts 2010: 7.
62. Ken Knabb (ed): *Guy Debord: Situationist International Anthology*. Berkeley: Berkeley UP, 1981. quoted in Kerr-Gibson 2012:277.
63. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 278.
64. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 280.
65. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 283.
66. *The Beach*, 1996, dir. Danny Boyle.imdb. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0163978. Web. Retrieved.2017.01.14. Kerr-Gibson 2012: 286.
67. Booth, William. *In Darkest London*. London, 1880. cf. Charles Booth's map of London poverty 1889.
68. Benjamin, Walter. *A Berlin Childhood around the Turn of the Century* cited in Susan Sontag: *One Way Street and Other Writings*. London: 1978:10.
69. Kerr-Gibson 2012:290.
70. Augé, Marc. *Non-places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. transl. John Howe. London: Verso, 1995.
71. Wunderlich 2008: 2.
72. Seamon, 1980: 149.
73. Wunderlich 2008: 2.
74. Seamon 2000: 6-7.
75. Giorgi quoted by Seamon, 1980: 149.
76. Seamon, 1979: 41.
77. Wunderlich 2008: 4.
78. Mennel 2008: 201.

V: A Case Study: The representation of the Thames, London bridges and city benches in some postwar British London-set new heritage films (pp.47-55)

The Thames is 215 miles long but it is navigable only for 191 miles. It is the longest river in England, but second longest in Britain preceeeded by the Severn by 5 miles. The Thames runs along 9 English counties and there are 134 bridges along the river and 44 locks above Teddington. There are about 20 major tributaries still flowing into the main river, but others like the Fleet (at London) have now disappeared under the ground but is remembered about Fleetstreet. The Thames is a tidal river below Teddington (see the map below).[1]

The tides can now be much higher than in the past making a difference between 7.3 meters between high and low tides, with around 5,5 meters difference on average, while during the Roman occupation, it was only around 1 meter. The high tide in other words has risen greatly over the past 2000 years as south-east England is slowly (12 inches, ie. 305 meters by the century) sinking into the water. When this is combined with the water issuing from the dissolution of the polar ice-caps, the tides moving up the lower reaches of the Thames are increasing at a rate of 2 feet (0.6 m) per century. That is why the recently erected Thames Barrier will not sadly provide protection enough and another barrier has already been proposed.[2]

The Thames is in large now a domesticated river having been tamed and controlled by many generations. Metaphorically (and this is important in films and visual representation and thus frequently used) the Thames is a river of dreams but it is also a river of death and suicide. It has been called 'liquid history' because within it dissolves and carries all epochs and generations. They ebb and flow like water.[3] In *The Principles of Psychology* (1890) William James first coined the phrase 'stream of consciousness' in which every definite image of the mind is steeped in the free water that flows around it. Thus 'it flows' like the river itself. Yet the river is also a token of the unconscious, with its suggestion of depth and invisible life.[4]

Baptism (and so religion and afterlife) was once also instinctively associated with the river. The Thames has been an emblem of redemption and of renewal, of the hope of escaping from time itself. Sir Walter Raleigh wrote in his *History of the World* (1610) from his prison cell that the Thames is a model of human destiny, a mirror of mortality.[5] The Thames becomes the image of the nation, mollifying land and water in one capacious embrace, affording coherence and unity to disparate regions. It permits the growth and spread of a common culture. It creates harmony out of apparent discord, and in that capacity alone it has done more to establish the idea of Englishness than any other national feature.[6] The Thames has been a highway, a frontier and an attack route, it has been a playground and a sewer, a source of water and a source of power. It has been what the Romans called a 'public' river, but it has also been a scene of deep private contentment.[7]

Without rivers there would't be great towns since without them it is almost impossible to supply a vast multitude of people with things necessary for life. The Thames has created civilisation, it fashioned London. No one would deny the central importance of the Thames to London. It brought its trade and in so doing lent beauty, squalor, wealth, misery dignity to the city.[8]

Bridges on the Thames in London (Greater London) to link the north and the south banks of the river form an integral part of the city, the citizens and thus often appear in opening or closing sequences of London-set films either as part of the narrative or

just as part of the visual frame. Below I enlisted the present-day London bridges and in brackets I named the ward or borough of London the bridge is connecting and I also marked the year of the erection of the bridge in its present form.[9]

a.) <u>Tower Bridge 1894</u> (fromTower Hamlets to Southwark)
b.) <u>London Bridge1973</u> (from City/Monument to Southwark)
c.) <u>*Canon street Railway Bridge,* 1866 (from Cannon street, City of London to Southwark)</u>
d.) <u>Southwark Bridge</u> 1921 (from Queen street, City of London to Southwark, Bankside)
e.) <u>Millenium Bridge</u>, 2002 (from Queenhithe, City of London to Southwark, Bankside)
f.) *<u>Blackfriars Railway Bridge</u>*, 1886 (from Blackfriars to Southwark)
g.) <u>Blackfriars Bridge</u>, 1869 (from Blackfriars to Southwark)
h.) <u>Waterloo Bridge,</u> 1945 (from Westminster to Lambeth: South Bank)
i.) <u>Hungerford Bridge and Golden Jubilee Bridges</u>, 1864, 2002 (from from Westminster to Lambeth: South Bank)
j.) <u>Westminster Bridge,</u> 1862 (from Westminster to Lambeth: South Bank)
k.) <u>Lambeth Bridge, 1932 </u>(from Westminster to Lambeth: South Bank)
l.) <u>Vauxhall Bridge,</u>1906 (from Westminster/Pimlico to South Bank: Vauxhall)
m.)<u>Grosvenor Bridge</u>, 1859 (from Westminster to Wandsworth: South Bank)
n.) <u>Chelsea Bridge,</u> 1937 (from Kensington and Chelsea to Wandsorth: Battersea)
o.) <u>Albert Bridge,</u> 1873 (from Kensington and Chelsea to Wandsorth: Battersea)
p.) <u>Battersea Bridge</u>, 1890 (from Kensington and Chelsea to Wandsorth: Battersea)
q.) *<u>Battersea Rail Bridge</u>*, 1873 (from Hammersmith and Fulham, Imperial Warf to Wandsorth: Clapham Junction)

Bridges in cities, like roads, enable bigger physical-geographical and thus also economic and social mobility. When the City of London spread over her original boundaries, over the Medieval 'square mile' in all directions, immigrants – being no freemen of London to buy property or to have any rights 'inside' the City – settled on the south bank of the Thames, in Southwark. Southwark was outside the jurisdiction of the London Lord Mayor and his fellow London city fathers, ward leaders and judges, called aldermen and their body, the Court of Aldermen (wards are geographical-jurisdictional units, districts in the City of London) and it was both easier and cheaper for the immigrants to get settled on the less controlled south bank.[10] However, most of the industry (guilds and livery companies) and trade was carried on inside the wall, (wards 'within' the wall), in the City on the northern bank of the river, so crossing the Thames was vital for the newcomers. There were two main options to cross the river: by boat or ferry or through the bridge. The first bridge, the original London Bridge in Roman times served military purposes, as Roman London was built at the junction of two main roads runnning from east to west and from south to north. London bridge was originally built of wood but after several fires, it was rebuilt in stone in the 12th century.[11]

Other neighbouring 'suburbs' of the City of London included Westminster, seat of the royal residence and later of the Establishment represented both by the court and the Parliament, further upstream, but still on the Thames. However it was too expensive and exclusive for ordinary immigrants whether called 'foreign' or 'alien'(ie. not denizens or freemen of London) to settle. Similarly north of the wall, in Shoreditch, Smithfield and Moorgate the marshland prevented many from settling easily, thus the

south bank was the obvious and almost the only choice for a while. The other option later to settle was in the East End.

 Therefore crossing the river from Southwark -- whether by boat or on the bridge -- had symbolic significance in one's life to seek employment, fortune and a future, stability. This is an old trope deriving from the history of London, thus including a 'crossing the river on a bridge' sequence in most London-set films, as crossing by boat or ferry is as old and obvious a representational tool for filmmakers, as life in London itself. However, the representation of river transport (boat or ferry) is now often taken over by speedboats and yachts in postwar British films. I would like to cite two different examples, an early one is *Four in the morning* (1965), where a speedboat ride serves a social role, the protagonist is showing off to his girlfriend. Similarly in *Long Good Friday* (1980) Bob Hoskins' yacht represents wealth, is a status symbol to portray him as a rising visionary businessman, who would like to turn London into a postmodern world city. John McKenzie' 1980 film finally proved quite prophetic. The speedboat represents power and competition, often manifested in some chase scenes, sequences in films, eg. in *The World is not Enough* (1999), too.

So if the river and bridges stand for movement, transition and progress, what kind of movements, associated with the Thames, can we see in postwar British films? Contrasted with the static city skyline or spectacular river view, protagonists on the move often meet people at the river, or on a bridge, walking, strolling along the river, crossing the river, speedboating or just drifting, floating on the river just to name the most frequently represented forms of movement in films. On the one hand we can differentiate between the 'natural river' and the so called 'working river', on the other hand we can also witness the gradual transformation of the cinematic river from a 'place'(whether static or dynamic) into a 'spectacle' to attract and please our eyes.12

Read through the 'documentary gaze' in William Raban's documentary film *Thames Film* (1987), the river is both persistent and changing. In 1987 we witnessed the last days of the traditional British industry and of 'the working river'. When William Raban made his documentary film, *Thames Film* (1987), the brown poster of the film with the river and cranes still symbolised the 'working river'. By filming from the low freeboard of a small boat, the film attempts to capture the point of view of the river itself, tracing the 50 mile journey from the heart of London to the open sea. This contemporary view is set in an historical context through use of archive images and the words of the travel writer Thomas Pennant, who followed exactly the same route in 1787.Today this part of the river is already just a 'Site of Memory.'13

Similarly, when Wim Wenders shot *Wings of Desire* of Berlin (1997) we don't only see parts of the remaining Berlin wall, we have a view of the city, when metaphorically an angel is showing around (and escorting) the elderly man at the ruins, war damaged sites. In *Wings of Desire* Berlin is also presented as a 'Site of Memory.' Wim Wenders told in an interview: ''the fact that something was due to go is always a good reason to include in a scene. *Wings of Desire* is full of examples, almost none of the film locations exist any more starting with the bridge where the motorcyclist dies. That is gone, the place of the circus is now a park, no Potsdamer Platz or the Wall exist either.''14

City-set films often visually play around with and represent movement, transition and liminality (an 'in-between' state between movement and stability, as anthropologists including Arnold van Gennep and Victor Turner differentiate 'the three stages of transition').15 Metropolis-set films also heavily build on the above-described topography of the city and in the last years more and more frequently include scenes,

sequences at non-places (the term was first coined by Marc Augé), ie. ports, airports, stations, places to represent and underline transion in cities and citylife.16

Crossing the river can also stand for crossing the line (the threshold), with or without destinations, directions (often even with diversions). Movement and transition (both physical and social) relating to the river may include going either upstream or downstream, which can be a strong metaphor for the protagonists' social rise or fall. They are used in films just like staircases and lifts to represent going socially up or down, eg. in *Billy Elliott* (2000, dir. Stephen Daldry), when the strike ends, the miners are shown in the lift before descending again into the mines, and this is contrasted with Billy's social rise and appearance in the lead role of the Royal Ballett in the final sequence.

I would also like to contrast the representation of active and passive states in the representation of film protagonists. The movement, the flow of the natural river (the force of nature) is often contrasted with the stability of civilisation symbolised by the man-made city bench. The bench can symbolise the peaceful traditional English countryside, landscape contrasted with the city lifestyle in the buzzling city environment. People can, however, take a rest on the bench only for a while and in the next minute they must jump up to move on, or in some cases, must even run for their lives, and escape from the police like in Alfred Hitchcock's *Frenzy* (1972).

The bench traditionally provided place for two people (traditionally representing heterosexual couples), but today to express alienation in big cities, symbolically often there is just one person on the city bench in films. For example, we see Barbara (Judy Dench) sitting on the bench alone int he opening sequence, and a same-sex couple, Barbara and Sheba in the closing sequence of *Notes on a Scandal* (2003, dir. Richard Eyre). We also have the representation of people sitting on the same bench but sitting apart to mark either tension in or the temporality of the relationship (like Hugh Grant and the boy in *About a Boy,* 2000). We still often find seemingly happy couples on the big screen represented as sitting on a city bench (including Julia Roberts and Hugh Grant in *Notting Hill*, 2001) despite their social and cultural differences they try to bridge, but we also see arguing couples (like Jude Law and Juliette Binoche in *Breaking and Entering,* 2006, dir. Anthony Minghella) who fail to come to terms with their difficulties and thus cannot sit down together on the symbolic city bench.

I intend to argue below that the City view from the north bank, from the bench on Primrose Hill is not only different from the view from the south bank, from Greenwich hill, but also visibly marks the shift in the history of London from the postwar modern city to the postmodern global city, well-reflected in the different city skylines. From Greenwich we see the new 21st century postmodern city with the new skyscrapers, the Gherkin, the Pinnacle and Greater London, while from Primrose Hill we only see modern London with some high-rise blocks but no skyscrapers yet, and it is also a more distant view symbolising that we are (in the words of Thomas Hardy) *Far from the Madding crowd.* Below I tried to collect some postwar London-set films to illustrate how the representation of London is once permanent and is gradually transforming into the presently known postmodern skyline, the modern skyline with overwritten by the postmodern one with skyscrapers including the emblematic and symbolic 'Gherkin', London Eye and Millenium Bridge.17

It alway rains on Sunday (dir. Robert Hamer, 1947)

The film is set in Bethnal Green, a traditionally poor neighbourhood of London and follows the story of Johnny who has just escaped from Dartford prison. Postwar city poverty is shown both by muddy streets and food shortage.

Passport to Pimlico (1949, dir. Henry Cornelius)

We have the representation of landmark London to underpin the narrative, to highlight the sharp contrast of London, as the seat of the Establishment (images of Westminster are shown) and local London (Pimlico, portrayed as a pithole), in the plot metaphorically separated from London as if it was Burgundy, representing the contrast of the core and the periphery of the city.

Blue Lamp (1950, dir. Basil Dearden)

The film shows bombed London houses, poverty, children playing in muddy ponds and postwar food shortage, hungry men. A pistol, a murder weapon is found in the river/on the riverbank by children. They chase the murderer along Harrow road, London crossing the river on Ladbroke Grove railbridge. The bridge here is part of the narrative, not just a marker of some sort of change as from the 1980s.

Pool of London (1950, dir. Basil Dearden)

Andrew Higson labelled the *Pool of London* (1950, dir. Basil Dearden) Britain's 'Naked City'. The film's opening sequence shows London with St Paul's cathedral to mark the contrast between historical and indsustrial London, as most of the film shows the London port and docklands.[18] In the film a naive Jamaican sailor on shore leave in London's East End is dragged into a diamond robbery when trying to help a friend. The film features the debut performance of Earl Cameron - one of the leading black British movie actors working in 1950s and 1960s. Pool of London is one of the first British films to deal with mixed-race romance. According to BFI ''Ealing filmmakers, Basil Dearden and Michael Relph mix powerful social commentary with a tender love story in this tale of loyalty and friendship''.[19] After the river view and showing the London Docks in the final sequence, the ship is leaving London through Tower Bridge.

Four in the Morning (1965, dir. Anthony Simmons)
London is introduced with the Thames and the Tower Bridge and some peaceful strolling along the river before, in the following sequence, an unknown corpse appears from the river. Katherine Shonfield (2000) also underlines the centrality of the Thames to the film's structure and claims that in the extended central section of the speedboat river *trip* the river is part of the plot, it threads through each of the women's lives in the plot.[20]

Alfie (1966, dir. Lewis Gilbert)
We see London and the Thames at night setting the atmosphere of the film as Alfie, the protagonist is presented as a womaniser with intensive nightlife and many 'birds' in swinging London. For Alfie both the City and the night provide some shelter and disguise. Later on, Alfie is shown on the bridge at night again to symbolise the coming transition in his life (both in his family status and emotions) before realising he would need to change, as one of his girlfriends got pregnant, so Alfie will soon become a father and will thus soon need to decide which way to go.

Up the Junction (1968, dir. Peter Collinson)
In the opening title sequence we see the London skyline and the Thames, then we see

Battersea power station to mark that we are in south London. At the same time a rich Chelsea girl in white coat is walking on the bridge, crossing the river to date a man on and from the other side of the river. We are in in the 1960s London, more exactly in 1968, in the year of the revolution. Crossing the river symbolises crossing social bounderies, a very brave step in traditional class-ridden postwar England, thus here London and the bridge also represent progress.

Frenzy (1972, dir. Alfred Hitchcock) Alfred Hitchcock's *Frenzy* is about a serial strangler on the loose in Covent Garden. According to the BFI ''Frenzy could arguably be seen as Hitchcock's attempt to remain relevant in the wake of the 1970s surge in movie violence, but it remains one of his most characteristic films, complete with suspense scenes, wrongfully accused men, virtuoso camerawork and dollops of gallows humour''.[21] We see the Tower Bridge and the Thames, with Landmark London, but all of a sudden it is contrasted with the river bringing a corpse. In the introduction, the director, Alfred Hitchcock seems to floating on the river to highlight 'liquid history'. Besides the significance of the river and the riverside, there is also a sequence with the city bench. The suspect is on the run with his girlfriend and meanwhile they take a short rest on a city bench, before they need to run from the police. Here the bench could also symbolise a possible law court bench if caught.

Long Good Friday (1981, dir. John McKenzie)
We have several sequences representing the Thames. Bob Hoskins' magnificent white yacht (the future) on the river is contrasted with the Dockland cranes to represent industrial London in 1980. Bob Hoskins's speech, his prophecy that London will be the capital of Europe is also made on the riverbank. Tower Bridge serves as the visual frame. Tower Bridge represents old, traditional London, but with its gate open it might bring new possibilities into the life of the city.

Mona Lisa (1986, dir. Neil Jordan)
We see London Bridge at night in the opening sequence, the protagonist, Bob Hoskins is shown on a London bridge at night, crossing the river. Hoskins, the lonely hero is also shown sitting on the Primrose Hill bench alone.

Four Weddings and a Funeral (1994, dir. Mike Newell)
In the opening scene we see the view of the city and the river view, but unlike in earlier films, the river is already shown as a spectacle, not just a place.
The protagonists walk along the river, but not in the same pace, as part of the narrative, Hugh Grant who refuses to grow up and take responsibility, literally and symbolically is behind, thus he needs to catch up (and keep pace) with his American love, Andy McDowell.

Elizabeth (dir. Shekhar Kapur,1998)
In the Thames procession scene, we see the spectacular river, the river of procession and spectacle, but at the same time it is also the scene of a murder attempt against Elisabeth I, so from spectacle we quickly switch to the symbolic river of blood and death.

The James Bond Series*: The World is not Enough* (1999, dir. Michael Apted)
During the speedboat river chase there are no other ships or boats on the river, no sign of the 'working river', cranes or cargo ships to ruin the magnificant city view and river spectacle.

Notting Hill (1999, dir. Roger Michell)
In the opening sequence the male protagonist, Hugh Grant is just leaving a girl alone on the city bench, then a traditional intellectual local London is shown, the Portobello Road bookshop from outside and inside, Later on we can see Hugh Grant and Julia Roberts on a London park bench, sitting like lovers on the bench despite the social and cultural divide between a British shopkeeper (Hugh Grant) and an American film star (Julia Roberts).

Bridget Jones's Diary (2001, dir. Sharon Maguire)
Crossing the river symbolises a new chapter in Bridget's life, from her state of being single she is taking a step towards marriage, crossing the bridge, where the bridge again might just stand for liminality and change. While Bridget is walking on a bridge in the sunlight, old London symbol, St Paul cathedral is in background representing her past (and maybe a traditional church wedding, too).

All or Nothing (2002, dir. Mike Leigh)
This is not a new heritage, but a socialist-realist film from Mike Leigh. This is well reflected not only in the narrative but also in the use of the river, too. The protagonist, Phil, is a London cab driver, living with his wife and two adult children on an East London housing estate. He is always short of money, keeps borrowing even from his children. When, after an interesting meeting with a French lady, he gets confused and frustrated and he is crossing the river in his cab through the Blackwall Tunnel. The tunnel symbolises traditional industrial London, where Phil comes from. However, Phil, still decides to switch off his phone and to 'cross the river' through the tunnel to get out of town, to visit the sea (representing freedom literally and symbolically) to escape and to take a deep breath at the sea before he returns to his family and decides to change their life, work more, earn more and take the children to Disneyland.

28 Days Later (2002, dir. Danny Boyle)

This is not a new heritage film either, but a dystopia. The protagonist, Cilian Murphy is crossing a completely deserted London bridge spread with litter. Cilian Murphy is shown standing alone on Westminster bridge with no people just the Big Ben behind symbolising Westminster, the Parliament, the Establishment, the last signposts of London to remain.

Bend it like Beckham (1999, dir. Gurindher Chadha) and *Love Actually* (2003, dir. Richard Curtis)

The opening sequence of the new heritage film, *Love actually* (2003, dir. Richard Curtis) shows the arrival lounge of a London airport, in Marc Augé's term a non-place. The same is true for the closing sequence of *Bend it like Beckham* (1999, dir. Gurindher Chadha), when the families (both the Indian and the English families) see off their daughters to a London airport to fly to the US to become professional women footballers, and this dream and motivation helps the girls in the coming of age process and thus they are finally able to ('Bend it like Beckham') wave good bye to Beckham, and focus on their studies, football and real love.

Closer (2004, dir. Mike Nicholls) We see Julia Roberts and her partner sitting in the 'Panorama River Cafe' of Tate Modern Gallery across St Paul's cathedral, an interesting combination to show both old and new London but definetely with the intention to present it as being a spectacular city. Another sequence with the same

intention is to show Julia Robers and Clive Owen dating on the riverside with another breathtaking London view behind them.

Notes on a Scandal (2006, dir. Richard Eyre) We see the Primrose Hill bench with Barbara (Judy Dench), the old school history teacher sitting alone in the opening sequence (part of the narrative frame) and see Barbara with Sheba (her new potential lesbian partner or victim?) in the last sequence (closing part of the frame) with a breathtaking view of the city.

Breaking and Entering (2006, dir. Anthony Minghella)
Besides getting another spectacular river and city view, the Primrose Hill bench appears again in the final sequence with Jude Law and Juliette Binoche, when the lovers are breaking up near the bench, there is another couple sitting peacefully on the bench to mark stability and maybe even to represent hope for love and couples.

Fish Tank (2009, dir. Andrea Arnold)
It will be easy to prove that this is not a new heritage, but a socialist-realist film from Andrea Arnold, who is said to be the follower of Ken Loach. Arnold followed her superb debut feature *Red Road* (2006) with this similarly brilliant slice of social realism. Instead of the traditional spectaclular London skyline or riverview, Fish Tank' s opening sequence takes us to an East London Housing Estate. Mia, the 15-year old protagonist is also crossing a bridge, but this bridge symbolises Mia's coming of age story (Phil Powrie calls this film an alternative heritage film). We have some sequences showing the river, but either as a source of hobby (fishing) and food (Conor, Michael Fassbender teaches Mia not to be scared and even to catch a fish bearhanded to be later prepared and eaten) or as the river of death, when Mia almost kills Conor's daughter to take a revenge on him for his double life. Fortunately the little girl stays alive, as Mia int he last minute rescues her as well as herself from prison. Mia finally grows up, forgives everyone, which is represented by the scene when Mia, her sister and Mum dance together in harmony, literally stepping together in and to the same rhythm. According to BFI, „Shot in a claustrophobic 4:3 aspect ratio, *Fish Tank* is an incisive and unforgettable drama about longing for escape, positing Mia as an 'angry young woman' to rival the Angry Young Men of an earlier era of British social realism."[22]

BBC's recent London-set crime series: *Luther* (2010-16)

My last example for the representation of London bridges, sites and views is not a new heritage film either but a very popular crime series. Protagonist London 'copper' 'lieutenant DCI *Luther*' (Idris Elba) and his semi-invisible, but definetely sociopath partner, Alice Morgen (Ruth Wilson) often meet on Charing Cross Bridge to secretly exchange information to collaborate illegally. The bridge again is portayed as an in-beween, non-space, a grey zone, and enable a spectacular view of London, too. In Season 2/Episode 2 the 'Jack the Ripper' style sociopath, while killing people near Smithfield (the traditional meat market), Petticoat lane, speaks about the curse and dangers of Whitechapel, obviously referring to the legacy of Jack the Ripper and other London criminals. Some episodes of *Luther* build heavily on London legends, topographical stereotypes. In Season 2/ Episodes 1-2 sociopath twins start killing Londoners in some Docklands offices with a breathtaking London view in the background suggesting luxurious these new skyscapers might be, spectacular the view of London might also be, but they are no safe places despite their modern entry systems, CCTVs, round the clock security guards. The sociopath twins also threaten to explode London coffee shops, as well as a railway station. Spectacular London

might be in the 21st century, but it is still not a safe place sadly. London bridges might represent in postwar British films a city and citizens in transition for the better and for the worse.

<u>Conclusion</u>:

The new postmodern synchretic British heritage film of the 'Noughties' differ in many ways from the traditional history film of the 1930s. While in earlier history films we see a lot of traditional English landscape, countryside, palaces etc, postmodern new heritage films are frequently set in postmodern cities, in British films, they are mostly set in London partly as a reflection of our globalised world and transnational film industry, partly to appeal for a wider audience. They aim to attract both the audience of the traditional history and heritage films (mostly from southern English, middle or upper-middle class background and mainly women according to the research of Claire Monk, Film Professor of the University of Leicester) and the postmodern film spectators (who come from a wider circle, consume these films irrespecive of age, gender, class, race or cultural background). Emblematic London sites (both traditional sites and emblems, like St Paul, Big Ben, Westminster, bridges and city benches etc.) keep up the traditional English history mis-en-scéne, but postmodern skyscrapers rewrite the city view and skyline from the traditional to the globalised, postmodern and spectacular image of the city. In postwar British feature films set in London, the location is always marked by St Paul's dome and if we have a view of the city, it was mostly shot from Primrose Hill until the 1990s. However postmodern globalised London, London as a World City is now represented mostly with London Eye, Millenium Bridge, and some famous skyscrapers like 'the Gherkin', or 'the Shard', and even the city view has changed, it is now often shown from Greenwich with the new skyscrapers and new part of the city, the new Canary Warf and Olympic Park developments.

The Thames with all its multiple functions (enabling crossing, moving, sailing, transporting, speedboating, floating (as corpses) or fishing) is presented more as the 'natural river' on film today, either a place for pleasure (meeting, strolling, sailing, rowing, fishing etc) instead of the traditional 'working river' (represented by ships, docks and cranes) or is portrayed (esp. by the Thames bridges) as one of the city 'in-between' or 'non-places' (cf. elaborated in the theories of liminality, rites of passage and non-places/non-spaces by Marc Augé, Victor Turner, Arnold van Gennep etc.). City benches (also symbolically standing for traditional English landscape and values) are either empty in Cinematic London today, or instead of the traditional couples sitting on them, people are either sitting alone, or with their same-sex partners (*Notes on a Scandal*, 2003, dir. Richard Eyre), or sitting apart (eg. *About a Boy*, 2002, dir. Chris and Paul Weitz). Similarly boats, once symbol for trade and the British Emire, are now unused and in ruins and ashore eg. *This is England* (2006, dir. Shane Meadows), a great film with a symbolic title.[23]

<u>Endnotes for Chapter 5: Thames and London-set Films:</u>

1. Ackroyd 2008: 4.
2. Ackroyd 2008: 5.
3. Ackroyd 2008: 6.
4. www.britannica.com/art/stream-of-consciousness, James qtd Ackroyd 2008: 7.
5. Raleigh qtd in Ackroyd 2008: 8.
6. Ackroyd 2008: 9.
7. Ackroyd 2008: 9.

8. **Ackroyd 2008: 11.**
9. **Matthews 2008: 2.**
10. **Boast 1987:3.**
11. **cf. the History of London Bridge. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.17. https://www.thelondonbridgeexperience.com/timeline**
12. **Brunsdon 2007: 203.**
13. *Thames Film* **(1987, dir. William Raban) imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.05. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1725824/**
14. **Wings of Desire (1997, dir. Wim Wenders) imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.05. http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0093191/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1, Richard Raskin: Interview with Wim Wenders on Wings of Desire. It is images you can trust less and less.http://pov.imv.au.dk/Issue_08/section_1/artc1A.html. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.05.**
15. **Turner 1969: 94.**
16. **Featherstone 1991: 95-111.**
17. **https://www.ucl.ac.uk/new-students/newsfeed/0000-student-life-new/london-skyscraper-nicknames-explained. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01. 08.**
18. **Higson 2006: 56.**
19. **Pool of London, 1950. (dir. Basil Dearden. imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.02. http://player.bfi.org.uk/film/watch-pool-of-london-1950/**
20. **Shonfield 2000: 1.**
21. **Frenzy, 1972, dir. Alfred Hitchcock, imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2016. 11. 03. http://player.bfi.org.uk/film/watch-frenzy-1972/**
22. **Fishtank, 2009, dir. Andrea Arnold.imdb. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11. 02. http://player.bfi.org.uk/film/watch-fish-tank-2009**
23. **cf. *Womb*, 2000, dir. Fliegauf Benedek, a Hungarian film, where similarly an unused boat marks decline and a state of hopelessness**

BIBLIOGRAPHY: (pp.56-62)

Ackroyd, Peter: *Thames: Sacred River.* London: Vintage, 2008 Print

Al Sayyad, Nezar. *Cinematic Urbanism. A History of the Modern from Reel to Real.* London: Routledge, 2006. Print

Althusser, Louis. *'Freud and Lacan'* in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. transl. B. Brewer London: NLB, 1971. Print

Augé, Marc. *Non-places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. transl. John Howe. London: Verso, 1995. Print

Baker, Phil. 'Secret City: Psychogeography and the End of London' in Joe Kerr-Andrew Gibson (eds). *London from Punk to Blair*. London: Reaktion, 2012. Print.

Balázs, Béla *Theory of Film*. transl. Edith Bone, London: Dennis Obson, 1961, https://ia802307.us.archive.org/26/items/theoryofthefilm000665mbp/theoryofthefilm000665mbp.pdf. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.02.

Barron, Caroline. *London in the Later Middle Ages* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies* transl. A. Lavers London: Paladin, 1973. Print

Baudrillard, Jean. *Essays*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988. Print.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema?* Trans. Hugh Gray. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005. Print

Beaven, Alfred P. *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III - 1912*. London: Corporation of the City of London, 1908. *British History Online*. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.08. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/london-aldermen/hen3-1912.

Beier, A. L – Finlay, R. *London 1500-1700, The Making of the metropolis.* London: Longman, 1986. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. 1936 transl. Harry Zohn. (ed.) Hannah Arendt. New York. Penguin. Random House, 2005. Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.14. https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm

Bíró, Yvette. *Hetedik művészet* (*Seventh Art*). Budapest: Osiris, 2003. Print

Black, Jeremy. *Using History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2005. Print

Boast, Mary. *The Story of the Borough.* London: London Borough of Southwark, 1987. Print

Brunsdon, Charlotte. *London in Cinema: the Cinematic City Since 1945*. London: British Film Institute, 2007. Print.

Bruzzi, Stella. *Undressing Cinema* London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Carnes, Mark. C. *Past Imperfect: History according to the movies* New York: Henry Holt, 1996. Print

Cathcart Borer, Mary. *City of London: A History* New York: D.McKay, 1978. Print.

Cavell, Stanley. *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1979. Print.

Chapman, James. *The British at war: cinema, state and propaganda, 1939-1945*. London: I.B.Tauris, 1998. Print

Chapman, James. *Past and Present*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2005. Print.

Chapman, James. *Projecting Empire: Imperialism and Popular Cinema* London: I. B.Tauris, 2009. Print

Chapman, James. *Film and History.* New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2013 Print.

Clarke, David B. (ed.) *The Cinematic City* London: Routledge, 1997. Print

Cresswell, Tim -- Dixon, Deborah. *Engaging Film: Geographies of Mobility and Identity*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002. Print

Cunningham, Gail -- Barber, Stephen (eds). *London Eyes: Reflections in Text and Image*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007. Print.

Dave, Paul. *Visions of England. Class and Culture in Contemporary Cinema*. Oxford: Berg, 2006. Print

Debord, Guy: *The Society of the Spectacle* trans. Donald Nicholson Smith, New York: Zone Books,1994) Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.02. http://www.antiworld.se/project/references/texts/The_Society%20_Of%20_The%20_Spectacle.pdf

Derrida, Jacques. *The double session, Dissemination* transl. B. Johnson, London: Althone, 1981. Print

Dimendberg, Edward. *Film noir and urban space.* Harvard, Harvard UP, 2004. Print

Elliott, Andrew B.R. *Remaking the Middle Ages. The methods of Cinema and History in Portraying the Medieval World Views.* London: McFarland and Company, 2011. Print

Featherstone, Mike. 'City Cultures and Postmodern Lifestyles' in *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage, 2007. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12. 22.http://eclass.uoa.gr/modules/document/file.php/ Postmodernism.pdf

Finlay, Roger - Shearer, Beatrice Robina. 'Population Growth and Suburban Expansion' in Beier, A. L. -- Finlay, Roger (eds.) *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*. London, 1986. 37-59. Print

Fitzgerald, John. *Studying British Cinema 1999-2009.* Leighton Buzzard: Auteur, 2010. Print.

Fraser, George McDonald. *The Hollywood History of the World.* London: Michael Joseph, 1988. Print.

Foucault, Michael. *The Order of Things*. London: Tavistock, 1970. Print

Foxell, Simon. *Mapping London: Making Sense of the City*. London: Black Dog Publishing, 2011. Print

Gaddis, John Lewis – David, Christian. *The Landscape of History. How Historians Map the Past*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print

Grainge, Paul (ed). *Memory and Popular Film.* Manchaster: Manchester UP, 2003. Print

Győri, Zsolt (szerk.) *Fejezetek a brit film történetéből.* Eger: Líceum, 2010. Print

Hacker, Jonathan – Price, David. *Take Ten Contemporary British Film Directors* Oxford: Clarendon, 1991. Print

Harper, Sue. *Picturing the Past.* London: BFI, 2009. Print

Harper, Sue – Smith, Justin. *British Film Culture in the 1970s. The Boundaries of Pleasure.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2012.Print

Hay, James. 'Piecing together what remains of the cinematic city' in Clarke, David B. (ed.) *The Cinematic City* London: Routledge, 1997. Print

Hayward, Susan. *Cinema Studies. The key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Helsby, Wendy. *Understanding Representation.* London: BFI, 2005. Print

Heritage, Stuart. 'Hollywood's obsessions with biopics must be stopped before we get Madonna The film'. in *The Guardian*. 2016.12.13. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.14. https://www.theguardian.com/film/shortcuts/2016/dec/13/hollywood-obsession-biopics-must-be-stopped-madonna-the-movie-trump

Higson, Andrew. *Re-presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film.* London: Wallflower, 2006. Print

Higson, Andrew. *Film England: Culturally English Filmmaking Since the 1990s.* London: I. B. Tauris, 2010. Print

Hill, John- Gibson, P.S. *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print
Hill, John. *British Cinema in the 1980s.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1999. Print

Hipsky, Martin A. 'Anglophil(m)a: Why does America watch Merchant-Ivory movies?' in *Journal of Popular Film and Tv.* 22.3 (1994): 98-107. Print.

Hjort, Mette -- MacKenzie, Scott. *Cinema and Nation.* London: Routledge, 2000. Print

Hope, Murry. *The Psychology of Ritual.* London: Element, 1988. Print

Hughes-Warrington, Marnie. *History Goes to the Movies.* London: Routledge, 2007. Print

Humpherus, Henry. *The History of the Origin and Progress of the Company of Watermen and Lightermen of the River Thames*. I. 1514-1829. London: 1999. Print

Irimiás Anna. *Filmturizmus (A filmek és tv sorozatok turisztikai szerepének és hatásainak geográfiai vizsgálata)* Budapest: Akadémiai, 2015.
Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism and the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.* London: Verso, 1991. Print.

Jászay, Dorottya. 'Glossary' in Jászay, Dorotta – Velich, Andrea (eds.) *Film and Culture* 226-237. Budapest: ELTE, FSA Digital Textbook, 2016.

Jeffrey, Julie. 'Amistad. Steven Spielberg's true story' in *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 2001/1. 23-30.

Kállay, Géza. 'Being Film' in Jászay, Dorotta – Velich, Andrea (eds.) *Film and Culture* 5-18. Budapest: ELTE, FSA Digital Textbook, 2016.

Keiller, Patrick. 'London in the Early 1990s' in Gibson, Andrew and Kerr, Joe (eds.) *London from Punk to Blair*. London: Reaktion, 2003. 353-361. Print

Kerr, Joe – Gibson, Andrew (eds). *London from Punk to Blair.* London: Reaktion, 2012. Print

Koeck, Richard – Roberts, Les (eds.). *The City and the Moving Image. Urban Projections.* New York: Palgrave, McMillan, 2010. Print.

Landy, Marcia. *Cinematic Uses of the Past*, Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 1996. Print

Lay, Samantha. *British Social Realism from Documentary to Brit Grid* London: Wallflower, 2002.
Leggott, James. *Contemporary British Cinema, from Heritage to Horror.* London: Wallflower, 2007. Print

Lewis, Samuel. *A Topographical Dictionary of England*. London, 1831. Print

Mahoney, Elizabeth. 'The people in Parentheses: Space under Pressure in Postmodern City' in Clarke, David B. (ed.). *The Cinematic City.* London: Routledge, 1997. Print

Marriott, John. *Beyond the Tower: the history of East London*. Yale: Yale UP, 2012. Print

Marks, Laura U. *The Skin of Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment and the* Senses London: Duke University Press, 2000. Print

McDonnell, K. G. T. *Medieval London Suburbs*. Chichester, 1978. Print

Matthews, Peter. *London's Bridges*. London: Shire, 2008. Print

McKehnie, Kara. 'Taking liberties with the monarch: the royal bio-pic in the 1990s' in Monk, Claire – Sargeant, Amy (eds). *British Historical Cinema.* 217-236. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Interior Landscape: The Literary Criticism of Marshall McLuhan*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969. Print

Mennel, Barbara Caroline. *Cities in Cinema.* London: Routledge, 2008. Web. Retrieved. 2017.01.11. http://www.pixellized.com/assets/mennel---cities-and-cinema.pdf

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and the Invisible*.1968.Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.03. file:///C:/Users/Asus%20Eeee/Documents/Merleau_Ponty_Maurice_The_Visible_and_the_Invisible_1968.pdf

Miller, Toby – Stam, Robert (eds). *A Companion to Film Theory*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell, 2004. Print.

Mitchell, Neil (ed). *World Film Locations: London*. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2011. Print

Monaco, James. *How to read a film?* Oxford, Oxford UP, 2009. Print

Monk, Claire. 'Heritage film.' in *British Historical Cinema. (*Eds.) Monk, Claire -- Sergeant. Amy. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Monk, Claire: *From Political Critique to Online Fandom: Claire Monk on British Heritage Film, its Origins and Afterlife.* Web. Retrieved: 2015. 11.25. http://arts.leeds.ac.uk/screeningeuropeanheritage/956

Monk, Claire. The Heritage Film and Gendered Spectatorship. In *Close Up. The Electronic Journal of British Cinema*. Web. Retrieved: 2015.11.23.

Monk, Clair – Sargeant, Amy: *British Historical Cinema* London: Routledge, 2002. Print

Mulvey, Laura. 'A vizuális élvezet és az elbeszélő film. Metropolis - Feminizmus és filmelmélet' in *Metropolis* 4/4. 12-23. Print. (cf.in English: 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' in *Screen.* vol. 16/ 3.(1975): 6-18.)

Murphy, Robert. *British Cinema of the 90s.* London: BFI, 2009.

Noorthouck, John: *A New History of London Including Westminster and Southwark* **London: R Baldwin, 1773.** *British History Online* **http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/new-history-london Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.12.**

O'Connor, John E. *Image as Artefact: Historical Analysis of film and television.* **Harvard: Krieger Publications, 1990. Print**

Pidduck, Julianna. *Contemporary Costume Films.* **London: BFI, 2004. Print**

Plumb, J. H. *The Death of the Past.* **New York: Palgrave McMillan,1969. Print**

Porter, Roy. *London: A Social history*. **Harvard: Harvard UP, 1998. Print**

Portuges, Catherine. *Interview with Yvette Bíró, Interviews conducted in Paris, 5 July 2008 and in New York City, 1 Nov 2008.* **Web. Retrieved: 2017.01.21.http://yvettebiro.com/photos/interview_w_Portuges.pdf**

Reed, Nicholas. *Frost Fairs on the Frozen Thames.* **Folkstone: Lilburne Press, 2002. Print**

Reeves, Tony. *Movie London. Exploring the City Film by Film* **London: Titan, 2008.**

Reynolds, H. *The Churches of the City of London* **London: Bodley Head, 1922. Print**

Richards, Jeffrey. '**New Waves and Old Myths: British Cinema in the 1960s.' 160-178. in** *Cultural Revolution?: Challenge of the Arts in the 1960s*. **(Eds.) Moore, Bart – Seed, G. J. London: Routledge, 1992. Print**

Rosenstone, Robert. *Visions of the Past. The Challenge of Film to our Idea of History.* **New York: Harvard UP, 1995. Print**

Saunders, Anne. *St Paul's: the story of the Cathedral*. **London: Collins and Brown, 2001. Print**

Schneer, Jonathan. *The Thames: England's River.* **London: Little Brown, 2005. Print**

Shonfield, Katherine. *Walls Have Feelings; Architecture, Film and the City.* **London: Routledge, 2000. Print**

Seamon, David. *A way of seeing people and place*. **New York: Springer, 2000. Print**

Shohat, Ella – Stam, Robert. *Unthinking Eurocentrism. Multiculturalism and the Media*. **Hove: Psychology Press, 1994. Print**

Sobchack, Vivian. '**Surge and Splendour: A Phenomenology of the Hollywood Historical Epic' in** *Representations.* **1990. Winter. 24-49. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.25. http://xroads.virginia.edu/~DRBR2/sobchack.pdf**

Sobchack, Vivian. *The Persistence of History. Cinema. Television and the Modern Event*. **London: Routledge, 1996.**

Sorlin, Pierre. *The Film in History: Restaging the Past.* **Pittsford, N. Y.: Castle Rock, 1980. Print**

Szép, Eszter. 'Sequential Arts: Moments From the Parallel History of Comics and Film' in *Film and Culture* (eds.) Jászay, Dorottya – Velich, Andrea. Budapest: ELTE FSA Digital Textbook, 2016.

Stow, John. *A Survey of London. Reprinted From the Text of 1603*. Ed. C L Kingsford. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908. *British History Online*. Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.14. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/survey-of-london-stow/1603.

Street, Sarah. *British National Cinema*. London: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Street, Sarah. *Costume and Cinema. Dress Codes in Popular Film*. London: BFI, Wallflower, 2001.
Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's lost Renaissance.* London: Pimlico, 2000. Print

Stubbs, Jonathan. *Historical Film. A critical Introduction.* London: Bloomsbury, 2013. Print

Taunton Matthew. *Fictions of the City: Class, Culture and Mass Housing in London and Paris*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009. Print

Toplin, Brent. *Reel History: In Defence of Hollywood.* Lawrence: Kansas UP, 2002. Print

Toplin, Brent. *History by Bollywood: The Use and Abuse of Americal Past*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996. Print

Turner, Victor. 'Liminality and Communitas' in *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1969. Print

Vajdovich, Györgyi (szerk.) *A kortárs filmelmélet útjai*. Budapest: Palatinus, 2004. Print

Váró, Kata Anna. *A nemzeti identitás kérdése a brit filmben és filmtörténetírásban az 1970-80-as évek változásainak tükrében*. DLA. 2015. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.14. http://szfe.hu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/varo_kata_anna_dolgozat.pdf

Velich, Andrea (2016.a). 'The English Monarchy Film Revisited: From the Private Life of Henry VIII (1933) to Elizabeth (1998) and The Queen (2006).' 210-226. in *Film and Culture* (eds) Jászay, Dorottya – Velich, Andrea. Budapest: ELTE FSA Digital Textbook, 2016.

Velich, Andrea (2016b). 'Az angol történelem tanítása történelmi és kosztümös filmekkel' in *Kutatások és jó gyakorlatok a tanárképzés tudós műhelyeiből*. 203-214. (szerk.) Károly, Krisztina – Homonnay, Zoltán. Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó, 2016.

Vidal, Belen. *Heritage Film, Nation, Genre, Representation.* London: Wallflower, 2012.

Voigts-Vircho, Eckart. *Janespotting and Beyond*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag (GNV), 2004. Print

Walker, Alexander. *National Heroes: British Cinema in the Seventies and Eighties.* London: Harrap, 1985. Print

Walker, Dene. *British Heritage Films: Portrayal of Nationality and Modernity*

www.whatculture.com/film/british-heritage-portrayals-of nationality and modernity, 2014.04. 12. **Web. Retrieved: 2015.11.24.**

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form*. London: John Hopkins Press, 1990. Print

Williams, John – Brown, Nigel (eds.). *An Archaeological Research Framework for the Greater Thames Estuary.* Essex: Essex County Council, 1999. Print

Wood, J. - I. H. Smith (eds). *New British Cinema from 'Submarine' to '12 Years a Slave': The Resurgence of British Film-making.* London: Faber and Faber, 2009. Print

Wright, Melanie J. *Religion and Film: An Introduction.* London: I. B. Tauris, 2007. Print

Wright, Patrick. *On Living in an Old Country*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print

Wright, Patrick. *The River: The Thames in our Times.* London: BBC, 1999. Print

Wright, Patrick. *A Journey through Ruins. The last days of London.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print

Zemon Davies, Natalie. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1983. Print

Wunderlich, Filipa Matos.'Place-Temporality and Urban Place-Rhythms in Urban Analysis and Design: An Aesthetic Akin to Music' In *Journal of Urban Design*, 2013/ 18:3, 383-408. Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.28. http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1360918/1/10.1080-13574809.2013.772882.pdf

http://player.bfi.org.uk/britain-on-film/map/#/51.49949841/-0.1357375000/14/London// Web. Retrieved: 2016.11.30.

https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/elections-and-wards/Pages/default.aspx Web. Retrieved:2017.01.10.

http://arcelormittalorbit.com/ Web. Retrieved: 2016.12.10