View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Portsmouth University Research Portal (Pure)

# My Jewish London: Performance and Identity in Co-Creative Documentary Practice

**Searle Kochberg**

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Portsmouth.

**September 2019**

Declaration

Whilst registered as a candidate for the above degree, I have not been registered for any other research award. The results and conclusions embodied in this thesis are the work of the named candidate and have not been submitted for any other academic award.

Word count: 41,787 words

## Acknowledgements and Dedication

Film is a collaborative art form, and this research project put collaboration at the forefront of its creative aims. I would like to acknowledge the great help and support I received from a wide variety of individuals whilst working on this research project.

My first thanks go to six friends and collaborators who – with great enthusiasm – threw themselves into this research project. They are – in order of appearance – Josh, Roberto, Ed, Nick, Dave and Robin. It is quite an 'ask' in a world still rife with anti-Semitism and homophobia to request that collaborators appear on camera to communicate their (largely gay) male Jewish experiences on the streets of London. That they did so, and fed into the whole film project from preproduction through to post editing feedback with such generosity and creativity, I can only express my deep gratitude.

Secondly, there are the colleagues and students who helped me realise the films behind the scenes: thank you all. Particularly I would like to thank three colleagues in the Faculty of the Creative and Cultural Industries, Luke Robertson, David Kinnaird and Dave Jordan for their tireless support during the location shooting and editing.

Next, a tremendous thanks to my supervisory team at the University of Portsmouth for their individual and collective support, for saving my soul at times. Thank you Dr. Esther Sonnet for your keen eye, your clarity and focus, and Dr. Jenny Walden for your long-term overview of this project.

Finally, thanks to academics outside Portsmouth, in particular Professor Laura Vaughan of University College London and Dr. Yohai Hakak, for their generous advice to me over the years of research.

**This thesis is dedicated to my mum. As a gay Jewish son, I would be taking my life in my hands if it were not so! Thanks Mum.**

Searle Kochberg
University of Portsmouth, September 2019

## Abstract

This thesis examines the historical representation of Jewish London in U.K. mainstream documentary practice and finds a narrow band of conventional, 'authentic' narrative norms – safe interior spaces occupied by safe, stereotypical characterisations – that are exclusionary. The documentary archive holds very few examples that explicitly address *gay male* Jewish London experience. Through a co-creative practice-based research methodology, this thesis proposes a documentary mode of 'walking' films that challenges both the stereotypical Jewish identities previously represented and the documentary narrative structures used to construct them, and which facilitates more open, 'performative' configurations of identity. This PhD proposes an activist co-creative agenda to enable community members themselves to understand and provoke change in their representation. Issues of audience are central to the thesis: who is the audience for non-mainstream film practice? Do they differ from the assumed audience of mainstream documentaries, and how is that significant in terms of affecting social change?

**Chapter Plan**

Chapter 1 reviews the historical documentary film and television archive of Jewish London and identifies traditional narrative tropes and subject/object relations. The chapter speculates on the nature of audiences for the archive films.

Chapter 2 extends analysis of documentary's epistemological claims, its narrative/representational strategies with regard to encoded identities and its Sartrean encoded subject/object positions.

Chapter 3 looks to other theoretical models - primarily the phenomenological approaches of cine-ethnographer Jean Rouch and writer Maurice Merleau-Ponty – to establish a conceptual template for more active participation by social actors that might create more open and fluid representations of Jewish identity.

Chapter 4 examines the status of knowledge underpinning the proposed film practice methodology of the Filmed Personal Journey. This assesses the value of a conceptual destruction/deconstruction of 'authentic' Jewish identity and proposes instead the potential of performativity as a tool for social change.

Chapter 5 introduces the Filmed Personal Journey, a co-creative (after Cizek 2017) research methodology where the researcher/filmmaker works with communities on-camera in creative collaboration. By unseating the mainstream documentary orthodoxy of authorial filmmaker versus the filmed other, the content generated by the cine-ethnographic methodology challenges 'authentic' (hegemonic) Jewish identities, and offers new subjective understandings born out of the immediate context of co-creative experience.

Chapter 6 is formed by the seven co-creative 'walking' personal journey films.

Chapter 7 uses grounded theory methodology to analyse the co-creative data from the Filmed Personal Journeys collected in London public spaces. The analysis of the emergent field 'categories' further substantiates the claim that, by vacating mainstream documentary narrative treatments and exploring phenomenological *do*-ings on the streets of London, the on-camera collaborators 'place' their particular gay Jewish experiences in ways that contextualise Jewish London in new collaborative, de-centred configurations at the margins.

The Conclusion reviews the thesis to suggest that communities, especially those marginalised in mainstream documentaries, can revision themselves through creative collaborations located at the margins of recognised documentary practice. By vacating 'authentic' identities, narrative arcs and safe interior spaces, traditional audience positioning is also vacated, leaving 'place' for new Jewish social subjectivities to occur, ones that might lead to active changes in (self) representation from the community at the margins to the centre of 'authentic' representation.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements & Dedication i

Abstract ii

List of Appendices in Production File vi

List of Tables vi

Abbreviations vii

Glossary of Jewish Terms viii

Research Publications & Engagement xi

**Introduction & Guide to Thesis Presentation** 1

**Points of Departure (Chapters 1-3)**

**Chapter 1 History of Documentary Film Representation of London Jewish Identity** 4
Socio-Cultural Context and the Jewish London Documentary Archive 4
Interrogating the Archive 7
*Table 1 Chronological Summary of Jewish London Documentary Films funded by Mainstream Commissioning Groups* 8

**Chapter 2 Documentary: Epistemological Claims** 20
Narrative/Representational Strategies 20
Encoded Identities 22
Entrenched Subject/Object Positions 24

**Chapter 3 Challenging Identity in the Documentary Archive** 28
Identity: Essence to Experience 28
Emerging Subjectivities 30

**Journey (Chapters 4-6)**

**Chapter 4 Epistemology of the Filmed Personal Journey** 33

A Material Knowledge - Subjective, Relational, Local and In-the-Moment 33
Performativity: A Response to 'Authentic' Jewish Identity 35

**Chapter 5 Key Methodological Foundations for the Walks** 39
Identifying On-Screen Collaborators 42
*Table 2 Demographic Table of On-Screen Collaborators (London-based)* 44
A Particular 'Creative-Artistic' Enunciation: 45
The role of the filmmaker in co-creative practice 47
The role of on-screen collaborators 52
The tracking shot and the mechanics of filmmaking 53
From a definite safe interior space to an indefinite exterior experiential place 57
Ethics 60
A new approach to participant feedback: emotional map versus questionnaire 61

**Chapter 6: Seven Exploratory Co-Creative 'Walking' Films – on USB** 63

**<u>Points of Arrival</u> (Chapter 7 & Conclusion)**

**Chapter 7: Analysis of Emergent Grounded Theory Data** 64
Grounded Theory Methodology 64
Participants' Engagement with the Planned Shooting Protocol 65
The Particularity of the Filmed Personal Journeys 67
Jewish Experiences and Exterior Places: 74
Safe places? - home exterior 74
Hidden places - synagogue exterior 76
Ambivalent places - high Street 80
Ambivalent places - park 82
Non-places 84

**Conclusion** 86

**Bibliography** 93

**Filmography** 105

**UPR16 Research Ethics Review Checklist** 108

## List of Appendices in Production File

Appendix A: London Jewish Broadcast and Non Broadcast Documentary Archive

Appendix B: Broadcast TV Religious Programming Timeline (after Noonan 2008)

Appendix C: Collaborators' 'Emotional' Maps

Appendix D: 'Emotional' Map Transcripts

Appendix E: Completed Questionnaires by Collaborators

Appendix F: SK Field Notes on Production

Appendix G: SK Analysis of Collaborator 'Emotional' Maps

Appendix H: Signed Release Forms and Participant Information Sheets

Appendix I: Transcripts of Walks (Audios - unedited)

Appendix J: Faculty Ethics Committee Approval Forms and UPR16 Form

Appendix K: DVD of *My Jewish London* Films

## List of Tables

*Table 1: Chronological Summary of Jewish London Documentary Films*

*Table 2: Demographic Table of On-Screen Collaborators (London-based)*

## Abbreviations

Ashkenazi: Jews of northern European extraction.

A.H.R.C.: Arts and Humanities Research Council

B.U.F.V.C.: British Universities' Film and Video Council

B.K.Y.: Beit Klal Yisrael (Synagogue)

C.L.A.S.P.: Camden L.G.B.T.+ Advice and Safety Project

C.S.T.: Community Security Trust

E.D.P.: Empowering Design Practices

F.R.A.: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

G.J.I.L.: Gay Jews in London

I.S.A.: International Sociological Association

J.G.L.G.: Jewish Gay and Lesbian Group

J.P.R.: Jewish Policy Research

L.G.B.T.+: Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender +

L.J.C.C.: London Jewish Culture Centre, now merged with JW3, North London's Jewish community centre and arts venue

L.J.S.: Liberal Jewish Synagogue

L.M.A.: London Metropolitan Archive

R.J.: Rainbow Jews

R.R.: Ritual Reconstructed

W.L.S.: West London Synagogue

## Glossary of Jewish Terms

Ark: ornamental closet in the sanctuary of the synagogue which contains the Torah scrolls.

Bar Mitzvah: Aramaic and Hebrew for 'son' and 'commandment' respectively. A rite of passage ceremony for Jewish males, normally held at the age of 13, after which the boy is responsible for performing adult Jewish commandments. Female equivalent is the bat mitzvah.

Beit Klal Yisrael: Hebrew for 'the house of the Jewish people'.

Board of Deputies: quasi-parliamentary U.K. Jewish body in which 'deputies' represent synagogues and community centres.

Brit Ahava: Hebrew for 'Covenant of Love'. A guideline for L.G.B.T.+ weddings drafted by Mark Solomon for Liberal Judaism, and published before same-sex unions were legalised in England (2004).

Chanukah: Jewish Festival of Light, celebrated in December.

Chavurah: Hebrew for 'fellowship', where Jews meet informally for prayer or discussion.

Eruv: Hebrew for 'intermingling', normally used to describe a ritual enclosure in a public area within which Orthodox Jews can carry or push objects (like prams) normally forbidden in public on the Sabbath.

Haredi: a member of any number of Ultra-Orthodox Jewish sects who adhere strictly to Jewish religious law.

Hasidic: used synonymously with Haredi. Transliteration, and derived from the Hebrew word for 'piety'.

JW3: the Jewish Community Centre, London. This organisation opened in North London in 2013, and absorbed the older existing 'London Jewish Cultural Centre', also based in Hampstead.

Kehillah: Hebrew for 'congregation' or 'community'.

Keshet: Hebrew for 'rainbow'.

Kippah: Hebrew for 'skullcap' worn by Jewish men (and some women in Progressive Judaism) to fulfil the Jewish law which requires that the head be covered.

Klezmer: Yiddish term describing a genre of Eastern European Jewish music.

Knesset: Hebrew for 'listen', the term used for the Israeli parliament.

Magen David: Hebrew for 'Star of David', the symbol of Judaism.

Masorti: Hebrew word for 'traditional'. In the U.K. the term denotes a branch of Judaism that is liturgically 'Orthodox', but socially 'Progressive'. It is the equivalent of Conservative Judaism in the U.S.A..

Matzo: Hebrew word for 'unleavened bread' eaten at the spring festival of Pesach (Hebrew for 'Passover').

Menorah: Hebrew for 'lamp', and generally referring to a candelabra used in Jewish ritual.

Mezuzah: Hebrew for 'doorpost' – a small rectangular box attached to the top right of the door frame containing a scroll with a Jewish prayer on it.

Mikvah: Hebrew for religious ritual bath.

Minhag Anglia: an informal and unsystematic policy advocated by Modern Orthodox Jewish leaders in the U.K. to affect an anodyne blend of Jewishness and Britishness.

Mizrahi: Jews of Middle Eastern backgrounds.

Payot: Hebrew for 'side locks' worn by Ultra-Orthodox Jewish and boys.

Pesach: Hebrew for 'Passover' – a week-long festival marking the biblical story of the exodus of the Jews from ancient Egypt.

Progressive Judaism: encompassing the U.K. Liberal and Reform Jewish Communities.

Purim: Hebrew for 'lots'. An early spring festival marked by dressing up, cross dressing and partying.

Rosh Hashanah: Hebrew for 'head of the year', i.e. the New Jewish Year, falling in the early autumn, and one of the Holiest festivals in the Jewish calendar.

Seder: Hebrew for 'order', and a ritualistic evening of storytelling, singing and eating marking the beginning of Pesach.

Sephardi: Jews of Portuguese and Spanish backgrounds.

Shabbat: Hebrew word for 'Sabbath'.

Shabbes: Yiddish word for 'Sabbath'.

Sheitel: Yiddish word for 'wig' worn by Orthodox Jewish women as a sign of modesty.

She 'ma: Hebrew word for 'hear', and the first word of an important prayer ('Hear, O Israel…') recited at morning and evening prayers.

Shofar: A ram's horn blown ritualistically to signal the pact Jews make with God around the time of the Jewish New Year.

Shule: Yiddish term (colloquial) signifying the synagogue.

Shutafut: Hebrew word for 'partnership', and a term that was appropriated by members of the Masorti religious community for blessings of same-sex partnerships before they adopted same-sex marriage in 2017.

Tallit: a Jewish prayer shawl worn by men (and women in Progressive Judaism).

Tanakh: the Old Testament or Hebrew Bible, and a Hebrew acronym made up of letters of its three subdivisions – the Torah (the 5 books of Moses), the Nevi'im (the books of the Prophets), and Ketuvim (books collectively referred to as the Writings).

Tashlich: Hebrew for 'casting off' – a ritual enacted during Rosh Hashanah, marking the casting off of sins. The ritual involves casting breadcrumbs into a stream of water.

Tefillin: Ancient Greek root, meaning 'to guard' or 'to protect'. Black boxes on leather straps containing scrolls with psalms from the bible, worn on the arms and head by men during Orthodox Morning Prayer.

To'eivah: Hebrew word for 'abomination'.

Torah: Hebrew word for 'the law', and the Jewish term for the 5 books of Moses.

United Synagogue: the branch of Judaism that best exemplifies Modern Orthodox Judaism in the U.K..

## Research Publications & Engagement

Kochberg, S. (2016). Report. Ritual Reconstructed Project, 2014-2015. *Jewish Film & New Media*, Volume 4, Number 2, Fall 2016, pp. 186-191.

Kochberg, S. (2016). *Let Me Take You by the Hand: space/place film collaborations with London Gay Jews.* Screening and research discussion at the Vienna meeting of the International Sociological Association.

Greenfields, M., Kochberg, S., Milne, E.J., Rathgeber Knan, S.S. (2016, July). *Reconstructing Rituals: Using bricolage to (re)negotiate faith based rituals with the Jewish L.G.B.T.+ community*. Paper presented at the Vienna meeting of the International Sociological Association.

Kochberg, S. (2015). Filming for the Ritual Reconstructed Project. *International Sociological Association Visual Sociology Working Group Newsletter*, no.10, pp.14-17.

Milne, EJ, Greenfields, M, Rathgeber Knan, SS, Kochberg, S. (2015). *Exploring and Documenting Jewish Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex (LGBTQI) Narratives through Ritual Bricolage*. Paper presented at the IVM4 conference, University of Brighton.

Kochberg, S. (2015). *Let Me Take You by the Hand: space/place film collaborations with London Gay Jews.* Paper presented at the IVM4 conference, University of Brighton.

Kochberg, S. (2015). *Soundings and Findings in the R.R. project*. Paper presented at Soundings and Findings, Connected Communities, A.H.R.C., University of East Anglia.

Kochberg, S. (Director and Producer). (2014-2015). *Ritual Reconstructed: Transgender day of Remembrance, World Aids Day, Purim Spiel, Purim Panel Discussion, Pride Seder*. United Kingdom: A.H.R.C.

Kochberg, S. (Director and Producer). (2013-2014). *Rainbow Jews*: *oral history project*. 8 films and 2 TV shows. United Kingdom: National Lottery Heritage Fund.

Kochberg, S. (2014). *Finding place in [sub]urban space: Gay Jewish Male life stories filmed on the streets of London*. Paper presented at Geography, Film, and Visual Culture symposium, King's College London.

Kochberg, S. (2014). *Let me take you by the hand and lead you through the streets of London: Gay Jewish Male Provocations*. Paper presented at Performance, Place, Possibility in Contemporary Urban Contexts, University of Leeds.

Kochberg, S. (2013). *Cine-Ethnography to Auto-Ethnography: questions of self-representation in the London Jewish Male Gay community*. Paper presented at International Visual Sociology Association 2013*,* Goldsmiths College, London.

Kochberg, S. (2013) *My Jewish London*. Paper presented at MeCCSA Conference*,* University of Ulster, Derry.

# Introduction

The *My Jewish London* research project presented here comprises seven exploratory ethnographic documentaries and a written thesis which works explicitly in dialogue with them. Extrapolating from the Australian *Creativity and Cognition Studios*, this research project is identified as practice-based research 'where some of the resulting knowledge is embodied in an artefact'.[1] The documentaries produced are conceived very much as a working through of qualitative, inductive research where the practical exploration of authorship, documentary form and structure and representation are undertaken in an attempt to address the question, 'How might filmed personal journeys [the speculative format to be explored] be used to contest the constrictions of identity, place and geography forged in traditional documentary practice?'

The intellectual process of the filmmaking is reflexive, with the researcher continually asking questions of the documentary-making process from the research and development stage onwards. Although the 'significance and context' of the research's original knowledge is worked through in the reflective exegesis, 'a full understanding' of that knowledge 'can only be obtained with reference to the artefact itself.'[2] It is through continual scrutiny of filmic methods, including the nature of the creative collaboration with the on-screen subject and the nature of the film language used, that knowledge emerges for the researcher/filmmaker. At this early stage it is useful to consider why practice-based research seems a fruitful way to unpack an enquiry into Jewish London documentary and its preponderance towards stereotyping. A historical film studies research methodology might have been a way forward, as none of the Jewish London documentary archive has ever been systematically catalogued or analysed before. In a sense that has been done here, if only to understand the nature of conventional Jewish representation. Research into U.K. Broadcast policy has also helped to put into context existing representations as most of the films in the archive until the recent past were commissioned by TV broadcasters. As a researcher/filmmaker however, with a substantial background in Jewish community media projects, it was not enough for me to analyse what was wrong with existing mainstream documentaries, but to explore creative working methods that might move beyond the constrictions of conventional Jewish identities and Jewish London enclaves on-screen. In this regard I have been assisted considerably by an Arts and Humanities

[1] https://www.creativityandcognition.com/research/practice-based-research/

[2] ibid

Research Council (A.H.R.C.) research project which has run concurrently with this research, a project devised by me and on which I was a co-investigator. The films made for *Ritual Reconstructed* (2014-15)[3] are creative collaborations with L.G.B.T.+ London Jews and use cine-ethnographic techniques to capture Jewish ritual reworked or 'reconstructed' by the community (after the Jewish theological reformist tradition of Reconstructionism, discussed later in this thesis (Kaplan 2010)). However, the filmed ritual in the A.H.R.C. research project plays itself out in the conventional, safe spaces of synagogues, community centres and people's homes. Just like the mainstream Jewish London documentaries, safety seems an inherent quality in the work. *My Jewish London* on the other hand explores creative cine-ethnographic collaborations with the Jewish community through filmed personal journeys played out in the public spaces of London where Jews also live out lives, and where we negotiate our lives on a daily basis. In this endeavour, the research has adapted techniques from earlier, highly innovative 'street' cine-ethnographers, primarily Jean Rouch.

## Guide to thesis presentation

For reviewers of the practice-based research presented here, it is important to navigate through the films and written thesis in a manner that moves back and forth between the two, and not in a straightforward, consecutive way. This is so that in some way the reviewer will be tracing the exploratory path taken in the research project itself.

The first section of the exegesis, Points of Departure (chapters 1-3), should be read first. Here for the first time a chronology of Jewish London documentary made for mainstream commissioning groups is established, starting with films commissioned and produced in the 1960s. Why this point of departure? It was only around 1960 that 'modern' documentary as we understand it became commonplace in the mainstream media. This mode of representation is for the most part an admixture of a rhetorical style that owes its origins to print journalism – prescribed scripts, narrative arcs, hypotheses, voiceover narration (referred to as 'expository' documentary by Nichols[4]), and a model of filmmaking known as fly-on-the-wall documentary (referred to as 'observational' and

[3] Between 2014 and 2015 research for *R.R.* was 'funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) under the Connected Communities programme http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funding-Opportunities/Research-funding/Connected-Communities/Pages/Connected-Communities.aspx. The project is a collaboration between Liberal Judaism, Buckinghamshire New University; University of Portsmouth and The Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations at Coventry University'. (see www.ritualreconstructed.com).

[4] Nichols 1991

‘interactive’ documentary styles by Nichols[5]), a style that owes its origins to ethnographic film, and the miniaturisation of film kit and sync sound. Questions of the use of film as a humanities research tool are raised to frame the exploration of how more fluid and heterogeneous constructions of ‘identity’ can form out of new, co-creative (after Cizek, 2017) documentary practices to point to the direction of travel in the thesis.

After Points of Departure, the two written chapters (4 & 5) comprising the first part of the Journey should be read, where the research methodology is outlined. Then the seven exploratory films (chapter 6) continues the Journey and should be viewed in the exploratory theoretical/practice context now established. After viewing the films, the reviewer should return to the written thesis and to the section Points of Arrival (chapters 7 & Conclusion) which analyses the results and insights arising from data sets in the films identified from field data.

[5] Ibid. The difference in the modes of address is that interactive acknowledges the presence of the filmmaker, ‘observational’ does not.

# Points of Departure

## Chapter 1 A History of Documentary Film Representation of London Jewish Identity

### Socio-Cultural Context and the Jewish London Documentary Archive

The population of Jews in the U.K. is very small, only around 300,000, with about 2/3rds of Britain's Jews living in Greater London, making its Jewish population around 200,000 (Graham 2013a). And as the city with the largest gay and Jewish communities in the U.K. - with all of the major (L.G.B.T.+) Jewish organisations based here - London exerts a tremendous centripetal force on Jews and gays alike, reflected in films made about them. To a large degree, therefore, studying a subset of U.K. Jewish representation in documentary practice means studying Jewish London and Londoners on film.

As a term particular to the U.K. Jewry, 'Modern Orthodox' is understood as synonymous with traditional orthodox religious and cultural practice in the private sphere and integration in the public sphere. In the privacy of the home and synagogue, this translates as traditional Hebrew liturgy, separation of men and women at synagogue, men leading the prayers, kosher food etc.. The Chief Rabbi represents this community of Jews, who attend so called 'United' synagogues. In terms of numbers, their membership is the largest and most powerful in the U.K. As a U.K. religious identity label, 'Modern Orthodox' is to a large degree synonymous with the ideological construct the US-based Boyarin Brothers identify as 'authentic Judaism' (Boyarin & Boyarin 1993). The much-noted tendency in U.K. documentary to picture Jewish London life behind the safety of closed doors – as described below - is driven in part from the publicly reserved profile of the Jewish London Modern Orthodox community itself.

The circumspect attitude of U.K. Jewry in the public sphere is a well-documented phenomenon. It is seen to relate to the small size of the U.K. Jewish population, the assimilation of Jews into the wider U.K. population, and – since the 1967 Six Day War particularly, when the Israeli army first occupied the West Bank and Gaza - a rising tide of perceived antisemitism in the U.K. (see for instance Kahn

Harris and Gidley 2010). If the former Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sachs (1991-2013)[6] has made anti-assimilation and anti-Semitism his two main rallying cries in defence of 'the' U.K. Jewish community in recent years, a feeling of uncertainty, and a wanting to assimilate, to blend in, has led to what Brook has called a 'self-effacement' leading to 'timidity, the bedfellow of mediocrity.' (Brook 1989: 412). Abrams in his writings has referred to 'Minhag Anglia', a Hebrew term meaning 'the tradition of England', and an informal policy advocated by Modern Orthodox Jewish leaders in the U.K. to affect an anodyne blend of Jewishness and Britishness, to effectively hide away – a world away from the ultra-Orthodox and highly visible Haredi Jews. The cumulative result has been an unsystematic, informal attitude by Modern Orthodox Jews to effectively relocate 'Judaism in the private sphere' (Abrams 2010: 62). Abramson in her unpublished PhD thesis on Jewish London youth groups (Abramson 2010) is clear that she too sees private, interior 'safe' space as a key factor in the assertion of Jewish identity. But Jewish enclaves – formal and informal - are visible and pervade across London public spaces. By placing (gay male) Jews in their self-identified public 'Jewish London' cinematic environments, this research project immediately offers a direct challenge to the stereotype of the traditional Jew behind closed doors, a direct challenge to the safe, conservative Jewish policy of 'Minhag Anglia'.

Most of the archival documentary films discussed below were commissioned under the remit of U.K. TV religious programming, or 'minority' (in this case ethnic) TV programming, and the BBC and Channel 4 have been recognised as standard setters in both (Noonan 2008: 27). The brief historical timeline I have used below is adapted from the 2008 PhD thesis of Caitriona Noonan on *The Production of Religious Programming: The Case of the BBC* (Noonan 2008)[7]. To paraphrase Noonan's central idea, the landmarks in religious programming since the '60s are:

- 1962 The Pilkington Report heralds the birth of BBC2 - a station for minority interest programming (Noonan 2008: 76).
- 1977 The Annan Committee Report proposes the setting up of Channel Four, diversity programming and independent production in TV broadcasting (ibid: 81).
- 1981 the BBC Annual Report advocates the making of documentaries as part of religious programming (ibid: 86). 1982 (Channel4)

[6] Former Chief Rabbi of the 'United' Modern Orthodox movement in the U.K. – the predominant Jewish movement in the U.K. in terms of members.
[7] See Appendix B.

- 1990 heralds a shift to the (BBC) outsourcing of programme commissions to independent producers, and with it greater potential diversity in creative approaches.

The post 1990 changes in U.K. broadcast policy – driven by a move to a market-led media economy – have led to a 'softening' of approaches to documentary content, and particularly from the Noughties onwards to a commissioning focus around three narrative 'pillars' (strategies, values – an advertising term): the personality led factual documentary/ reality TV show such as *Jewish Mum of the Year* (Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012); the spiritual 'journey' genre such as *Jews* (Wall & Engle, 2008); and the big budget, prestige 'landmark' series such as *History of the Jews* (Schama & Kent, 2013).

Before the archive collection consists of films made for commissioning groups that are central sources of funding for U.K. mainstream documentary: TV broadcasters, the BBC and C4 particularly, and the BFI. Only in a minority of cases (the *Rainbow Jews* and *Ritual Reconstructed* films) were films commissioned as part of publicly funded research projects. For the most part the archive films are responses to commissioned briefs of broadcasters with clear agendas and intent.

Mainstream commissioners 'naturally' fund films that dispense conventional wisdom and stereotypes rather than more exploratory content with innovative narrational devices. Besides the constraints of time and money, the conventional hallmarks of mainstream content must also reach the traditional audiences of religious-content documentary, i.e. older middle class audiences drawn to the middle-brow didactic content. Since the 1990s, the films of the archive have increasingly targeted 'lean-back' audiences rather than the more 'lean-forward' engaged audiences or 'viewsers' - viewers-cum-users - who potentially might be driven to action by what they see (Kochberg 2012: 34) – and in the bargain generates predictable results. Over time, It is the mainstream documentary there has been a noticeable shift away from more 'hard' documentary on Jewish experience (i.e. rigorous, hard hitting, well researched) to increasingly 'soft' (popular, entertainment driven) narration and style.

Later in this thesis, the filmic protocol of the research films of *My Jewish London* will call on co-creative on-screen collaborators – in particular gay Jewish men - who have an investment in activism and seek change in Jewish film representation.

## Interrogating the Archive (see Table 1 below and Appendix A)

The Jewish London documentary archive referred to in this thesis comprises three main sources:

- **The '*London Jewish Cultural Centre'* collection** (broadcast TV and non broadcast docs). Since 2013 the collection has been housed at JW3, London's premier Jewish Community Centre and based in Hampstead, North London.

- **The BFI Mediatheque** - www.bfi.org.uk/mediatheque (broadcast and non broadcast docs).

- **Researcher's private archive** of Jewish-related nonfiction film.

Two other sources of filmic material referred to in the thesis are the work of the researcher/filmmaker and consist of cine-ethnographic oral histories, TV focus groups and ethnographic-cum-documentary research films:

- **The London Metropolitan Archive** holding all the National Lottery funded Jewish L.G.B.T.+ online oral history docs, including the *Rainbow Jews (R.J.)* materials[8]. *Rainbow Jews (R.J.)* is a landmark history and heritage project, coordinated through Liberal Judaism, with original funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund. It charts the history of the L.G.B.T.+ Jewish community in Britain from the 1950s to the present day. The archive and touring exhibition includes oral history films and focus group TV shows made by Searle Kochberg with University of Portsmouth colleagues and students. R.J. was officially launched in February 2014 as part of L.G.B.T.+ history month at the Atrium Gallery, London School of Economics.

- **Art and Humanities Research Council (A.H.R.C.)** - www.ritualreconstructed.com: five L.G.B.T.+ Jewish London films were made as part of the larger Art and Humanities Research Council (A.H.R.C.) project, *Ritual Reconstructed* (*R.R.*) - a creative and collaborative community research project, with ethnographic films as part of its output. Like *R.J.* the archive and touring exhibition[9] of *R.R.* include films made by Searle Kochberg with University of Portsmouth colleagues and students. *R.R.* was officially launched in November 2015 at the JW3, London's principal Jewish cultural and heritage centre.

[8] https://www.rainbowjews.com/

[9] At the time of writing, the most recent venue for the touring exhibition was the Brighton & Hove Progressive Synagogue, August 2019, soon to be followed by Leicester Progressive synagogue.

| ***Table 1 – Chronological Summary of Jewish London Documentary Films funded by Mainstream Commissioning Groups (for a full list of documentary archive films see Appendix A in Production File)*** | |
|---|---|
| Film Title, makers etc | Narrative |
| Vas, R. (Director, Editor). (1962). *The Vanishing Street* [Documentary]. U.K.: Jewish Chronicle/ BFI Experimental Film Fund. | An observational documentary made on Hessel Street, Whitechapel, in the East End of London. The film documents the final days of a Jewish market street, before the shops are pulled down to make way for a new block of flats. The film adopts the narrative tone of tradition versus modernity, and marks the passing of a way of life for East End Jews. |
| Brown, G. (Presenter), Searle. A. (Director) & Ralling, C. (Exec. Producer). (1968). Who are the Cockneys Now? [Television series documentary episode]. In *One Pair of Eyes*. London: BBC. | An episode from a series of personal documentaries made by the BBC in the late '60s. This film follows Georgia Brown (actor and singer) as she retraces her steps from the West End to the area of her birth, in the environs of Petticoat Lane, in the East End of London. The film focuses on the clash of modernity versus tradition, and is clearly subjective, very much engaging with the bios and material memory of Brown, told on the streets of her childhood. Self-conscious use of tracking shots and dialectical montage evoke time passing, waves of immigration, change. Of particular interest in the film is Brown's engagement with the then changing nature of the street culture from that of a Jewish migrant population to a Bangladeshi one, evoked strongly in a tracking shot in Blackline Yard, and in Brown's discussion of multiculturalism at the Brady Youth Club (Jewish), E1. |
| Smith, N. and Heritage, T. (Directors) & Stein, B. (Producer). (1969). *Some of My Best Friends*. London: Creative Presentation Production. | A film dealing with the clash of modernity versus tradition, this time told through the eyes of a number of second generation Jewish Londoners. The film is interesting in that it offers the views of assimilation of young adult Jewish Londoners, as well as the views of young gentiles discussing their work lives with Jewish people (eg in the rag trade of Soho). The film is largely set in the West End and North London suburbs (Hendon and Stamford Hill?). |
| Goldschmidt, J. (Producer and Director). (1974). *Just One Kid*. London, Birmingham: ATV. | This semi-documentary uses real life locations (Hanby Street, East End) to evoke the childhood memory of the protagonist, actor and tailor, Alfred Maron, who appears in the film. The film moves between colour shots of disused contemporary buildings to dramatised flashbacks in b&w - interludes from the protagonist's childhood. The film is written by Bernard Cops. |
| Morrison, P. (Series Producer). (1991). *A Sense of Belonging* [Television series]. London: Channel 4. | This is the first major series on U.K. Jews commissioned by Channel 4. The research is very impressive for its day, and endeavours to tell the insider story of U.K. Jewish experience from 19th Century migration to present day assimilation into U.K. culture. Essentially the series tells its story around 3 subplots, all of which originate in the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament, or Tanakh). The C4 series begins with a historical overview, and organises itself around the subplot of Exile (the story of the Jewish diaspora, migration patterns to the U.K., the early Jewish trade unions, U.K. fascism and Black Shirts, the Holocaust, post WW2 assimilation). The binarism of modernity versus tradition is an organising principle for the overarching narrative, but the episode continually avoids facile reconciliations and solutions. The second episode organises itself around the subplot of contemporary Wilderness - personal spiritual journeys of U.K. Jews. The episode again challenges stereotypes by telling stories of those who have found faith rather than lost it, who are NOT Ashkenazi (of Northern European extraction), of those persons who are converts to Judaism. The latter part of the series focuses on the subplot of Exodus - urban migration within mainly London Jewish populations. Locales include London suburban 'Jewish High Streets' (South Hertfordshire), North London Jewish study centres, Ilford (North East London) Jewish schools. This conventional 'journey' of Jewish London urban migration is offset by personal stories of Jewish |

| | |
|---|---|
| | persons affiliated to groups that are pro-Palestinian, anti-nuclear, or 'Jews Against Apartheid' (Jews hold a vigil in Trafalgar Square). What makes the latter part of the series as interesting as the earlier parts is that there is no attempt to reconcile identity conflicts within the Jewish community. Views of the left and right are represented.<br><br>This series, in terms of its refusal to take the 'easy route' in mapping a U.K. Jewish journey, is a major contribution to the representation of U.K. Jews in traditional documentary. |
| White, S. (Director). (1991). Volvo City [Television series documentary episode]. In R. Ackerman (Producer), *Cutting Edge*. London: Channel 4. | An important early example of U.K. broadcasters' interest in the U.K. Hasidic[10] Ultra-Orthodox community (later series focused on Manchester and Gateshead as well). The documentary was shot in Stamford Hill, NE London, and used an 'interactive'[11] ethnographic approach to explore the lives and beliefs of a group of Ultra-Orthodox London Jews in their religious enclave. Here the full gamut of fetishised Jewish iconography was on display: bearded men in black coats and hats driving large Volvo 'family' cars, women in sheitels[12] and pushing buggies around the streets, kosher restaurants, the mikvah (ritual bath), and the Orthodox Jewish wedding celebration with a modesty partition separating dancing men and women. As is the case with many documentaries featuring Jewish Orthodox communities, the theme of their difference, their separation from the 'outside' community, is reinforced throughout. |
| Haber, R. (Director). (1992). Oy Gay [Documentary short film]. In C. Farthing (Producer), *Out*. London: Channel 4. | This short film was screened on C4 as part of C4's early series on (largely) L.G. identities and lives, *Out*. It marks the earliest example (in the archive at any rate) of a traditional U.K. L.G. (only) Jewish documentary, and has a narrative which is at pains to forge a cultural link between a Jewish identity and an LG one. If it features the same tired signifiers of 'Jewish' (the menorah[13], Hebrew text, Klezmer music, star of David, bagels, the ark[14] of a Jewish sanctuary), the film does attempt to integrate the two identities with scenes involving lesbian Jewish parenting, 'Jewish' drag, gay Jewish drama, and the wider L.G. community's relationship to the Holocaust. |
| Walker, S. (Director). (1997). Jewish Wedding [Television series documentary episode]. In S. Lambert (Series Producer), *Modern Times*. London: BBC2. | A feast of stereotypes, and still one of the most enjoyable traditional documentary films made on Jewish London. It also marks an early taste of the clichés to follow in the Noughties with Reality TV's 'soft' approach to Jewish London representation and its focus on 'democratainment'[15]. In this film, Jewish filmmaker, Stephen Walker, follows two people to the altar with his camera. The 'hook' for general audiences is the feast of Jewish stereotypes on offer, the general good nature of the film and most importantly the fact that the groom goes through a change of religion and a circumcision in the journey to the altar. He is the character through which middle England can empathise with the story being told. Clever editing highlights the differences culturally between a traditional middle class urban Jewish family (the bride's) and a rural middle class gentile family (the groom's). |
| Faupel, H. (Exec. Producer), & Schreuders, T. (Producer and Director). (2002, | A documentary focusing specifically on the theme of L.G. Jewish Londoners and their religious lives. Again, a montage of iconic clichés is |

[10] Transliteration, and derived from the Hebrew word for 'piety'.
[11] See Nichols 1991, 1994.
[12] Yiddish for wig - worn by some Orthodox married women to conform to Jewish law which requires them to cover their hair for modesty.
[13] Hebrew for 'lamp', and generally referring to a candelabra used in Jewish ritual.
[14] Ornamental closet in the sanctuary of the synagogue that contains the Torah scrolls.

[15] After Hartley (1999), and quoted in Turner 2006: 157.

| | |
|---|---|
| March 24). *For Love and God* [Television broadcast]. London: BBC1. | paraded on camera, but this time the featured Rabbi, Rabbi Mark Solomon[16], is himself gay, and in the film convenes a lesbian Jewish 'wedding' ceremony for a lesbian couple - a 'Brit Ahava', Hebrew for 'Covenant of Love' 2 years before same-sex civil partnerships were legal in England. The film also acknowledges a gay and lesbian Orthodox network, *Avraham* (Hebrew for Abraham). The lesbian couple also enact a Passover 'Seder' (Hebrew for 'order') service in their Jewish home. A gay man also discusses the ceremonial Seder plate, a specifically L.G. Seder plate, with the inclusion of a transgressive 'exotic', 'foreign' orange[17] on the plate. This idea of the transgressive Seder plate was later explored in more detail in one of the films made by Kochberg for the A.H.R.C. funded research project, *Ritual Reconstructed* (2014-2015)[18]. |
| Land, A. (Presenter), (2003, August 31). In Z. Hassid (Producer and Director), *Some of My Best Friends are…Jewish!* [Television broadcast]. London: Channel 4. | This film features the sister of Michael Grade, Anita Land, as she wanders through her Jewish London in order to explore what it means to her to be a Reform Jew. The film makes popular viewing because of the then rising pillar in religious programming of the 'celebrity' spiritual journey. Of thematic interest is the film's discussion of Orthodox Jewish law, who is Jewish and who isn't, all from Land's point of view. As a self-declared 'Jewish princess', whose mother was not Jewish according to Orthodox Jewish law, Land is not Jewish herself. As someone committed to a Jewish way of life, she questions the whole notion of what constitutes an 'authentic' Jew. |
| Littlejohn, R. (Writer and Presenter) & Collingridge, D. (Producer and Director). (2007). The War on Britain's Jews? [Television series documentary episode]. In *Dispatches*. London: Channel 4. | An investigative, 'expository'[19] documentary featuring journalist Richard Littlejohn. He investigates the rising tide of antisemitism in the U.K. and its likely origins. Religious leaders (Jewish, Muslim), politicians, Jewish Community Security Trust (C.S.T.) members and academics are interviewed. What makes the film formally of interest is the use of the tracking shot and montage of images from Cable Street, in London's East End. As Littlejohn walks alongside the huge Cable Street mural, followed by the moving camera, individual visual elements from the mural are singled out to reinforce the message of the film – what happened in the 1930s in London is happening again. |
| Isaacs, M. (Director). (2007). All White in Barking [Television series documentary episode]. In Fraser, N. (Exec Series Producer), *BBC Storyville*. London: BBC2. | An important humanist 'interactive' documentary, made by the 'auteur' Mark Isaacs. As an esteemed ethnographic documentary director, he was afforded an extended shooting schedule and long post-production, all to allow a narrative to emerge from his participant-observation as filmmaker in Barking, East London. There he follows three elderly protagonists, only one of whom is Jewish and a survivor of the Holocaust, as they contemplate the rising tide of right-wing populist racism in Barking. Isaacs's filmic intervention is an attempt to understand it and to facilitate some reconciliation amongst the film's protagonists. |
| Wall, A. (Exec. Producer), & Engle, V. (Producer and Director). (2008). *Jews* [Television series]. London: BBC4. | The title is clearly a branding decision. This three-part TV series can best be categorised as an attempt to bring *A Sense of Belonging* (1991) up to date, in a climate of shrinking budgets and shrinking research. It perfectly fits the Noughties broadcast agenda of the 'spiritual journey' pillar in religious programming. The three films, although intelligently made, are a repackaging of the age-old ghetto to suburbs Jewish diaspora narrative (in this case the Stamford Hill to Golders Green/Hendon) that goes back to Louis Wirth (1998) and the Chicago School. The last episode perhaps is the most provocative, in that it |

[16] A guideline for L.G.B.T.+ weddings, drafted by Mark Solomon for Liberal Judaism, and published even before same-sex unions were legalised.

[17] 'Some years ago, a group of students at Oberlin College wished to make a statement about Jewish inclusiveness… Either they, or a Jewish feminist called Susannah Heschel, had the idea of using an orange to symbolise inclusivity...' (Kochberg 2016: 189).

[18] *Pride Seder* (Kochberg 2015).

[19] See Nichols 1991, 1994.

| | |
|---|---|
| | looks at the rising tide of Orthodox revivalism amongst young British Jews, and their relationship with Israel as a spiritual home. |
| Soudry, N. and Uscinska, K. (Series Producers and Directors). (2008). *A Match Made in Heaven* [Television series]. London: ITV. | An early 'take' on religious programming as Reality TV. Here protagonists of various religious backgrounds – including Jewish – are 'matched' with persons of their own religion to see if they 'click'. Of note only as the first Reality TV venture into Jewish Rom Com territory. |
| Charker-Philips, L. (Series Producer), & Draper, S. (Producer and Director). (2012). *Jewish Mum of the Year* [Television series]. London: Channel 4. | A more recent Reality TV venture, made in partnership with *Jewish News*. Here the age-old cliché of the perfect Jewish Mum is rolled out as both 'soft' documentary and as a game show. The series of programmes week-by-week 'tested' their protagonists in various degrading domestic tasks to see who in the end would emerge as the 'winner', as Jewish Mum of the Year. The verdict: a numbing assault of the senses with an array of character, narrative and visual stereotypes. |
| Bailiff, K. (Series Producer), & Durlacher, C. (Producer and Director). (2012). Arnold Circus [Television series documentary episode]. In *The Secret History of Our Streets*. London: BBC. | An episode from a TV series on U.K. streets. This film travels through Arnold Circus, off Shoreditch High Street, In London's East End. Although not strictly speaking a film about Jewish London, it includes Jewish protagonists returning to their old homes and revisiting family stories triggered by the locale. |
| Foulkes, H. (Exec. Producer), & Langan, D. (Producer and Director). (2015). Judaism [Television series documentary episode]. In *My Life: My Religion*. Salford: BBC2. | Made as part of the innovative *My Life* CBBC documentary strand, this film tells the story of an 11-year old Jewish boy as he attempts to explain his faith and culture to the young target audience for the series. You would expect every (stereotypical) Jewish icon to be on display, and that is the case. However, the film impresses as it attempts to encapsulate a child's view of his faith and his cultural background for children unfamiliar with them. |
| Doust, R. (Producer and Director). (2016). *My Big Gay Jewish Conversion* [Online TV broadcast]. London: BBC3. | A film made for BBC3 (online), this film follows a Catholic young gay man's exploration of Judaism, as he questions whether he wishes to convert to Judaism so that he and his partner can have a Jewish marriage. The story takes the protagonist from London to Israel. Unfortunately, for a man who can only have a same-sex Jewish marriage ceremony within the context of Progressive Judaism, the film shows the protagonist spending a lot of time experiencing Orthodox values in Israel. As an exercise in documentary rigour, this is sloppy and 'soft'. |
| Oord, R. (Producer and Director), (2017). *Canvey – The Promised Land* [Television broadcast]. London: BBC. | A recent documentary that follows the exodus of a small contingent of Orthodox Jews from Stamford Hill to Canvey Island, all in search of cheaper housing and the chance to build a new community. Once again 'Jewish' is interpreted by commissioning editors as Ultra-Orthodox ghetto Jewish. However, the exoticisation and fetishisation in the film are offset by the filmmaker's engagement with the local Canvey Island population as well as the newcomers. The film viewed in the round is an essay in successful multi-cultural dialogue across different ethnic and religious groups. |
| | |

The archive of the mainstream commissioning groups (TV broadcasters and BFI) dates from c. 1960 to the present, in other words from the moment in documentary production that is marked by the onset of miniaturisation and portability of field kit, synchronised sound and handheld cameras. This moment is thus regarded as marking the birth of 'modern' field documentary practice, and was

established in France as *Cinéma Vérité*, in the U.S.A. as Direct Cinema and in the U.K. as Free Cinema. The terms refer to slightly different aesthetic strategies: *Cinéma Vérité* is an interactive[20] documentary style (interactive between filmmaker and subject), Direct Cinema is an observational[21] documentary style (fly-on-the-wall documentary with no apparent interactivity), and Free Cinema is a mixed style: observational with a 'voice-of-god' voiceover associated with the expository[22] documentary style. In terms of representation of Jewish London, the archive covers the period from the seminal BFI/ *Jewish Chronicle*-funded observational documentary on London ghetto Jewish life, *The Vanishing Street* (Vas, 1962) through to the expositional/interactive BBC documentary, *Canvey - The Promised Island* (Oord, 2017)[23]. The films in the archive are the product of both Jewish creative teams and non-Jewish creative teams[24], Straight and L.G.B.T.+. The majority of these archive films are original commissions for U.K. TV for the simple reason that TV companies have proven the most consistent sources of funding for Jewish themed documentary in the U.K. since the '60s. It is only in recent years that anything approaching regular funding has been available from the other sources such as the A.H.R.C., the Heritage Lottery Fund and the U.K. Film Festival production funds. As already noted the U.K. Jewish population is small and - except for the highly visible Haredi (Ultra Orthodox) communities – its community is prone to public self-effacement. This is reflected in the relatively small number of film commissions over the years. Added to that is the problem of there being no definitive film archive. From the onset, this research project has raised issues around film history and the problems of film evidence. With the number of films limited, and the films spread across a number of collections that are all 'partial' at best, film research is not straightforward. It is a bit of a detective story. What is assembled is as accurate a record of existing Jewish London docs as I have been able to compile[25]. Neither the L.J.C.C.[26] nor the BFI Mediatheque collections are definitive, clearly evident in the fact that their collections don't even particularly overlap. Getting hold of films can be difficult too – U.K. broadcasters rarely make available copies of their early TV films to individual researchers. Fortunately in the case of the broadcast films, the British Universities' Film and Video Council (B.U.F.V.C.) provides copies of post-1997 broadcast documentaries for academics. One of the outcomes of this thesis is that it marks the first attempt to collate, build and

[20] After Nichols 1991
[21] ibid
[22] ibid
[23] See Appendix A for the full London Jewish documentary archive.
[24] Of the Broadcast films discussed below – including those referred to in the footnotes – 65% of the films have Jewish presenters, directors or producers.
[25] For the problems around film archiving and film as evidence see for instance Allen and Gomery 1985: 25-38; and Gaudreault 1990: 133-150.
[26] In the case of the LJCC for instance, their focus on Holocaust education and 'Hollywood' (later Israeli) film meant that despite supposedly building 'the' U.K. Jewish film archive, many Jewish-related U.K. broadcast doc films were often left unrecorded.

analyse the existing available Jewish London film and TV archive. It is worth noting at this point that one of the reasons I embarked on research projects like *Rainbow Jews* (*R.J.*) was to create a body of cine-ethnographic research work with which to make sense of L.G.B.T. Jewish London, from the early pioneer days of the 1960s and 1970s to the near present. As the key source of commissioning finance for Jewish themed documentary in the U.K., the main broadcasters have tended to set the aesthetic parameters for all commissions, within and beyond their organisations. Why? Because it is their conventions, codes, and signifiers – categories - that have largely established the 'correct' means of representation. Thus all commissioning groups tend to bring pressure on filmmakers to be 'representative', and meet the guidelines laid down in broadcasting for religious programming, and those policies tend to favour the representation of the middle (Modern Orthodox Jewish) ground.

Andrew Benjamin, in his reflection on the nature of modernity, sees at its heart a struggle to maintain discontinuity/ plurality in the light of counterforces which attempt to efface these differences and establish a reductive 'universality' (Benjamin 1993: 131-141). This universality in U.K. Jewish representation can manifest itself not only in the choice of social actors and their particular circumstances, but in the mainstream, realist[27], prescribed logic of the documentaries which tell their stories with the use of conventional character arcs. Many of the archive films evidence the pitfalls of makers assuming deductive, hypothetical production paradigms associated with dramatic storytelling – burdened as they are with the commissioning pressures of frontloading narratives with repeated familiar motifs that insist on progression, resolution and singularity.

In an attempt to 'locate' Jewish London around the notion of 'authentic Judaism' (Boyarin & Boyarin 1993), the presenters and filmmakers have chosen to represent the London Jewish community in ways that suggest an increasing reliance on Jewish 'journeys' that are 'going somewhere', that are teleological. In other words, they have a prescribed end goal, a historical narrative arc, or what Walter Benjamin describes as a 'storm…blowing from Paradise…propel[ling]…into the future. This storm is what we call progress.'[28]. This tendency is irrespective of whether the filmmakers are Jewish or not[29]. If the journey as plot device has real utility when telling Jewish stories – founded as it is in diasporic fact – too often on TV it is embellished in folklore as well. In the U.K. broadcast archive, the Jewish London journeys people take verge on a prescribed teleology, 'progressing' from the inner city ghetto to the suburb as per Louis Wirth's arguments of the Chicago School in the early Twentieth Century (Wirth 1998). The films 'develop' from scene to scene, offering conventional

[27] As defined by Colin MacCabe 1974.
[28] Benjamin 1992: 249.
[29] As indicated earlier, in footnote 35, 65% of the films have Jewish presenters, directors or producers.

historical syntagms: Eastern autocratic Europe to the U.K.[30], East End to West End[31], West End to the 'burbs – Ilford, Golders Green, Borehamwood and Stanmore[32], Diaspora to Israel (and back)[33]. What is being constructed is conventional storytelling, where the dramatic conceit of inciting incident, crisis, climax and resolution takes precedence over the immediate experience of on-screen subject and filmmaker at the moment of creation. Citing Renov in 2004, 'history, when encrypted within the fictional diegesis, is allowed to "represent" lived experience, but it is sealed off and made safe' (Renov 2004: 41).

Only the earlier documentaries from the archive – *One Pair of Eyes: Who are the Cockneys Now?* (Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968) and *A Sense of Belonging* (Cooper and Morrison 1991) – avoid the certainty of teleological progression. At times reflecting the spirit of the writings of Walter Benjamin (Benjamin 1992: 249), these two documentaries offer no absolute teleological trajectory for the histories they tell. They locate their narratives instead in the diversity of experience and the concrete materiality in the streets of London (and elsewhere), as a series of arrested personal moments, stopping and starting, looking back then forward then back again, rather than presenting the stories as ones of continuous 'progress'[34]. Nevertheless, even they at times resort to the well-worn Jewish metanarrative of 'journey'. In *One Pair of Eyes* the central protagonist, Georgia Brown, tracks (albeit complex) patterns of urban migration in the East End and beyond. And in *A Sense of Belonging*, the experiences of U.K. Jews are organised around 3 subplots all of which originate in the journey narratives of Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament, or Tanakh): Exile, Wilderness and Exodus[35]. More recent films in the archive, however, show no hesitancy at all in offering concrete teleological trajectories in the histories they tell. By the time the 2005 Ofcom Report was released – confirming that where religious programming was concerned audiences preferred factual storytelling rather than televised religious services (Noonan 2008: 162) - three pillars were firmly established for religious programming: the personality led factual documentary/reality TV show, the spiritual 'journey' genre, and the landmark series such as *History of the Jews* (Schama, 2013), all a consequence of the market-led economic environment (ibid: 162-166). These religious narratives are

[30] See Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968; Morrison, 1991.
[31] See Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968; Morrison, 1991; Land & Hassid, 2003; Littlejohn & Collingridge, 2007; Foulkes & Langan, 2015.
[32] See Morrison, 1991; Haber, 1992; Walker, 1997; Wall & Engle, 2008; Soudry & Uscinska, 2008; Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012.
[33] See Wall & Engle, 2008; Foulkes & Langan, 2015; Doust, 2016.
[34] See Benjamin 1992: 249
[35] Episode 1 is organised around Exile stories (the precedent being the Old Testament books of Genesis, Ezra, Esther and Daniel); episode 2 is organised around Wilderness (see the books of Exodus and Numbers); and the two final episodes around Exodus (see the book of Exodus).

focused on progression and resolution. In the commercially driven, competitive market of contemporary telemedia, more nuanced plot structures do not emerge.

In terms of narrational style, mainstream documentaries are rarely just one rhetorical style. What they can achieve quite successfully is a seamless, transparent mix of styles so that the audience feels the 'authenticity' of the moment (observational or interactive), the intimacy of shared experience (interactive) with the narrative drive (arc, and turning points, causality, closure) of the expository style. One thing that is avoided for the most part in mainstream documentary is any suggestion that what you are seeing may not be the whole truth, may be a construction[36]. In the Jewish London documentary archive, the typical TV documentary style for anthropological subjects pervades, a mixture of both interactive and expository styles, often in the same film. Why expository[37] style? Because time constraints and editorial control dictate that voiceover, talking head interviews and elliptical editing help to get the editorial message across quickly and efficiently. This approach can be used in a complex, 'hard' journalistic story[38], or for a 'soft' Reality TV series, where the 'quirky' omniscient voiceover literally tells the audience what to make of the funny scenarios[39]. What you do not get, of course, is the independent voice of the participants themselves. They are merely there to support the editorial message. That is when the interactive style is often incorporated into the archive documentaries. Here at least there is a genuine attempt to create a phenomenological dialogue between the participant, the filmmaker and the audience. In the more in-depth community films in the archive we witness this[40]. People talk to camera directly and are afforded an opportunity to digress somewhat for the editorial line, which is accounted for in the preproduction scripting process. It is in this category that we find the three L.G.B.T.+-themed Jewish documentaries in the archive, *Out: Oy Gay* (Haber, 1992), *For Love and God* (Faupel & Schreuders, 2002) and *My Big Gay Jewish Conversion* (Doust, 2016).

Stereotypes, whether well-intentioned or not, are reductive. They reflect a 'yearning for rigidity…for hard lines and clear concepts', for control (Mary Douglas, cited in Gilman 1985: 19), and too often the archive makes evident the inadequacy of these concepts. In terms of Jewish characters, U.K. commissioning groups, regulatory bodies and public opinion again burden mainstream documentary makers with the need to focus on 'the broad middle ground of British Jewry' (Cooper and Morrison 1991: 3). What this means in effect is the need to focus on traditional 'authentic' Jewish lives, either

[36] Assaults on realism in TV broadcast documentary are limited to documentary 'art' strands like Storyville on BBC4
[37] Nichols' rhetorical category, see Nichols 1991.
[38] See Littlejohn, 2007.
[39] See Soudry and Uscinska, 2008; Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012.
[40] See Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968; White, 1991; Morrison, 1991; Isaacs, 2007; Wall & Engle, 2008.

Modern Orthodox or Haredi Jews, to the exclusion of Jews affiliated to Progressive Judaism, secular Jews, non-Ashkenazi Jews, Jews of colour, L.G.B.T.+ Jews, and converts to Judaism. More diverse representations of Jewish characters are, however, visible, particularly in earlier archive documentaries (1960s - 1990s), where existential debates regarding Jewish London identities play themselves out: Jewish versus Jew-ish, secular versus Progressive versus Modern Orthodox versus Haredi (ultra-Orthodox), assimilated versus integrated (separate minority identity, but integrated culturally and socially), male versus female, traditional versus modern gender identities, rich versus middleclass versus poor, bourgeois versus radical values, Jewishness versus multiculturalism[41]. It has to be said too that these debates do at times have an open-ended nature to them. They are not always played out in ways that resolve them, say, through a typical character construct over time. However, the very fact that the debates are couched as thematic binarisms weighted in favour of the 'authentic' means that a determinist agenda in the editing in the end only reinforces a realist, deductive narrative agenda constructed in the fabric of the films.

Since the turn of the 21st century, however, one can see too much chasing of popular commissions, and an ironing out of the interesting ambiguities, intersections and tensions in the representation of that identity. Post 2005, particularly, one can sense broadcasters commissioning 'softer'[42] entertainment driven material, including Jewish material, see for instance *A Match Made in Heaven* (Soudry & Uscinska, 2008) and *Jewish Mum of the Year* (Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012). But even before that date, there is archival evidence of the upbeat, cheerful, cliché ridden Jewish story, with a heavy emphasis on rites of integration – weddings and marriage[43], bar and bat mitzvahs[44], domestic goddesses[45] – in other words documentaries that evoke the 'comedy' as an organising principle. As the commissions have moved toward reality TV tropes, we have had paraded before us more and more stereotypes such as the Jewish princess[46], the Jewish Mum in the kitchen[47], the Rabbi in front of the bookcase, the male scholar with kippah (religious skull cap) on his head and seated at a desk (both evident throughout the whole archive), the gorgeous non Jewish 'trophy' male converting to

[41] See particularly. Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968; Smith, Heritage & Stein 1969; Morrison, 1991.
[42] An Industry term, particular common in the noughties, when it was common at TV Industry conferences to debate the moral difference between hard, well researched, serious documentary, and 'soft' entertainment factual commissions like 'docu-soaps'.
[43] See Walker, 1997; Soudry & Uscinska, 2008; Doust, 2016.

[44] See Foulkes & Langan, 2015.
[45] See Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012.
[46] Soudry and Uscinska, 2008.
[47] Walker, 1997; Wall & Engle, 2008; Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012; Foulkes & Langan, 2015.

Progressive Judaism[48]. All of these characters are presented on the TV screen as examples of 'ordinary' Jewish folk, and not as social actors carefully cast by canny producers for their dramatic impact on shows designed as 'democratainment' - a term coined by John Hartley (1999) to describe what he saw as a growing democratisation of the media, but queried later by Turner who questioned the relation of democratic values to 'the proliferation of DIY celebrity' and 'the explosion of "the ordinary" in media content' (Turner 2006: 157). Another 'pillar' of post 2005 religious broadcast programming is the use of celebrities to tell documentary stories. These documentaries, despite being serious in tone and subject matter, inevitably have an inflection of rags to riches, entertainment, East End to West End nostalgia, rather like a Hollywood musical[49]. Here the thematic message is 'romance', that anyone can transcend their humdrum circumstances of birth.

If the true 'act of performing ritual both brings into being moral states of affairs and entails commitment to their terms' (Rappaport 2002: 446), the London Jewish documentary archive reflects films designed for a general audience, with their oversimplification of Jewish religious ritual rather than depiction of what is highly codified, rather esoteric religious practice. One also senses the lazy deductive eye of the media researcher cum social scientist that often supports what safely fits into the conventional wisdom of what 'Jewish' is. One is reminded of Prof. Geoffrey Alderman's 'simple typology of [U.K.] Jewishness' (Alderman 1994: 201). His 'simple' typology of 'Jewishness' is inherent throughout the archive, one largely defined in terms of Jewish home life, Jewish culture, Jewish practices and religion, loyalty to Jewish tradition, sense of attachment to Israel[50].

In an age when factual programming has increasingly succumbed to 'soft', entertainment-led commissioning pressures, representation of Jewish ritual in mainstream documentary has become even more repetitive, reductive and simplistic, with repeated narrative motifs of modern Judaism as a given monoculture defined by Orthodox Jewish law, heterosexual gender norms and Ashkenazi food. What is in evidence across the U.K. archive are most visually accessible iconic events in the Jewish religious calendar and their associated motifs: the Friday night Sabbath dinner at home (candles, chicken soup, challah bread), the handling and reading of the Torah scrolls (the parchment scroll of the Jewish bible, the Pentateuch, held normally in the ark in the synagogue sanctuary[51]), Chanukah – the winter festival of light (iconic candelabra) – and the Passover Seder night at home

[48] Walker, 1997; Doust, 2016.
[49] See Haber, 1992, Land, 2003; Charker-Philips & Draper, 2012.
[50] A huge problem now, because of the conflation in the U.K. public's mind of Israel and Jewishness, and something that can be 'blamed' on the media
[51] The Torah scrolls are taken out from the Ark at the front of the sanctuary, and portions read in the synagogue three times each week. On Mondays and Thursdays small sections are read. The main reading is on the morning of Shabbat (Sabbath). Over the course of the year the whole scroll is read in sequence.

(candles, matzo flat bread, matzo balls, the Seder plate of ritual foods). Interestingly, because it is all about having a good time, dressing up camp and cross-dressing, the (largely) secular celebration of Purim also features quite often. The ritual of kosher food preparation and eating are also recorded extensively on camera.

Elaborating on the subject of Jewish spaces in the archive, the obsessive use of Jewish 'safe space' defined around home, synagogue and cultural centre is reductive, stereotypical and one that does not veer very far away from 'authentic' Modern Orthodox Jewish values and agendas. If safe spaces, usually interiors, can be associated with collective action and challenge, where there is 'a certain license to speak and act freely, form collective strength, and generate strategies of resistance' (Kenny 2001: 24, quoted in Roestone Collective 2014: 1346), these 'strategies of resistance' are rarely evident in the archive. *One Pair of Eyes* (1968) is one clear example where they are. In it, Georgia Brown discusses the 'exclusivity' at her old Jewish youth club with its Jewish East End youth membership, in the light of the changing multicultural nature of 1968 Whitechapel. But too often 'safe' spaces means an endless repetition of the same tired clichés regarding Jewish interiors, home and synagogue, and their function in Jewish life. This repetition has the cumulative effect of reducing the breadth of lived experience of people. In those spaces is played out a series of clichés where, at times, it appears that in synagogues people do nothing more than unroll the torah scrolls from the ark or walk down the aisle getting married. Similarly, in their kitchens and dining rooms they simply prepare food, light candles and eat chicken soup with matzo balls. It is not that events such as these at home and in the synagogue have no significance in Jewish life, but what is at issue is the relative value ascribed them in these documentary films. The holiest (i.e. the most important) days of the Jewish calendar, Rosh Hashanah (New Year) and Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), for instance, are rarely featured in traditional documentaries, partly because of lack of access for filmmakers during the religious services, and partly because they are deeply contemplative services and are not particularly visual. An exception to this would be the blowing of the shofar (the ram's horn), central to both these holy days' ritual[52].

Where L.G.B.T.+ ritual is represented in the archive, because of its novelty value as 'other', it often fares rather better than more traditional ritual in terms of representation. In the few L.G. Jewish docs made for U.K. broadcast TV in the 1990s/early noughties there is a genuine attempt to offer a diversified view of 'gay' Jewish London experiences and ritual. In *Oy Gay* (Haber, 1992) – an early

[52] But rarely seen in the archive documentaries; examples being *A Sense of Belonging* (Morrison, 1991). and *My Life: My Religion* (Foulkes & Langan, 2015)

commission for Channel 4 - London Pride, queer bars, queer Jewish sensibilities, and an interview with radical feminist lesbian Rabbi, Sheila Shulman, are featured. A later film from 2002, *For Love and God* (Faupel & Schreuders, 2002), features a lesbian 'marriage' ceremony conducted by gay Rabbi, Mark Solomon[53], as well as the National Theatre production of Kushner's *Angels in America* (Jewish Queer themed), where L.G. Jewish religious practice and culture are viewed as authentic on their own terms, offering something new to say about U.K. Jewish experience, and with many persons taking part identifying as L.G.-Jewish Integrators (after Schnoor, 2006), affiliated with Progressive Jewish London organisations. These films in a sense prefigure some of the cine-ethnographic research work of *Rainbow Jews* and *Ritual Reconstructed* from 2012 onwards.

For the most part, the archive films reject meaningful street locations, avoiding how they might have a defining character in the shaping of Jewish London experience. At best, street locations serve as colourful backdrops or continuity devices to connect talking-head shots and interiors. Only the early films try to say something about the public spaces as characters themselves in the stories they tell. In *The Vanishing Street* (1962) the street isn't only observed, but is used also as a metaphor for a Benjaminian world that is dying, dead, soon-to-be buried or written over as per a palimpsest, where one image is overwritten by another. This 'uncanny' paved over palimpsest[54] is also suggested in *One Pair of Eyes* (1968), *Just One Kid* (1974) and even in the much more recent *The Secret History of Our Streets: Arnold Circus* (2012). Too often however, one is watching a highly fetishised filmic panorama, like *Volvo City* (White & Ackerman, 1991). Here Jewish characters are 'marked' by their visual difference as 'other' - Ultra-Orthodox men in black with hats on and payot (side locks), and Ultra-Orthodox women in sheitels (wigs), pushing prams – as they scurry around the streets of Stamford Hill, East London, carrying food parcels, usually on the eve of the Sabbath. In the process the film tells us too little about the complex social interactions and transactions that inform these people's street lives.

One of the intentions of the research methodology developed here, then, is to explore further whether the choice of exterior public spaces such as the 'Jewish' high street might provide more than mere 'plastic' backdrops to the performed narratives, as witnessed in the majority of the documentary archive.

---

[53] An interesting example where the genre of comedy is used in a more progressive way than most traditional Jewish documentaries.

[54] Benjamin's writings on decay dovetail to a degree with Freud's on the 'Uncanny' (trans. of the German 'Das Umheimlich', literally 'creepy') and its relation to the death drive, see Freud 1990: 335-376. The relation between the unconscious and the palimpsest is discussed in Rosalind Krauss's essay on Max Ernst, in Krauss 1994: 33-93.

# Chapter 2 Documentary: Epistemological Claims

## Narrative/Representational Strategies

For documentary makers, and those who support the indexical value of factual filmmaking, 'the objective nature of photography confers on it a quality of credibility' absent from all other visual arts (Bazin 1967: 13). But the rhetorical devices in documentary filmmaking are also used to persuade, to convince, and make absurd any facile claim of immediacy, innocence and transparency. For, despite appearances to the contrary in many instances, 'observational'[55] documentary filmmakers know that representation is always 'more' than resemblance. In recent decades those who support the epistemological value of documentary have moved to a less purist position, to one that acknowledges ontological rhetoric and subjectivity/intent, whilst still holding on to the 'stickiness' of the indexical sign (Renov 2004: 22).

Other commentators on documentary take real issue with the notion of truth value in documentary and prefer to talk about 'fictive' qualities in documentary (Renov 2004: 23), or indeed duplicity (Kuhn 1978). Tagg for instance has famously asserted that 'the documentary mode…call it "real reportage" or what you will… remains imprisoned within an historical form of the regime of truth and sense' (Tagg 1993: 102). Taken to the extreme, this line of argument leads to statements such as 'there is no such thing as documentary (Minh-ha 1993: 90). In other words 'real' images on our screens are best understood as natural*ised* – images that only look real but are instead complex constructs informed by powerful interest groups in society, the subjects really behind the camera. Those who argue such a position would, however, have a hard time convincing many documentary practitioners who continue to argue passionately for some basic - if nuanced - indexical value to their work. A case in point is the video shot by a WPVI–TV news helicopter on 13 July 2000. The Philadelphia news team captured as only a lens-based medium could the beating of Thomas Jones by city police. Clearly, video images such as these provide some visual record of events. The images index or evidence violent police behaviour even before any cultural interpretations – lines of inquiry, judgments and explanations – are placed on them. To a maker of documentary film, comments such as Tagg's are clever and provocative, but do not help to support the production of knowledge and truth. Non-fiction work at its best helps reveal truths that are original and stimulate debate[56], this

[55] As per Nichols categories in Nichols 1991.
[56] For a full review of these arguments see Kochberg's original text in Kochberg 2002: 29-41)

despite impossible asymptote like aspirations toward authenticity for even the most ethnographic of documentarians.

Hayden White's structuralist analysis of the poetics of 19th Century history writing (White 2014) is useful as it discerns four main generic themes running through the history writing: comedy (reconciliation of the forces at play in the world, festive occasions, hope triumphant), tragedy (state of division in the world, the fall of the protagonist, a resignation to one's lot in life), romance (redemptive drama, protagonist's transcendence of the world of their experience, a liberation from it) and satire (protagonist is a slave to circumstance, not the master of their fate). The four generic themes resonate across all documentary stories, just as they do in 'authentic' historical writing. Editorialising - having an argument, trying to convince a viewer of something - means establishing not only a subjective eye, but also a subjective voice as a filmmaker. But shaping documentary comes with it concerns over validity and ethics. The pitfalls of the deductive, hypothetical production paradigms established in mainstream documentary briefs cannot be overlooked when considering the epistemology of documentary, burdened as briefs are with the commissioning pressures of frontloading narratives with repeated familiar motifs that are 'representative'. Mainstream documentaries - particularly of late - hide behind 'realist' myth-like narrative strategies in an attempt to tell a satisfying story. Lévi-Strauss (1977) and Wright (1992) would argue that what is being constructed in these later documentaries is 'history-as-myth': not a polemical view of history as envisaged by Benjamin - with its lack of clarity, its heterogeneity, its blind alleys, its lack of clear progress (Benjamin 1992: 245 -255). Only in two early documentaries of the archive is there a sense of the filmmakers exploring their subjects inductively, with no clear *a prioi* hypothesis. They are prepared to work more in the moment, with general propositions that develop during their filmic encounters amongst the Jewish community, raising questions, with no clear solutions. There is no attempt to put to bed dramatically, to hypothesise the themes, too early, nor is there an attempt to reduce treatments to a convenient set of binary pairs (such as the authentic versus inauthentic Jewish self, or past versus present) that can apparently be reconciled within the myth-like treatment of the narrative. *One Pair of Eyes* (Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968) and to a degree *A Sense of Belonging* (Cooper and Morrison 1991) locate their narratives instead in the diversity of experience and the concrete materiality of the streets of London (and elsewhere), as a series of phenomenological encounters of camera and on-screen presence: arrested 'shared' moments, stopping and starting, looking back then forward, rather than as an objective, progressive continuous narrative. History, then, as envisaged by Walter Benjamin (1992). This provisional attitude to thematics is one that I pursue in the collaborative inductive logic of the research films.

## Encoded Identities

'Modern Orthodox' Jewish stakeholders in the U.K. (the Beth Din, the Chief Rabbinate, JW3 etc.) have ensured that it is their lawful (under Orthodox Jewish law) patriarchal, matrilineal, heterosexual model of Jewish religious identity that is taken as the default definition of Jewish identity (Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010; Abramson 2010) in social discourse, and one that translates to the depiction of Jewish London on film. Boyarin and Boyarin (1993: 693-725) critique this Jewish identity blueprint, a singular 'authentic' Judaism, which they term the 'univocal discourse' in (Diaspora) Jewish identity. They and others (Jakobsen 2003: 82) see a self-conscious appropriation of language as the way forward[57], whereby identity/ies are something we 'do' rather than something we essentially are, a Jewish identity that can encompass continuity and change[58]. Such is the position advocated by Progressive (i.e. Liberal and Reform) Judaism in the U.K., which strives to broaden the spectrum of Jewishness by arguing for experience rather than essence, and identity/ies representing a broader canvas.

Financially, it is the interest of the agents of mainstream media to present as much as possible an *a priori* identity on-screen: one that is vetted, approved, costed, interviewed, and slotted into a prescribed (themed) narrative prior to shooting. This identity is rendered as distinguishable as possible, for the argument is it must be 'representative' (see Tagg 1993 on 'the burden of representation'), particularly in an era of fragmented audiences and shrinking budgets.

Finding an audience for films means not alienating your main minority target group, and in the case of Jewish London that means not alienating the centre of the U.K. Jewish community itself. In 'Varieties of Authenticity in Contemporary Jewish Identity', Charmé argues that 'for people who see themselves as members of a racial, ethnic, or cultural "species", authenticity becomes focused on embracing and enacting the social roles legitimated by the group. Jewish social roles in the U.K. are dominated by the conservative values of the United Synagogue and *its* Chief Rabbi, and the Board of Deputies[59] (all representing Jewish Orthodox interests, although a small contingent of Progressive Jews do sit on the approximately 300-person[60] Board of Deputies). As official arbiters of Orthodox

[57] As per Butler (2006).
[58] As opposed to a subjectivity that is the product of forces beyond conscious control.
[59] Quoting Kahn-Harris and Gidley, the Board of Deputies is 'a quasi-parliamentary body in which "deputies" represent individual synagogues' and community centres. 'The Board has traditionally been the principal mechanism through which the concerns and interests of Anglo Jewry are represented to the British state and the British public. It survives….with criticisms at various points of the non-inclusion of …Haredi Jews, secular Jews, Zionists and anti-Zionists.' (Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010:3)
[60] Figure from the Board of Deputies website, https://www.bod.org.uk/about-us/structure/

Jewish life in the U.K., the Beth Din, the Chief Rabbinate etc. have ensured that it is their lawful (under Orthodox Jewish law) patriarchal, matrilineal, heterosexual model of Jewish religious identity that is taken as the default definition of Jewish identity (Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010; Abramson 2010). In his analysis, Charmé also draws on the existential writings of Sartre, in particular the polemical *Portrait of the Anti-Semite* (1948). Charmé points out that 'properly understood, Sartre's work can be seen to anticipate many of the assumptions about cultural identity popularised by recent work in cultural studies' (Charmé 2000: 140). Sartre encourages Jewish resistance 'rather than efforts to disguise [identity], deny or otherwise flee from the inescapable fact of being Jewish, a fact that was being determined by anti-Semites in any event'. Conscious, coherent Jewish identity of self in Sartre's terms becomes a mark of authenticity and is 'associated with moral courage…' (ibid). This tallies with post-Enlightenment Jewish thought where 'Tikkun Olam' holds sway as a major philosophical argument and aspiration. It literally translates from the Hebrew as 'repair of the world' and is a rallying cry for social justice for Jews and for the welfare of society at large (Shatz, Waxman, and Diament 1997).

Sartre's monograph continues to resonate for Jews in the diaspora. Certainly, in the context of the U.K. documentary archive, there seems to be little appetite amongst makers of 'hard' documentary or social actors to abandon a self-present identity 'associated with moral courage…' (Charmé 2000: 140). There may be particular historical reasons for this, for despite the Jewish community's integration into British life, its relative affluence and high levels of education, since the 1970s it has felt increasingly defensive and beleaguered. In a social climate of mounting antisemitism - conflated with anti-Zionism on the political left and with strident nationalism on the right (Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010; FRA 2018) - traditional purveyors of 'hard' documentary have increasingly presented the viewer with the indexical, deductive, and prescriptive Jewish 'politics of authenticity' that 'merge with the politics of identity' (Charmé 2000: 140). However, with a drive toward clarity, singularity and a 'group-self presentness' by definition comes a flattening out of diversity, and emerging marginalised voices within or allied to the group can be effaced. Even for those more recognised identities that are fully crystallised – such as Modern Orthodox within Jewish representation - the certitude of traditional documentary verisimilitude allows little space for reflection or supposition. Identity is a given, established as a concrete object and a consequence of pre-production research and development.

For this reason, vacating the certitude of the object at hand – an *a priori* identity – is an initial point of departure in the inductive thinking and exploration of this research project.

## Entrenched Subject/Object Positions

Bazin's view on the concept of the objective in film clearly owes a debt to Sartre:

> In 1931, at the age of 26, Sartre wrote a laudatory essay on cinema entitled "L'art cinématographique" (pp 546- 552) …Much of what Sartre says seems to echo throughout Bazin's writings. Sartre praises the cinema for its [objective] innocence, its humanistic potential, its immediacy, and, above all, its mimetic qualities: "(cinema) is, of all the arts, the closest to real life: real men living in real countrysides… (Sartre "L'art cinématographique." 1931: 549. Cited online Totaro 2003).

The flipside to this phenomenological approach was Bazin's alignment with Sartre on his insistence of the centrality of the subject, understood by its difference and existential separation from the object. This Sartrean play of self versus object is witnessed in his film writings which not only support the objective (indexical) value of film – (see his essay 'Ontology of the Photographic Image' reprinted in Bazin 1967: 9-16) – but also the authorial 'stamp' of the creative subject behind the image – see his essay 'La Politique des Auteurs' (reprinted in Graham 2009: 130-147). This divisive legacy of Bazin lingers on. Bill Nichols, in his ground breaking study, *Representing Reality*, clearly holds the two as separate, not mixing, by acknowledging both the subject behind the camera and the indexical object 'captured' in front of it (Nichols 1991: 112-115). Plantinga too has asserted that documentary can be 'openly expressive, manipulative, and rhetorical' and still fulfil its [true epistemological] social function (Plantinga 1996: 311).

Documentary practice will, I believe, always make a convincing case for the 'stickiness' of the indexical sign as its cornerstone (Renov 2004: 22), where the subject behind the camera has the ability to tell *a truth* that is valuable, one that 'captures' something or someone (an object) in a way that contributes to knowledge, (see Kochberg 2002: 30-31), even if that knowledge is subjective. However, too often mainstream documentary creates too clear a subject/object division in documentary, and thereby enforcing a clear hierarchical ethical imbalance in the status of the observed versus the observer. Foucault (1979) and TT Minh-ha (1993) argue that creative agency needs to be considered in terms of its roots in social discourse (eg patriarchal, imperial), with creative subjects seen as discursive subjects (Heath 1973; Pollock 1989), and their films not seen as transparent, innocent and 'scientific' but as purveying cultural values which potentially lead to the disempowerment of the 'object' of the gaze. In *Difference and Pathology* Gilman notes that stereotypes are born out of a mainstream societal need - as reflected in the mainstream documentary - to perpetuate the difference between self and other, to 'control' the other, and to provide 'an appropriate vocabulary for the sense of difference'. The stereotype is made up of

‘patterns of association’ from *perceived* [my emphasis] ‘real-life experiences’ and ‘the world of myth’ (Gilman 1985: 18-21).

So if ‘rational’, concrete, ‘objective’ conventional ethnographic documentary would argue for maintaining a clear of a separation of self and other for the sake of academic and ethical rigour, it is for many philosophical writers the very mechanism whereby duplicitous stereotypes are maintained. And yet, ethnographers continue to maintain ‘clear blue water’ between self and other, and this resistance to contamination of the two leads to its continuity in documentary practice, with many documentary filmmakers coming from a social science or journalistic background, where these ethical positions are entrenched. When one considers Jewish researchers studying Jewish subjects, conservative positions continue to pervade, displaying a curious anxiety, because of the proximity of researcher and object of research when both are Jewish. Take Jack Kugelmass, a Jewish social scientist, for instance. He has raised his concerns regarding one Jew studying another ethnographically. In his essay ‘Between Two Worlds…’ he talks about the objects of study (Jews) being ‘like a vortex, determined to suck us [Jewish researchers] in so they might see their future in our eyes.’ (Kugelmass 1988; 36). But rather than see this ‘contaminated’ view of subject/object relations as a problem, I see it as a potential move forward in filmic representation for Jewish documentary film researchers. Others agree. Jean Rouch, as early as the late 1950s explored the subject/object contamination. In his seminal exploration of ethnographic documentary, made with Parisian on-screen co-creators in the summer of 1960, *Chronicle of a Summer* (Rouch and Morin 1961), his field working method incorporated a necessary inter-subjectivity between filmmaker and on-screen collaborators. In a scene in the Place de la Concorde, his camera and the miked on-screen collaborator, a Jewish Holocaust survivor, Marceline, affect a momentary exchange of ethno-looking, ethno-thinking, ethno-showing, and participant observation, one that is explored again in his and Edgar Morin’s critical writings (eg Rouch 2003: 87-101, 229-265). Rouch’s camera tracks Marceline, as she has a private dialogue with her dead father, killed in the camps – Marceline insisted that the separately recorded audio remain private to her at the time of filming, unheard by Rouch till afterwards: her private authorial moment of ethno-thinking (Rouch 2003:153-154).

This self-conscious collaborative reciprocity and mutuality of filmmaker and on-screen participant is also exemplified in the writings of Buber, Butler and Nichols[61]. Rouch’s ‘ethno-dialogue’ has reverberations in the ‘I/Thou’ existentialist philosophy of Buber, in Butler’s theory of performance and performativity, and in Nichols’ concept of interactive documentary. For Buber, ‘the individual is

[61] See Buber on ‘I and Thou’, see Butler on ‘devenir’ or ‘becoming’ and Nichols on the Interactive rhetorical mode of documentary (Buber 1965, Buber 1994, Nichols 1991, Butler 2010).

in fact of existence in so far as he steps into a living relation with other individuals' (Buber 1965: 16-17). In Butler's case too, knowing ourselves, or 'becoming' only comes about through the interaction with others[62]. For Nichols, only through self-conscious interactivity in documentary is the 'veil of illusionary absence [of the filmmaker] …shorn away' (Nichols 1991: 44). In 1988, Faye Ginsburg reported being struck by what she coined a 'parallax effect'[63] emerging in Jewish ethnographic film, where Jewish ethnographic filmmakers observed their own community from a vantage point that sidestepped the traditional ethnographic ('neutral' observer) viewing position, and licenced 'the artistic rather than the constraints of the scientific' (Ginsburg 1988: 17)[64]. Ginsberg mapped out the parameters of this new cinematic effect as follows:

- films made by makers inside the Jewish community (i.e. with 'local knowledge')
- films of a 'participatory' nature (in that 'the subjects are engaged as both makers and audience').
- films demonstrate a self-conscious 'process of the reinvention(s) of contemporary Jewish identity', by figuring 'identities in transformation'
- films foreground artistic signification 'rather than the constraints of the scientific'.

Coming to this research project with a profound interest in Jean Rouch's approach to urban cine-ethnography, particularly his *Chronicles of a Summer* (1961), I was keen to explore my own particular 'parallax effect' in Jewish auto-ethnographic film on the streets of London. In the working method that I propose here, I revisit 'participatory' community video as a 'co-creative' reflexive film practice (after Cizek 2017) forged between researcher/ filmmaker and community collaborator, exploring the possibility of Martin Buber's I/Thou existential dialogue (Buber 1965, 1994), this time between the filmmaker and on-screen collaborators.

What is proposed in this research project is a polemical view of the subject/object relation as an imminent relation, one founded on challenging the creative concreteness of traditional mainstream (ethnographic) documentary work. In terms of Jewish ethnographic representation and record, clearly what Ginsberg (1988) and others see as a virtue – her so-called 'parallax view' – others, like Kugelmass (1988) insist on seeing as a dangerous 'vortex', one that undermines the legitimacy of the Sartrean subject/object relation. Perhaps, we need to reconsider the legitimacy of the established

[62] See for instance Zajdermann, P. (Director). (2006). *Judith Butler: Philosophy of Gender* [Television broadcast]. Paris: Arte.
[63] An aesthetic adaptation of the scientific term meaning the apparent displacement of an object observed due to a change or difference in the position of the observer (source: www.dictionary.com).
[64] See also Bruss 1980: 296-320

Sartre model in relation to the documentary. Lacanian psychoanalysis challenges the 'logic' of indexical fixity of the object, and the defining authority of the seeing subject. Here the subject and object - like in the writings of Buber, Rouch etc - are inextricably linked in any Real scopic relation. As Lacanian art theorist, Margaret Iversen, points out in her provocative passage on Holbein's *Ambassadors* and the efficacy of anamorphosis:

> From an orthodox position, the viewer…is master of all he surveys…Only when he starts to leave the room and casts an oblique glance back does the shape resolve itself into a human skull… In other words, only when the position of illusionary mastery is vacated [by the subject] does the gaze [of the object] come into full view (Iversen 1994: 457).

These writers are advocating the same thing: the utility of thinking about self and other as inextricably entwined, with aesthetic strategies for making manifest that particular relation and thus facilitating the 'destruction' of the centrality of the subject.

This research project is designed with self and other inextricably entwined. Here a Jewish ethnographic filmmaker observes his own community from a vantage point that sidesteps the traditional mainstream documentary view of the other. Instead the research design calls for a particular subjective parallax view. The on-screen subject is the co-creative subject/collaborator, and the target audience is the community itself, with the films themselves intended as a creative repost to the stereotypical positioning of other in mainstream documentary. The exploration of a filmic form as a creative 'useful object' is envisaged (Petric 1993: 5), one that can participate in the building of social action in communities at the margins – in this case fellow gay Jewish men in London.

The next chapter explores the idea of *do*-ing documentary as a phenomenological interaction 'in the moment' of collaboration, with collaborators both in front and behind the camera.

# Chapter 3 Challenging Identity in the Documentary Archive

## Identity: Essence to Experience

As discussed in the previous chapter, at the centre of UK Jewish identity politics is a reluctance to vacate an *a priori* position of certitude and definition. However, Andrew Benjamin's ontological reflection on the nature of modernity, as a struggle to maintain discontinuity/ plurality in the light of hegemonic counterforces that attempt to establish a universality (Benjamin 1993: 131-141), helps to explain the ambition of the *My Jewish London* research project: to challenge the traditional representation of concrete identity, bound up inevitably as it is with the material practices of the mainstream media.

Referring back to the film archive again, *One Pair of Eyes* (Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968) is that rare example of a experiential documentary that 'reads' almost like a proto auto-ethnographic production, with an ethno-thinking, ethno-showing participant observer/maker/performer (singer/actress Georgia Brown) walking through 'her' East End, followed by a tracking camera that marks her in-the-moment as well as evoking her abstracted past experiences, thought of times past and her place in it. Here the film language shows an intuitive engagement with debates around emergent selves (particularly of the presenter) and subjective public 'places' long before the philosophical debates around these subjects were current[65]. This 'placement' of social actors in particular personal, cultural and historical narratives, ties in with the phenomenological writings of Heidegger – his sense of 'being-in-the-world' (1988) - and the writings of Merleau-Ponty – his exploration of perception (1981) - where the importance of place is 'constitutive of one's sense of self' (Casey 2001: 684) and vice versa, where perceived places are a product or effect of our being there[66]. In the *Primacy of Perception* Merleau-Ponty goes on to argue that 'the experience of perception is our presence at the moment when things, truths, values are constituted for us' (1976: 25). For filmed documentary encounters, this has huge implications, for it supports the idea that knowledge is subjective, of place and of time, in the moment. In the same paragraph Merleau-Ponty argues that 'this experience of rationality is lost when we take it for granted as self-evident [i.e. prescribed], but is, on the contrary, rediscovered when it is made to appear against the background

[65] In terms of production context, I put this down to a particular creative period in U.K. film practice when the English New Wave was exploring new film forms and narrative strategies.

[66] that 'there would be no space without the body…that through movement and orientation we create a link between our bodies and the outlying space' (quoting Valentine 1999: 49)

of non-human nature' (ibid). Although he is clearly not writing about documentary practice, the criticism is clear and strong. Truths arise in the moment, and are not *a priori* and self-evident. Such arguments lead to many questions about the construction of identity in documentary. Too often, the very nature of traditional non-fiction filmmaking practice – research and development, treatment, script, preproduction, production, post production – posits the notion of an identity which is a given, a hypothetical model in the head of the creators and subjects themselves. The very nature of the traditional documentary production process is one that pins down identity, even if the identity being represented is in agreement with the on-screen participants and is progressive.

Returning to the few Lesbian and Gay (L.G.) Jewish mainstream documentaries in the archive, *Oy Gay* (Haber, 1992) takes more creative risks, by giving voice to the performance of L.G. Jewishness, with its director's exploration of secular as well as religious gay Jewish identities and how they might intersect in different ways. *For Love and God* (Faupel & Schreuders, 2002) on the other hand is more circumscribed around religious practice and is very TV formulaic – expositional (after Nichols 1991) with voiceover, talking heads and cutaways. However, in the end the makers of both films define L.G. Jewish London personae from their perspective, where the characters fit the director's treatment/vision: each fits a slot in the filmmaker's overarching treatment. There is little sense of the filmmakers offering much space for spontaneity for the on-screen social actors or themselves. If both films achieve some sense of exploration and speculation around emergent identities, the imposition of 'creative self' versus 'filmed other' hovers in the air. A strategy of identity politics, if prescribed in the creative process used by filmmakers, can at best only reproduce that identity. I would argue that any attempt to explore 'new' representations – in this case progressive religion, homosexuality and personal Jewish locales – could well start with an exploration of the phenomenological nature of the encounter between filmmaker and on-screen social actor in the field. In giving voice to particular Jewish identities conceived as emerging subjectivities at the point of encounter, I am reminded of the comments of Nick Lambert who argues that 'Identity is a political act, through which we stake our claim to society, but it is also an emotional utterance, one that reflects our deeply-grounded anxieties.' (Lambert 2008: xix). 'Emotional utterances' that manage to evade the predetermination of traditional documentary discourse might best be conceived 'in the moment'. Sarah Abramson (2010) in her PhD on Jewish London youth clubs has appropriated Valerie Hey's comments around the forging of unexpected identities in places where identities are potentially 'simultaneously asserted and "under threat"' (Hey 2006: 452). That identity, taken on to the streets likely comes with profound sense of self-awareness. As Prof Laura Vaughan - Professor of Urban Form and Society at University College London and an expert in London Jewish enclaves - has

noted (Vaughan 2012), Jewish Londoners for reasons 'to do with self-identification as "other'…'will have a more heightened awareness of where they are within the public realm' (Vaughan 2012). It is my founding proposition that in attempting an exploration of a particular Jewish London, that experienced by gay men, people in front of and behind the camera might focus on the moment of encounter in 'Jewish' (Staetsky and Boyd 2014: 13-15) and gay[67] public places, where comfortable assertion, and potential street hostility, might spontaneously coexist for the creatives. That interactive moment might itself afford utterances that move between assertion and threat and which usefully preclude safe stereotypes.

## Emerging Subjectivities

In terms of identity politics and the politics of representation, minority and marginalised communities will always be confronted with the dilemma of needing to appropriate visible, coherent definitions of some sort, 'for communication and exchange' (Holmlund and Fuchs 1997: 4). But at the same time they need to avoid the problems of objectification and pigeon-holing, which are so often the effects of cultural policy, of broadcasting policy, of official policy. The very nature of identity politics, itself a discourse from the social sciences, insists on tangible social constructs. The fact that many mainstream documentary filmmakers have been trained in the academic disciplines of the social sciences only accentuates the likelihood of mainstream media artefacts constituted of hypotheses, deductive reasoning, prescription, labels and pigeon-hole versions of identity. At the close of this chapter, it is worth re-examining the Marceline sequence from *Chronicle of a Summer* (Rouch, 1961), and particularly what Rouch has to say about it and ethnographic documentary in general. He reiterates his theory and practice of ethnographic film: that by necessity a maker must engage with their subjects, and that if used creatively participant observation can produce important results. Rouch was clear that an ethnographic filmmaker must throw himself/herself into the ritual he/she is experiencing and recording: he/she must ethno-look and ethno-think. In turn, protagonists are encouraged to ethno-show and ethno-think on camera. In a democratic exchange of experiences, an ethno-dialogue is established between maker and subject, and knowledge is 'the result of an endless quest where ethnographers and those whom they study meet on a path…" (Rouch 2003: 101).

[67] See for instance F.R.A. EU L.G.B.T.+ Survey, 2013.

Rouch's philosophical writings are often largely discussed by documentary filmmakers in terms of their implications for participant observation, and their facilitation of democratic ethno-shows on camera by the participants. This process Rouch called 'shared anthropology' (Rouch 2003: 101). But the issue of the momentary 'meet[ing] on a path' is often overlooked for obvious reasons. If classic ethnographers have been interested in 'unadorned' filmed records of ritual, without the embellishment of field narrative, filmmakers are not. For them the interest in Rouch's work lies in his interactivity with his objects of study, like Marceline. In fact, so skewed has this interest been by filmmakers, that much of the 'quality' mainstream documentary in the U.K. of the last 30 years has been shot in this style. But the 'meet[ing] on a path' has been forgotten because storytellers inevitably do not get excited about work with little narrative drive. And so overwhelming has the Rouchian interactive cinéma vérité documentary aesthetic been, that even social science film is now obsessed with dramatic storytelling as a disciplinary method of working. However, it might be argued that much of the efficacy of the Marceline sequence is in the 'meet[ing]': in other words what happens in the moment between Rouch and Marceline, the unexpected - for him… her conversation with her father, for her… a creative liberation that is a consequence of what he called 'pedovision' - live tracking shots following the collaborative social actor. Camera and social actor respond to each other in the moment, and in this case without the filmmaker being aware of what the social actor is saying at the time of recording. Rouch later described this as 'like some spontaneous sacrilege that pushed us to do what we had never done before… we will never do it again' (Rouch 2003: 153-154). This is what is worth revisiting. What is happening here is not just a birth of ethnographic interactivity – as important as it is – but also the establishment of a filmic knowledge forged out of the spontaneous 'experience of perception', 'our presence at the moment when things, truths, values are constituted for us' (Merleau-Ponty 1976: 25).

## Points of Departure – Summary

- The mainstream documentaries in the Jewish London film archive are for the most part reductive in their singular, stereotypical view of 'authentic' Jewish London tucked safely indoors.

- These mainstream documentary films insist on the narrative of journey – largely a teleological drive from past to present, what Walter Benjamin has referred to as a 'storm' which 'irresistibly propels [history] into the future…what we call progress' (Benjamin 1992: 249).

- Subject/object positions in mainstream documentary are reinforced because of the nature of mainstream production processes which insist on prescriptive treatments and deductive hypotheses, both of which insist on a concrete authorial subject behind the camera versus a separated object of investigation in front of the camera.

- Stereotypes are perpetuated by an insistence on the separation between self and other. A filmic method exploring collaborative reciprocity and mutuality of filmmaker and on-screen participant, what Rouch calls a 'shared anthropology', might present the researcher with a mechanism to challenge Jewish stereotypes in documentary.

- Inductive, exploratory co-creative non-fiction filmmaking, working in creative partnership with community members and staying in the moment in personally chosen public spaces, might present opportunities - afford the time and space – for new truths to be constituted spontaneously.

# Journey

# Chapter 4 Epistemology of Filmed Personal Journey

## A Material Knowledge - Subjective, Relational, Local and In-the-Moment

In his polemical monograph *Why Marx Was Right*, Terry Eagleton advocates a subjectivity that is materialist in the Marxist sense. Here the material reality of one's existence is implicit in the act of being, in the performance of it: 'men and women were first of all agents. They were creatures who transformed themselves *in the act of* [my emphasis] transforming their material surroundings' (Eagleton 2011: 130). Revisiting the Marxist model of historical materialism, Eagleton argues that Marx rejected the passive subjectivity of the 18th c British empiricists/materialists (Locke and Hume) where human beings are 'mere mechanical functions of the material world' (ibid: 129). Instead, citing Alfred Schmidt, Eagleton emphasises the phenomenological nature of our material being, where a 'ready, sensuous, physiological being is therefore the precondition of any theory of subjectivity' (ibid: 131). For Eagleton, historical experience and understanding are themselves corporeal. His phenomenological approach to the material nature of existence allows for the *act of* the body 'to transcend itself and its situation, as well as to enter into complex relationships with other bodies of its kind in that open ended process we know as history. Human bodies which cannot are known as corpses' (ibid: 38). This particular materialist interpretation of subjectivity dovetails with Heidegger's 'being-in-the-world' (1988) and Merleau-Ponty's exploration of perception (1981)[68], both of which are cited by Jon Anderson (2004: 255) as key drivers of the concept of place - 'as constitutive of one's sense of self' (Casey 2001: 684). Positioning ourselves in particular spaces, 'places' us in particular personal, cultural and historical narratives, and in turn perceived places are themselves a product of our being in them (Merleau-Ponty 1981: 219). Eagleton's social subjects too are conceived as 'creatures who transformed themselves *in the act of* [my emphasis] transforming their material surroundings' (Eagleton 2011: 130).

The material self as reciprocal, relational and emergent in the act of *do-ing* suggests strong links to the anti-Sartre existentialist philosophy of Martin Buber, and in Judith Butler's theory of

[68] That 'there would be no space without the body…that through movement and orientation we create a link between our bodies and the outlying space' (quoting Valentine 1999: 49).

performance and performativity. For Buber, 'the individual is a fact of existence in so far as he steps into a living relation with other individuals' (Buber 1965: 16-17). For Butler, the performative act is all about 'devenir' or 'becoming' (Butler 2010), where knowing ourselves, or 'becoming' only comes about through the interaction with others. Philosophical connections can also be drawn back to Jean Rouch's in-the-moment, in-the-field cine-ethnographic 'ethno-dialogue' and 'ethno-thinking', an understanding forged in the performative relations of filmmaker and on-screen collaborator (Rouch 2003: 100-101).

As a cine-ethnographic project built on reflexivity, there was no attempt in the research methodology to maintain a facile pretence of 'neutrality or heightened objectivity' as per the 'scientific' approach to knowledge acquisition in classic anthropological film (Charmé, Horowitz, Hyman, and Kress, 2008: 124). Here 'the "core" of representation is the reflexive interval' (Minh-ha 1993: 105), born of creative interactivity and a continual thinking through of method during the making process. Thus the *My Jewish London* personal journey films attempted to achieve a reflexive, experiential ethno-thinking, an understanding shared between researcher/filmmaker and on-screen collaborator that was intimate, and ideally suited to the building of knowledge through interpersonal creative interaction. The particular experiential knowledge is NOT a given, not *a priori* to the moment of creation. Grounded in field experience of the moment, *subjective material* knowledge in front and behind the camera – offers the possibility of new paradigms for being, thinking and understanding.

In adopting the logic of Eagleton's polemical argument about the material self and understanding, the research methodology moved away from the traditional approach of mainstream documentary, with a given subject behind the camera and an object of study in front of it, indexed and authenticated (Nichols 1991: 112-115), as per the philosophical tradition of Sartre and Bazin. However, the inherent risks for marginalised identities in the deconstruction of a concrete self-versus-other dialectic were clear enough. The logic that followed Sartre's argument was that any attempt to vacate the politics of difference – and, with it, the clear position of a self-present identity and its corollary, the 'other' (understood as 'the dominant social and political groups…as a negative foil') – was to challenge the very notion of authenticity (Charmé 2000: 140). But, Eagleton centres his debate on the self-defeating nature of identity politics as political action, because of its inevitable tendency toward separation and self-identified pigeon-holing, and protests that we are forced to see everything through a prism of 'identity' – to see ourselves as 'meaningful' only through frameworks of knowledge that are categorised, separated – whether singular or intersectional – and always set adrift from any local material experience. For Eagleton, the inevitable conclusion to be drawn is a

diminishing of class solidarity and collective action. His 2011 polemical monograph, which I also heard him deliver as a keynote speech at the 2013 MeCCSA conference in Derry, Northern Ireland[69], on reflection only reinforced the position I was to explore in the research project. As George Lamming[70] put it in his voiceover for the 1963 documentary, *West Indians*, 'the politics of colour [difference] may disappear when workers recognise that their difference from the source of power is the same, their [material] interests identical.'

## Performativity: A Response to 'Authentic' Jewish Identity

In the documentary, *Judith Butler: Philosophy of Gender* (Zajdermann, 2006), Butler provides a useful distillation of her polemic on gender performance. In the programme she talks about 'doing' gender, how stereotypes 'do' us and 'undo' us, but that if we are 'undone' by others (dominant ideology), we are not just an effect of discourse, even if we are never free from its power and determining nature. In the documentary, she also states that the origins of her ground-breaking book, *Gender Trouble* (Butler 2010) lay in attempting to understand how her Jewish American family wrestled to embody normative, 'authentic' roles of gender and ethnicity. According to Butler they failed first and foremost because the attempt was a fantasy for anyone, but particularly so for Jews who were/are defined by their marginality in society. At a stroke, Butler identifies the power of images of the ego ideal[71] in the media, as the 'doing' and the 'undoing' of us.

Butler interprets [gender or ethnic] performance as a 'compulsion',

> …not a performance that a priori subject elects to do, but …. *performative*, in the sense that it constitutes as an effect the very subject it appears to express. It is a *compulsory* performance in the sense that acting out of line with heterosexual norms brings with it ostracism, punishment, and violence, not to mention the transgressive pleasures produced by those very prohibitions (Butler 1993: 314-315).

The last part of the sentence, however - about 'transgressive pleasures produced' - begins to suggest a more productive subjectivity, something akin to the material subjectivity that Eagleton conceives. In an interview with Fina Birulés, Butler continues to suggest that there is a 'wrestle' going on with the power of hegemonic discourse. 'The "I" steps back from these gender norms, even if such norms are the conditions that have determined its formation; that is, it does not abandon or destroy them,

[69] as a paper entitled 'Notion of City of Culture, and Spaces and Places of Culture'.
[70] The Barbadian poet. See Lamming & Gold, 1963.
[71] In Freudian theory, unconscious and conscious images that impose concepts of ideal behaviour, images developed from parental and social standards. Part of the super ego.

but it does wrestle with them' (Birulés 2009). The research methodology of the personal journey films is an attempt to facilitate a 'stepping back' from these norms associated with 'I' for identity politics through the potential efficacy of performative acts by both researcher/filmmaker and on-screen collaborators.

Boyarin and Boyarin (1993: 693-725) critique the Jewish identity blueprint, a singular 'authentic' Judaism, which they term the 'univocal discourse' in (Diaspora) Jewish identity. They and others (Jakobsen 2003: 82) see a self-conscious appropriation of language as the way forward[72], whereby identity/ies are something we 'do' rather than something we essentially are, a Jewish identity that can encompass continuity and change[73]. Such is the position advocated by Progressive (i.e. Liberal and Reform) Judaism in the U.K., which strives to broaden the spectrum of Jewishness by arguing for experience rather than essence, and identity/ies representing a broader canvas. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick takes a similar position, this time in relation to homosexuality where - just as in the case of Jewishness - male gay identities are continually in flux, a contested field, 'a space of overlapping, contradictory, and conflict[ing]…definitional forces' (1990: 45). Janet Jakobsen proposes a 'complicitous' homosexual/Jewish relation, one that resists easy assumptions about essential relations/ parallels between the two identities (2003: 79-80), in other words the relation is in itself in flux, a contested field. Jakobsen uses this term rather than 'analogous' to avoid thinking of the relation as always the same. It is not.

In *The Savage Mind*[74] Lévi-Strauss explains how mythological (including religious) thought and rites are continuously broken down and rebuilt again through new constructions of already existing sets of events, and how rituals serve to bring union to previously separate groups (such as gay and Jewish). Bricolage - Lévi-Strauss's term for tinkering, or the (re) working of found materials to piece together new structures - helps make in-the-moment performative ritual particularly fertile ground for the piecing together of new rituals and identities (Kochberg 2016: 186). The idea of spontaneous 'tinkering' finds precedence both in Progressive Jewish thought and philosophy, and in Lévi-Strauss's concept of mythical thought. Reconstructionism is a modernist Jewish philosophy and movement founded in the U.S.A. by Mordecai Kaplan before the Second World War. It is one that does not consider ancient Jewish Halakha (religious law) necessarily binding; Jewish commandments can be accepted or rejected by individual congregations and 'reconstructed', to suit the needs and beliefs of the individual congregations concerned. Reconstructionism is not officially recognised in the U.K.,

[72] As per Butler (2006).
[73] As opposed to a subjectivity that is the product of forces beyond conscious control.
[74] Lévi-Strauss 1974.

but it has influenced many Jewish U.K. Progressive congregations, and their relationship to the Halakha (Jewish religious law). This includes the L.G.B.T.+ friendly London congregations of Beit Klal Yisrael (founded by radical American feminist, Rabbi Sheila Shulman in the late 1980s), and South London Liberal Synagogue (whose emeritus Rabbi, Janet Darley, has a long history of involvement with the Reconstructionist Jewish community of Utah).

Using the classification system proposed by Schnoor[75] (2006: 43-60), the on-screen collaborators in this research project could be described for the most part as 'gay-Jewish integrators', participating 'in gay Jewish organisations; challenging Jewish theological perspectives on homosexuality; emphasising linkages between Judaism and homosexuality…' (ibid: 52). Various permutations of the gay-Jewish intersection (different ethnic and class perspectives) arise spontaneously throughout the research films[76], where on-screen performative acts *constitute* in-the-moment expressions of Jewish subjectivity that are quite separate from prescribed traditional Halakhic identities (i.e. those of Jewish religious law) found in mainstream documentaries. In a sense the method encourages an in-the-moment performative 'tinkering' of what constitutes Jewish experience. The cine-ethnographic research method presented here offers a parallel way of thinking about the performative constitution of the Jewish subject and belief systems on film as the A.H.R.C. funded *Ritual Reconstructed (R.R.)* research project whose films were conceived by the same researcher/filmmaker just after the filming of the personal journeys. Quoting from its website, *R.R.* is a project 'working with film, performance, installation and storytelling to look at the ways in which Jewish people who identify as LGBTQI engage in religious and community life…how being LGBTQI has influenced, shaped or changed Jewish faith rituals and how our Jewish selves have influenced LGBTQI rituals'[77]. Both *R.R.* and *My Jewish London* seek to thwart hetero-normative expectations of much of Jewish cultural and religious signification and in the process create filmic events where Jews identifying as 'other' might feel more engaged and less detached from Jewish experience, ritual and practice (Alpert 1998; Schneer & Aviv 2002). The tinkering on camera and in-the-moment by collaborators (and indeed the researcher/filmmaker) offers the potential for local, material film-making as activism, forged as it is in local experiences of being Jewish at the margins, something that will be picked up later in the thesis.

---

[75] to describe how gay Jews in Toronto negotiate their ethno-religious and sexual identities - Toronto has roughly the same number of Jews as London, with long established L.G.B.T.+ friendly Progressive (Reform or Reconstructionist) Jewish organisations similar to those in London.
[76] Even in the heteronormative 'control' film, Josh reflects on the intersections of religious and national identity.
[77] See www.ritualreconstructed.com

The next chapter introduces the research filmic methodology in relation to its particular position of 'documentary as co-creative practice' (after Cizek. See see Aston et al ed. 2017: 38-48), where gay men who have specialised knowledge of the L.G.B.T.+ Jewish world, referred to by Randal Schnoor as 'gay-Jewish integrators' (2006:52) work creatively in conjunction with the researcher/filmmaker. As creatives for the most part, with backgrounds in art, design or media, the gay-Jewish integrators on-screen have a 'broader sense of the co-design and the spirit behind making something', even if they 'have absolutely no interest in picking up a camera…' (Aston et al ed. 2017: 39).

The overall methodological logic of the research is also influenced by the (auto) ethnographic typology proposed by Adams and Manning, and what they describe as a 'creative-artistic' approach (2015: 350-366). Their 'creative-artistic' ethnographic approach foregrounds performative acts by filmmaker and on-screen collaborator – tracking shots, participant voiceover, on-camera performative acts of the collaborators, self-conscious associative editing of the filmmaker – all to affect 'engaging and accessible accounts of personal and/or cultural experience' (ibid: 360), and ultimately to explore a co-creative framework that might facilitate community activism. The logic of the filmed subjective truth locates its own veracity at the margins, in co-creative performative acts in front and behind the camera that foreground spontaneity and on-the-street locations.

# Chapter 5 The Key Methodological Foundations for the Walks

The salient points of the film method of personal journeys are:

- Each filmed walk is constructed around exterior public spaces that reflect a personal Jewish London specific to each participant. There are no interior shots.
- The specific routes and stories explored in the films are those of the participants.
- The participants walk through and perform their own stories. Each has a different relationship with the filmmaking process. Some prefer to talk in 'private' whilst walking, largely in conversation with themselves; others prefer to stop to talk and address the camera, filmmaker and audience; still others prefer a balanced combination of the two.
- There are no interviews in the films. Questions by the filmmaker are only utilised as prompts if the on-screen collaborators 'dry up' or 'freeze' (see filmmaker prompts amongst the grounded methodological 'categories' below)
- The only plot device imposed by the filmmaker is the 'journey' – a journey through *My Jewish London*. There is no imposed dramatic narrative arc by the filmmaker.
- Some narrative themes explored in the films – personal 'Jewish' public space, visibility versus invisibility – are introduced in preliminary interviews around the participant information sheets between filmmaker and on-screen storyteller.
- Conventional cutaways and scene dissection are generally kept to a minimum, in favour of a foregrounding of the wide tracking shot and its exploration as an aesthetic of ontological ambivalence ('naturalistic' versus an instrument of distanciation).
- Cutaways are also kept to a minimum as they slow down the speed of filming, and deter the focus away from the performance of the collaborator.
- Radio mikes, light-weight digital cameras, the avoidance of tripods, artificial lights and booms, are also utilised to speed up the process of recording and make the experience as intimate as possible for the on-screen collaborator. Their concentration is not broken.
- The real time aesthetic aims at a less smooth, less unified personal narrative that classic elliptical editing would achieve, one that is more naturalistic and spontaneous – evident in pregnant pauses, blind allies, omissions, repetitions of the participants, (Bazin 1972: 16-40, 47-60) – as well as indicative of a more meditative, distracted on-screen collaborator.

The research method was designed with particular areas of responsibility split between filmmaker and on-screen colleagues, dependent on the particular phase of production:

RESEARCH DESIGN: The metanarrative of each 'journey' was prescribed by the researcher/filmmaker from the beginning of the project. I will discuss the implications of this organising principle later –

alluding as it does to a prescribed meta-organisation of on-screen subjects' stories, the historical myth of the 'wandering Jew', and the current praxis of psycho-geography.

PREPRODUCTION: Collaborators took the lead in research and development - the setting up of their particular geographical journey through *their* Jewish London before the filming began. Guidance and support were given by the researcher/filmmaker in terms of risk assessment, access and ethics. Walks were generally no more than 2 miles in length (I requested that walks be at normal walking speed (3 miles/hr), and not more than 40 min duration). Also the walks could be arranged in two components (as per Roberto/Robin walks. N.B. in Robin's case he chose to do two completely separate walks).

PRODUCTION: The filming process was collaborative, often spontaneous, based on in-the-field experiences, with the filmmaker taking his lead from the on-screen collaborators, following them as best he could. There was agreement in principle as to where the on-screen person would be walking prior to each shot - just so the tracking camera and radio mike did not 'lose' the figure or speech, and to allow for reloading the camera. However, the details of what ended up on the recorded film - monologues, reflections, ritual, body movement, stasis - these elements were dictated largely by the actions of the on-screen persons. Highly portable kit – lightweight digital camera, no tripod, radio mike – allowed for filming quickly in the field, so as to not impede the free flow of performative acts of those in front of the camera. It also ensured no excessive embellishment by the filmmaker who had no shooting script to follow and no obvious character arcs ('what does he want, need?') to work from.

POST PRODUCTION: Editing was under the creative control of the filmmaker, although changes were made at the behest of the collaborators if they were prompted by ethical issues. The time line was constructed to reflect accurately the temporal order of experiences on route. Nothing in the final visual cut was out of temporal sequence – a common practice in mainstream documentary to achieve dramatic effect. The filmed walks were edited down from approximately 1 hour of rushes per walk (filmed over ½ a day shooting schedule) to 15 minutes of screen time. Two points:

- With little time for stylistic embellishments during the filming process, the final edits remained largely assemblage edits: i.e. minimal editing within scenes (just simple cuts assembling a collection of long shots together); sync sound from radio mikes for the most part; and few continuity devices that embellish editing within scenes – cutaways, close ups, expressive camera angles, added ambient sounds or music soundtrack.
- Only in the pilot film (Josh's) was the audiotrack of the on-screen collaborator partly 'grabbed' from audio taken from another session (the 'emotional' map session). This

was due to the fact that during his filmed walk in the park, Josh wandered off beyond the range of the radio receiver of the filmmaker, and therefore the audio was not picked up. The filmmaker asked him to 'retrace his steps and thoughts' as it were in the audio recording from the map session. This method of 'pick-ups' was not repeated again, with the on-screen collaborators asked to stay within radio range of the receiver. Elsewhere, audio was always from the filmed walk, and as much as possible sound synced with the visuals was used. Occasionally, sound was grabbed from elsewhere within a particular scene for continuity reasons.

**Acknowledging production decisions and their effects on the films:**

1. Radio mic range limited the distance on-screen collaborators could be from the sound mixer/receiver. This meant that on-screen collaborators were not 'free' to wander the journey of their choice away from the camera, as sound signal would be lost. This in turn meant that VERY extended extreme long tracking shots were not possible, and researcher/filmmaker and collaborator had to plan the logic of the shots before shooting, including cutaways. All of this rather compromised the original 'Jansenist'[78] production concept of a spare assemblage of tracking shots, and what emerged was a very simplified verité style.

2. Loss of radio signal meant that occasionally sync sound from was grabbed from elsewhere in the footage, as is typical in mainstream doc. Again this was at odds with the original design logic of the films which aspired as much as possible to link sync sound and image from same raw footage in the films.

3. Offscreen prompting by the researcher/filmmaker (if the on-screen collaborator 'dried up' on camera), or a collaborator choosing to talk to the camera whilst not moving, meant that the filmed personal journey at times resorted to static shots, rather than the tracking of moving collaborators. Again this meant that some sequences in the films resembled more traditional documentary coverage of social actors.

4. The filmmaker's decision to opt for traditional scene dissection – master shot/close up/ cutaway – to achieve thematic effects rather than cover the scene largely with a wide shot meant that occasionally location work was slower than originally envisaged.

Despite these qualifying statements, for the most part the film method was successful at filming very quickly, and thus prioritising the spontaneity of the on-screen collaborator's performances on camera as they journeyed through their Jewish London.

[78] Appropriated from Bazin's essay 'William Wyler, or the Jansenist of *mise en scène*' reprinted in Williams 1980: 36-52.

## Identifying On-Screen Collaborators

The research method focused on gay men within a wider Jewish context, not Jewishness within a wider gay context. Why was the project set up this way? In the first instance, anecdotal evidence suggested that the wider secular L.G.B.T.+ culture was not very interested in matters of faith within its community[79]. As Schnoor points out when writing about gay Jews in Toronto 'movements that focus on sustaining a collective identity for an oppressed group [such as L.G.B.T.+] sometimes overlook the concerns of sub-groups' within them (Schnoor 2006: 43-44). As a researcher/filmmaker such attitudes would make it more difficult for me to find a tangible and supportive research environment within a gay community context[80]. In the second instance, the more progressive branches of U.K. Judaism (particularly Liberal Judaism) had a long standing commitment to inclusivity, diversity and support of L.G.B.T.+ initiatives, and it was those *Jewish* initiatives that interested me. In the third instance, I had worked for many Progressive Jewish organisations with formal or informal L.G.B.T.+ associations, and thus it would be relatively easy for me to access potential research collaborators willing to engage with the research project.

My selection process for collaborators was dictated by my experiences and contacts. Given the intimate, in-depth ('thick'[81]) and creative nature of the demanding longitudinal research work, I was always going to be reliant on strong personal contacts, rather than working through the filter of a specific institution. I met the collaborators largely through L.G.B.T.+ Jewish community 'gatekeepers' and my work on L.G.B.T.+ Jewish community projects, attendance at Progressive (Liberal, Reform or Masorti) synagogues, or at public events such as London Pride walking with the Jewish groups. The research collaborators all self-identify as Progressive L.G.B.T.+ Jews in some way (except the control). Many of the collaborators are in the creative industries, and are spokespersons or gatekeepers themselves for their particular London-based Jewish community endeavours.

Sample size. A research project such as this required that the collaborators trusted me, knew my work, and were prepared for the close contact required of them over the period of time that the project was to last for. The sample size was, therefore, by extrapolation, small, as it was demanding of the collaborators' time requiring them to:

---

[79] This was mentioned in the collaborators' feedback for this research project – see Nick's feedback questionnaire (Appendix E).

[80] I am not alone is adopting the approach of studying gay identity in London Jewish contexts. See for instance an interesting study of Jewish Gay Londoners in Coyle and Rafalin 2001.

[81] First applied by Geertz (1973) to ethnography, a thick description refers to the detailed account of field experiences in which the researcher makes explicit the patterns of cultural and social relationships and puts them in context (Holloway, 1997).

- attend a series of meetings with me to discuss the logic of the research project.
- plan the journey they then experienced on camera (locations and story).
- two days filming (filming the informed consent discussion and the 'personal journey').
- produce a reflective 'emotional' map of their experience – a graphic form of reflective feedback from them to the researcher.
- review the films (are they happy that they were represented fairly?).
- complete a questionnaire on the collaborative process and the film's final outcome, well after the film's completion (a year plus in most instances), so that collaborators had time to review the films again and reflect on the overall experience.

Despite recognising the particularity inherent in 'my own perspective', the film-as-research design did try to reflect a multiplicity of gay Jewish experience. If the demographics were skewed in favour of middle-aged men, that is because they could afford the research time that the project demanded more than younger men could. Younger gay Jewish men were often less settled in their careers and could not/would not make available the time necessary to participate.[82] The project was limited to men, as it was felt that to open it up to other gender identities would make the research too broad. Nevertheless, the research project did attempt to represent a spectrum of Jewish male viewpoints: Jewish born, converts to Judaism, British born, foreign born, London born, U.K. migrants from outside London, middle aged men, young men, people of different races.

In summary, the in-depth creative filmic collaborations with a number of Jewish men in London make the case for the 'validity' of the research work, despite the small sample size – six collaborators, seven films. As will be demonstrated later, performative cinematic acts inherent in the research films offer new insights into Jewish London experience, and open up to discussion issues of representation entirely absent in the documentaries of the archive. The researcher has relied on his very in-depth 'embedded' knowledge of the L.B.G.T.+ Jewish community over a number of years to ensure the 'reliability' of the field data.

[82] This proved to be the case on other Jewish related research projects I was involved with.

| *Table 2 – Demographic Table of On-Screen Collaborators (London-based)* | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Sexuality | Age band | Ethnicity | Career (at time of filming) | Religious Affiliation | Migration/Voyage history |
| Josh (the 'control') | straight | 20s | white | Chair of mainstream Jewish youth organisation | Modern Orthodox Judaism | London resident, with extended periods spent in in Israel. |
| Roberto | gay | 50s | white | Graphic and Garden designer, artist, illustrator. | Liberal Judaism | Colombia-London |
| Ed | gay | 60s | white | Architect, painter and sculptor. | Masorti Judaism (conservative religiously, socially Progressive) | South Africa-London |
| Nick | gay | 50s | Mixed race | Public service administrat or. | Liberal Judaism (recent convert to Judaism) | Rural Bedfordshire to London |
| Dave | gay | 20s | white | U.K./Israeli haute couture agent. | Modern Orthodox/Progressi ve | London resident |
| Robin | gay | 60s | white | Actor, writer, musician. | Liberal Judaism | London resident (German refugee parents) |

With the exception of Josh (who is a long-standing family friend), all collaborators were gay Jewish men, were all 'out', and all associated formally and informally with Progressive Jewish organisations, secular or religious, separatist L.G.B.T.+ or more inclusive. The gay persons represented an informal network of persons, sharing several London-based Progressive L.G.B.T.+ Jewish affiliations:

- Jewish Gay and Lesbian Group (Jewish L.G.B.T.+ Group, formerly J.G.L.G.) – Ed, Nick, Roberto, Robin, Dave
- Gay Jews in London (G.J.I.L.) – Dave, Nick
- Keshet U.K. – Dave, Ed
- Rainbow Jews project (National Lottery funded – see below) – Ed, Nick
- Liberal or Reform (together referred to as Progressive) Synagogue members – Nick, Roberto, Robin

The research films consist of seven films, listed in chronological order of filming:

- 2012 Josh personal journey – Hendon.
    - Josh is the voice of 'authentic' Judaism (Boyarin and Boyarin 1993: 693-725) in this project as a self-identifying Modern Orthodox heterosexual male, and the 'control' for this research work. At the time of filming (2012) he was Chair of a U.K.-based Zionist Jewish youth organisation.
    - This is the pilot film of the series and is a technical run through of the filmed personal journey method – walking and talking, filming with sync sound (radio mikes), and long duration travelling shots.
- 2013 Roberto personal journey – Queens Park and Edgware Rd
- 2013 Ed personal journey – Queens Park, Kilburn, St John's Wood
- 2013 Nick personal journey – Fitzrovia, Soho, Trafalgar Square
- 2013 Dave – Canons Park
- 2014 Robin personal journey #1 – Bloomsbury, Fitzrovia
- 2014 Robin personal journey #2 – Hackney, Stoke Newington

## A Particular 'Creative-Artistic' Enunciation

It was already apparent to me at this early stage of the research project that the Jewish documentary archive, and the art-based media projects, all demonstrated a predilection toward the 'journey' trope as a metanarrative device. This I imported into the 'logic' of the *My Jewish London* research methodology in as much as I requested that the collaborators take me on a filmed walk around their *Jewish London*, on a personal journey as it were. It represented *the* major assumption I was to make around gay Jewish London experience, that the journey trope was a valid way of Jewish Londoners to think about their experience of Jewishness[83]. What was not prescribed in any way was where the journey would take us – literally (Barnet, Brent, Westminster, Bloomsbury, Fitzrovia, Hackney, Harrow) and metaphorically (encompassing themes such as migration, foreign-ness, translation, impermanence). Elsewhere, the *a priori* categories reflected my predilection for

[83] This trope was later to be challenged by two of the on-screen collaborators – Robin and (to a degree) Josh. See Appendix E and Appendix I respectively.

Rouchian ethnographic research methods, Buber's I/Thou existential model and Benjamin's spatial philosophy of history, in pursuit of a particular notion of subjective knowledge emerging from the particular experiences when 'filmmaker meets on-screen collaborator'. The working methodology of filmed personal journey would be an opportunity for filmmaker and on-screen collaborator to explore the degree to which documentary film collaborations could challenge the singularity of 'authentic' tropes of Judaism normally on display in U.K. mainstream documentary. Instead, the particular filmic working method would explore what happened to factual representation when stripped of some of the anchors for identity in documentary film – a script and with it a character arc; highly elliptical editing; character identification markers (decision making under pressure); identifiable character needs/wants/change; close ups; point of view shots, turning points.

The personal journey research method would rely very heavily on the tracking shot, in anticipation that it might help define, or rather construct, continuums, circuits of variable speed', and help establish 'a coexistence of…continuums of different ages' (Deleuze 1990: 119), just as in Rouch's *Chronicle of a Summer* (1961) and Renais's *Toute La Mémoire du Monde* (1958). The aesthetic style was an attempt to avoid editorial streamlining and elliptical style of the expository mainstream doc, and instead mobilise the long-duration, real time tracking shot, both as a marker of in-the-moment authenticity, but also from time to time as a marker of abstraction and distanciation (see below). By *do-ing* documentary, the working method would explore whether spontaneous creative expressions would happen in front of the camera, a form of automatic performance, triggered perhaps as a consequence of being in a particular location.

Susan Scheibler, in 'Constantly Performing the Documentary' (1993: 135-150), sees the particular ontology of the performative inherent in documentary as affirmative, very much in the spirit of Butler and Rouch, seeing advantage in the deflection of attention away from the purely 'referential [descriptive] quality of documentary' (Nichols 1994: 93). Building on J.L. Austin's (1961) differentiation between the performative and descriptive qualities of (spoken) utterances, and the subsequent comments Derrida (1982: 321-330), Scheibler interprets the performative in documentary as something beyond a mere ploy to critique documentary's tendency toward (potentially duplicitous) description and conventional documentary storytelling[84]. In the *do-ing*, documentary language also 'takes on meaning' in the very act of enunciation (Scheibler 1993: 140) and becomes 'a field of [indefinite] enjoyment, of play and desire' (ibid: 146). It is this performative element that I think best describes the aspiration behind the ontology of the documentary language

[84] Stella Bruzzi's main argument in 2000.

of the personal journeys methodology, an ontology that was to explore the *do-ing* of gay Jewish subjectivity, rather than the deceptively straightforward *tell-ing* of it: all in an attempt to see what knowledge emerges in terms of representation. Exploring the *do-ing* of documentary in a way that foregrounds the performative moment of creation might free Jewish London representation from its traditional tropes: a 'subordination to a [realist] logic' and the 'protocols of the discourses of sobriety' (Nichols 1994: 100), manifest in the 'univocal discourse' of 'authentic' Judaism (Boyarin and Boyarin 1993: 693-725).

In summary, the research would explore the potential for performative moments in the cine-ethnographic research films to challenge realist and reductive documentary tropes, moments that were the product of the principles of 'interactivity' as understood by Rouch, Nichols and Buber. Thus, certain *a priori* Creative-Artistic methodological (and analytical) categories emerged at the research and development stage:

- The performative role of the filmmaker - as participant observer
- Performative ethno-showing and ethno-thinking collaborators
- Tracking shot ontology – naturalism, real time, no narrative arc, Rouchian pédovision, Benjaminian abstraction and philosophy of history
- Personal Jewish London in public space, 'the journey'.
- Ethics and concerns over collaborator safety vis-à-vis antisemitism/racism

These each provoked further examination which will next be addressed in turn.

## The role of the filmmaker in co-creative practice

In the early noughties, a work colleague at the University of Portsmouth, Jane Young, herself a documentary filmmaker, was initiating in South Hampshire a new way of working in Digital Storytelling (equivalent term to Participatory Video) – a concept started in the late 1990s around communities creating their own storytelling projects from-the-ground-up[85], and pioneered by institutions like the BBC[86]. Jane was working on a participatory audio-visual project at the Rowan's

[85] With the arrival of new media devices in the 1990s such as personal computers, camcorders, and affordable editing software, digital storytelling as a concept was conceivable and enabled individuals/ communities to share their stories via the internet, on discs and other electronic platforms.
[86] See the pioneer BBC Digital Storytelling projects, *Capture Wales*, 2001+ and (the England based) *Telling Lives*, 2002+.

Hospice in Waterlooville, the *Life Review* project[87] (2002-2004) where she made audio-visual cross-platform personal narratives under the instruction of the content providers, the hospice community. This was a new way of thinking about community video, where in most instances communities were trained up on kit to make the films on their own.[88] Using Jane's production logic and expertise, stories could be constructed in a more professional way, with the community content providers free to focus their energies on their storytelling and research. According to Jane, the community members 'certainly engaged in the process of telling the story, but their main concern was the quality of the finished product', something that she could help guarantee (Young 2016). Jane's re-conceptualisation of participatory video with/in the community had a profound effect on the framing of my role as researcher/filmmaker in the *My Jewish London* films. But the current research films also aspired to move away from a more realist tradition of community digital storytelling, and its foundation in community curatorship (communities producing their own projects)[89], to a more self-consciously creative collaboration between the researcher and on-screen participants. Kat Cizek's recent idea of 'co-creative practice', with its emphasis on creative collaboration between filmmaker and on-screen participants and ascribing different spheres of agency in the creation of a documentary, can be seen in many ways as a comparable methodological approach to that of Jane Young, and certainly added weight to my research design (see Cizek interview with Mandy Rose in Aston et al ed. 2017: 38-48).

Tali Hyman has called on the Jewish ethnographer to adopt a 'critical proximity, using 'the full range of reactions that s/he has to being in the field, simultaneously as "insider" and as "outsider" (in different, and shifting ways)…' and thus 'learning how to *use* one's Jewishness without *abusing* it (i.e., unreflexively).' (Charmé, Horowitz, Hyman, and Kress, 2008: 125-126). 'Learning how to *use*' my Jewishness was key to how I was to *do* things in this ethnographic project, working toward a felicitous connection with the on-screen collaborator. Borrowing from Buber, my ambition for the project was an 'I and Thou' dialogue between filmmaker and front-of-camera collaborator, based on 'mutuality, directness, presentness, intensity and ineffability' (Buber 1965: 12).Thus, the working method from the outset recognised different and complementary spheres of agency: firstly, those of the on-screen collaborator - the narrative, the locations, the on-camera performance; secondly, those of the filmmaker - the metanarrative logic (the journey), location shots (e.g. the tracking shots), post-production (coordination of editing).

[87] Regional Lottery funded for the first year of the project (2002-2003), when Jane was working on it.
[88] By the second year of the project, Jane had trained up in-house staff members to record and edit the patients' stories.
[89] For a seminal review of participatory video theories and methods see E-J Milne et al (ed.) 2012.

How, then, did the creative partnership manifest itself from the perspective of the collaborators? In most instances the feedback of the collaborators talks of a positive, complementary and creative partnership: Roberto felt guided by the filmmaker 'on the journey', and felt 'relaxed and pretty much myself… thanks to Searle who made me feel comfortable'. The 'filmed walk' 'felt very different and much more powerful and 'REAL [than a traditional interview]'. However, he also challenged some filmic decisions that I made. If he loved the shots of him 'walking through the park – scenes of families, kids playing – the trees – I think more of the trees whistling in the wind would have added more weight to my narrative', he also questioned some of the aesthetic decisions I made with regard to the editing: '…don't really like shots of the shoes – or my back [in Queen's Park] – very negative I felt.'[90] Here he disagreed with some of the filmmaker's spontaneous responses to the encounter, where low angle shots of the ground, Roberto's shoes, suggest the traumatic experience of migration in early childhood: something that was evident in his in-the-moment performative act on camera in Queens Park, as he describes his move from Colombia and his distant relation with his father (he cried off camera at one point). Here, at the moment of *do*-ing, on-screen Roberto's subjectivity meets documentary language and the two become 'a field' of creative 'play and desire' (Scheibler 1993: 146). The two co-creative elements spontaneously confront each other, and in the absence of a filmmaker's prescribed treatment and shot list, mixed creative messages may occur. This is exactly what happened in this case. Roberto's feedback to me in this instance read, 'I didn't actually like the shots – which are quite numerous [sic, in reality mainly one long duration shot] – of my back to the camera. During the actual filming, I thought it was interesting – but in the edited version – I actually don't really like it'[91]. As filmmaker, I can remember shooting this shot self-consciously because of what I perceived as a need to offer a visual counterpoint to the positive spin Roberto thought his verbal story was conveying. In fact, as the filmmaker participant-observer, filming Roberto talking only a few metres from me and the camera (so I could hear him clearly), I felt the opposite was true. If Roberto wanted me to convey a happier, ethereal mood along the lines of, 'the trees rustling in the wind would have added more weight to my narrative'[92], for me the in-the-moment performative act, his *do*-ing the scene, was about loss, whatever he was 'describing'. As the filmmaker co-collaborator, using the poetics of film language allowed me to make my own creative marker based on my filmic participation and observation in-the-moment.

Other collaborators in the research project also commented upon the co-creativity in it. Ed noted in his feedback that the project 'felt collaborative'. He went on to comment of his performance, and

[90] Appendix E
[91] ibid.
[92] ibid

that if 'there was a consciousness of being on camera… it felt real because we were talking about the reality of my environment'. He also noted positively on the use of performative camera language conceived spontaneously in-the-moment by the filmmaker at the end of Ed's film – as he deliberated on same sex marriage outside his shule: 'There were certainly [added] spontaneous aspects…the way you filmed my close relationship with the shule in Abbey Road'.[93]

Nick talked about feeling 'comfortable as Searle was relaxed as a facilitator which put me at ease'. In terms of co-agency. He felt that he 'was more able to "be myself" rather than if I was…in a traditional interview'; and that the filmmaker 'was very aware of the many ways of being Jewish and the participants' life stories, including my own'.[94] Dave too noted in his feedback how the camera shots reinforced his creative intention: 'your creative eye with selecting the right shots for my narrative - e.g. wide angle shots in the field when I was being pensive + reflective'[95]. He felt that the filmic research method allowed him 'to think + explore at my own pace. Like a soliloquy'[96].

As a filmmaker, what I perceive from the feedback in general is a recognition by the collaborators of the added value afforded the project through the exchange of creative ideas with the filmmaker, many of which were arrived at spontaneously in the field. Certainly it was my intention that this be the case, to work with persons well versed in the creative industries, who could bring their keen sense of performative rhetoric to the films, and thereby enhance the formal density[97] of the performative *do*-ings. I would certainly argue that such risk taking with on-screen collaborators – sharing authorial responsibilities, filming in one moment in time and space, relying on what happens at the time to a large degree – is rather unprecedented in traditional documentary. But before I claim too much for the field research method, Robin – the last of the collaborators - felt that the creative exchange was less than successful. If he felt that preproduction was very collaborative - 'trying to work out what I would do, when we first talked about it, was interesting' – the production felt 'less free as a creative collaborator'. At this point in the creative process Robin felt he was trying to fulfil my overall project agenda:

> Your agenda, or my fantasy of your agenda, was in my mind more than I feel you realised. Where you thought you were giving me loads of space to create my contribution freely, actually what was happening was that I was trying to sort of second guess what you wanted and supply it.

[93] ibid
[94] ibid
[95] ibid
[96] ibid
[97] See Goodman (1984) on the density of the signification of visual art language.

Robin's concerns continued through to the editing process:

> I wonder whether the edit process itself could fruitfully have been directly collaborative. As one does as an actor [Robin is an actor by profession], I felt that once I had made my contribution during the filming, all power was then removed from me while you (and perhaps someone else, an editor?) made all the editing decisions, which can massively change the perceived meaning for the eventual viewer. I was then allowed a very limited (limited by the nature of the process, I don't mean limited by you deliberately) amount of power back by having the option to have sections of the films cut. But there was never a dialogue about what would happen if the whole thing was constructed otherwise in some way. I don't mean I have specific suggestions, but I wasn't asked, and that is quite traditional in terms of the power of the director/producer[98].

Robin raises a very important point here about a collaborative approach to the editing 'where the participants have the opportunity to offer their interpretations of the material before the form of the film is irrevocably set' (Pryluck 1988: 264). In my defence, I would argue that it was always my purpose to reflect as honestly as I could the collaborators' experiences at/of the London locales at the time, journey narratives either of their choosing from pre-production onwards, or emerging in-the-moment spontaneously on location. If the research project had a 'planned approach' to the collaboration, with specific areas of authorial responsibility assigned to filmmaker and on-screen collaborator, each with 'clear objectives' from the beginning, providing 'a means of focus and co-ordination for post-production' (Toal 2002: 178), this was partly to protect the on-screen collaborators from any potential exposure (particularly anti-Semitism or homophobia – see Ethics section below) , and partly to facilitate in the collaborators a 'broader sense of the co-design and the spirit behind making something', even if they 'have absolutely no interest in picking up a camera..' (Aston et al ed. 2017: 39). With Robin being an actor, notions of 'the spirit behind making something' probably meant something quite different than to the others I worked with, for this model of *complementary agency* worked very well with the majority of collaborators.

*The particularity of the role of filmmaker:* Returning to the point made above regarding a 'planned approach', the 'planned approach' was conceived from the onset very much from the researcher's perspective of activist documentary practice. At the time of making the research films I was already heavily involved in large, externally funded research projects on LGBT+ Jewish experience, *R.J.* and *R.R.* These projects, although unprecedented in the U.K., were both organised from the centre, from the headquarters of Liberal Judaism. The research films on the other hand aimed to be more 'independent', born to a large degree of immediate experience and creative exchange on-the-

[98] Appendix E

streets. In this way as an activist filmmaker I hoped to 'free' my creative collaborators from the all-to-familiar codes of Jewish London, and so be able to experience their Jewishness in ways that might – as the research question indicated - contest the constrictions of identity, place and geography forged in traditional documentary practice?' In this sense, the unspoken agenda of the 'planned approach' of the researcher/filmmaker was about impassioned intervention to create change. This might explain in part my reluctance to open up the editing process to collaboration, as commented upon in Robin's feedback. Further bias/intent is evidenced in my predisposition to 'foreign' elements in the collaborators' autobiographies. The design of the project around 'journey' perhaps evidences my inherent interest in it, given my particular Jewish and gay life experience as a cosmopolitan person, Canadian by birth and British by inclination. Reflecting on this now, I was probably predisposed to working with the particular collaborators I worked with from the selection stage onwards because of our shared sense of creative exploration, translation, migration, cosmopolitanism. I would have gravitated to them and they to me in the various organisations where I made their acquaintance. This no doubt skewed my sample toward a particular type of gay Jewish integrator – often transplanted to London from elsewhere, 'foreign' and creative.

I also chose to also include a Modern Orthodox 'straight' Jewish man in the sample because of my desire to explore the degree to which gay Jewish London men might have similar or different stories to tell compared to a straight Modern Orthodox man.

## The role of the on-screen collaborators

Eagleton protests that we are forced to see everything through a prism of 'identity' – to see ourselves as 'meaningful' only through frameworks of knowledge that are already categorised, separated – whether as singular or intersectional identities – and always set adrift from immediate material experience. Binarisms such as authentic Jew versus gay Jewish 'other' only result in an affirmation of a dominant value ('authentic' Jewish identity) versus and a junior value ('other' Jewishness).

The research methodology was designed to explore a more unplanned, in-the-moment 'reconstruction' of what it is to *do* Jewishness differently, with fewer implicit hierarchies. But as much as Eagleton's notion of the material self and the *do*-ing of knowledge underpinned much of the research design, simply put, the complete destruction of an a-priori given 'identity' could not be

avoided in the final films. Why? Because the on-screen collaborators were chosen to collaborate on the research on the basis of their having an identity as 'gay-Jewish integrators' in whatever ways - institutional, religious or cultural - that manifested itself. That meant that those identities would always play a part in the films in some way. What the research design could and did aspire to, however, was a working methodology that decentred those given albeit intersectional identities just long enough for something new, unexpected (previously invisible) to manifest. It might be something the on-screen collaborators had suppressed for fear of reprisal, or something they had not consciously thought of before the act of filming their journeys began. I didn't rehearse this idea with them in the planning stages because I wanted to explore the efficacy of the research method, and any advanced notice of my interest in on-screen performative acts *constituted* in-the-moment rather than prescribed identities, would likely be self-defeating, by making the whole experience too self-conscious for the on-screen collaborators.

Staying with the method's design and intent, it must be said that inevitably the very technical nature of the film making process intervened at times. Despite a shooting protocol that was designed around travelling shots to facilitate spontaneity in the on-screen collaborators, the logistical breakdown of each filmed sequence of shots into a meaningful edited sequence of elements (the mix of tracking shots, cutaways where needed, direct-to-camera addresses by on-screen collaborators – referred to as 'découpage') precluded any fantasy of complete spontaneity. In his questionnaire completed two years after the filmic experience, Josh brings this up, that 'it felt quite unnatural to pause, stop and reflect out loud'[99].

## The tracking shot and the mechanics of filmmaking

In the cinéma vérité documentary film, *Chronicle of a Summer* (Rouch and Morin, 1961), Jean Rouch and his working partner Edgar Morin explore the potential of 'pédovision' (Rouch 2003: 240) - tracking shots with synchronous sound recorded in the field (Paris streets) as a tool for performative cine-ethnography. The personal journeys research method is built on the premise of keeping the experience as spontaneous as possible for the participants.

The film sequence poses the central ontological dilemma of the elaborate in-the-field tracking shot. Is it the ultimate marker and record of presence, of a naturalistic camera movement in the here-and-

[99] Appendix E

now, or is it a marker of distance, of abstracted contemplation, of distraction? Or both? The key to the answer for me was to be found in the earlier documentary, Alain Renais's *Night and Fog* (1955). The opening shots travel in 'living colour'[100] through the abandoned Auschwitz concentration camp, and at once mark the authentication of the location, the living moment as here-and-now, and at the same time render an uncanniness to what is clearly not visible anymore, the thousands of skeletal bodies rehearsing their death walk. Here lies the potential of the tracking shot used this way. It rehearses the compelling dialectic of Bazin's naturalistic tendency (Bazin 1967: 9-16) versus the Benjamin notion of otherness, dislocation, surreal[101] distraction, and alert contemplation[102]. If Gilles Deleuze focused on the 'strangeness' of Renais's 'time-image' largely in terms of a present-past historical relation (Deleuze 1994: 122[103]), it is my assertion that the Renais tracking shot in his modernist/Nouvelle Vague films aims much more toward a critical kino eye which brings out the contradictory potential of the tracking shot, as a marker of here-and-now 'presentness', and as a marker of Benjaminian abstraction[104].

The research films build on the phenomenological writings and films outlined above with regard to the tracking shot and its ontological interest, as well as previous street documentary films on Jewish experience made by the researcher/ filmmaker such as *Irene Runge: My Way* (Kochberg 2003) and *L'Esprit de l'Escalier* (Kochberg 2010). How would the on-screen collaborators respond to the particularity of the tracking shot ontology?

From the beginning of the filming, it was clear that spontaneous performative acts were emerging from the collaborators, as well as prescribed 'mapped thoughts to specific locations'. In the pilot film, Modern Orthodox 'straight' Josh, despite preparing 'broad themes before starting the walk' is clear that 'beyond some rather loose thoughts, most of the content was developed spontaneously whilst on the walk', with 'certain sections…developed whilst live on the [i.e. 'to'] camera – sometimes at the prompting of the interview'[105]. Josh ponders his existential Jewish self spontaneously as he wanders in extreme long shot in a park in Hendon, N.W. London (Sunnyhill

[100] A term coined by the US broadcaster NBC in the 1950s to announce its broadcasts presented 'in living colour'.
[101] See Wollen 2002: 98-101, where he makes the concrete connection between Rouch, "naturalistic" ethnographic film and surrealism.
[102] See Duttlinger 2007: 33-54, where she recognises in Benjamin's early writings an argument for the critical (dialectical) potential of BOTH distraction and alert (not self-absorbed) contemplation.
[103] Quoting Deleuze on Renais, 'In Renais' case, however, this inadequacy of the flashback does not stop his work as a whole being based on the coexistence of sheet of past, the present…' (Deleuze 1994: 122).
[104] In his 'Theses on the Philosophy of History' Walter Benjamin famously pictures history as NOT 'a chain of events' but as revealed to the angel of history as 'one single catastrophe, which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage… The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead…But a storm …propels him into the future…call [ed] progress' (Walter Benjamin 1992: 249). Again, broader history can be located in concrete materiality on/in the streets, as a series of arrested moments, rather than as continuous 'progress'.
[105] In fact, not an interview, but an off-screen intervention by the filmmaker. See Appendix E

Park), almost out of radio link with the sound mixer. Here he monologues in a very distracted (Benjaminian) way on the impossibility of a complete London Jewish identity:

> The idea of being both tied to a place in Britain and tied to Israel and that whole concept, everything...is wrapped up in a fundamental conflict, a tension within identity. Because whilst I am proudly British and very much enjoy London, there's not the same deep level connection. For me London is about past, it's about where I was, and Israel is about future. ...This diaspora identity is somewhat fundamentally inconsistent, it's not a whole Jewish identity....it's in pieces[106].

Or maybe identity in general is 'in pieces'? The travelling shot, coupled with Josh wandering through the park, seemed to affect a 'failure', or a destruction of concrete identity. In its stead the on-screen collaborator affected an equivalent of diary 'writing' with his body and mind, where in the moment performative acts led to occasional blind alleys, contradictions, repetitions and omissions, rather than coherent, ordered stories taken from a single, particular moment in time in the mode of the 'classic' autobiography (Pascal 1960: 1-20). In this pilot film, so basic was the filming procedure, tracking shot, repositioned camera, 2nd tracking shot, talking heads, etc that insufficient attention was given to building sequences later in post-production. For later films therefore the filming protocol was formalised a little more, though minimally, so as not to detract from the spontaneity of the profilmic event. Failure of a fully rounded, concrete, 'whole' identity to emerge in this pilot, in favour of cinematic performative acts alluding to an imminent subjectivity, suggested a research method that might indeed explore what Eagleton called the phenomenological nature of our material being, where a 'ready, sensuous, physiological being is… the precondition of any theory of subjectivity' (Eagleton 2011: 131).

Given that the key tracking shot aesthetic protocol was by necessity adapted in the field for the technical and operational reasons outlined above, I was eager as researcher/filmmaker to review the collaborator feedback with regard to their perception of the working method's spontaneity. Certainly every effort had been made to maintain the original shooting protocol as much as possible for all the ontological reasons and epistemological aspirations already discussed. Working against the very nature of traditional documentary filmmaking practice and its construction of knowledge[107] was to align the research shooting protocol with an understanding of an emergent, 'automatic

[106] See Appendix I

[107] IE its insistence on an *a priori* treatment as well as a shooting script of some sort (ie shot lists mapped against likely audio), are all attempts to minimise spontaneous 'surprises', and to ensure a successful shoot in what is a deductive process of storytelling (research and development/treatment/hypothesis/testing hypothesis).

writing' of one's subjective self, not a prescribed, scripted and stereotypical identity on-screen, penned by the discourses of hegemonic documentary practices.

Comments were largely supportive of this filmic ontology[108]:

- Josh comments that although his journey was mapped out beforehand, as well as the broad themes, most of the content developed spontaneously: the synagogue and C.S.T., the Eruv[109], these were live on camera.

- Roberto comments that he had some notes, but most of what appeared on-screen was spontaneous. Ideas evolved through the walk.

- Ed comments that the route (home to shule) was pre-planned, but that many of the themes - the social housing, graffiti, his relationship to shule were spontaneous.

- Nick says that 90% of the material on film was spontaneous. Ideas developed 'live' on camera. He goes on to add that 'that he found that he 'was more able to "be myself" rather than if I was…in a traditional interview'; and that this was facilitated by the fact that the filmmaker 'was v. aware of the many ways of being Jewish and the participants' life stories, including my own'.[110]

- Dave notes that the route was considered/ pre-planned, but that the memories of his father, his youth, were spontaneous, and the Tashlich ritual enacted on camera too (see below). Dave says that 'filmed walk' method 'allowed me to think + explore at my own pace. Like a soliloquy'[111].

- Only Robin argues that as an actor, it was 'difficult' for him to *do* something that was 'there in perpetuity to be viewed by who-knows-who, when it wasn't one's own impulse that it sprang from.' Yet, despite his overall concerns he did acknowledge that:

> …there were moments during filming when what came out of my mouth was genuinely spontaneous – things I hadn't planned in advance to say – when things just 'popped into my head'; and one or two moments when I felt genuine emotion in the moment….that there were topics I spoke about that I hadn't particularly planned to. One example, as far as I remember, was the story about coming out to my family and my father prioritising that I politicise it. As far as I remember, I hadn't planned to talk about what happened by the lions outside the British Museum [gay cruising] - that was prompted by being there and remembering while the camera was running. Similarly just before that, I had heard the story about the railings being removed from Russell Square during WW2 [again because of cruising] a few days before, from my mother, and it was prompted by walking past there.[112]

---

[108] See Appendix E

[109] Jewish religious boundary for the Sabbath, recognised by Barnet Council, and marked out by existing railway lines, street boundaries, fencing. Occasionally necessitating the construction of new poles and nylon wire.

[110] ibid

[111] ibid

[112] ibid

## From a definite safe interior space to an indefinite exterior experiential place

Andrew Benjamin has written that metropolitan public spaces such as those in the *My Jewish London* films should be understood as sites of negotiation, contestation and reimagining, where 'there is always already a play of the multiplicity of racial and cultural voices' (Benjamin 1993: 137). Extrapolating from his philosophical arguments, the Jewish urban spaces in the research films are taken to be 'spatial environments in which Jewish things happen, where Jewish activities are performed, and which in turn are shaped and defined by those Jewish activities', where Jewish space is defined 'by performance' (Lipphardt, Brauch and Nocke 2008: 4). Here, the constituted London 'places' are 'cast' as central characters in the films, just as much as the on-screen collaborators and the filmmaker. There never was, nor is there now a claim that the same stories could have been shot elsewhere in the U.K.

There are several collaborative art-based phenomenological projects (A-D) that informed the grounded theory methodology of the *My Jewish London* involving the *place*ment of participants' stories in particular, personally significant spaces. Each of these research projects explored the philosophical notion of our 'being-in-the-world' (Heidegger 1988), and our perception of/in it (Merleau-Ponty 1981: 219), where through 'movement and orientation we create a link between our bodies and the outlying space' (Valentine 1999: 49). Hence space becomes imbued with personal investment and experience and vice versa, the result of which is 'a meaningful location' (Cresswell 2004: 7). In each case, the rejection of the notion of 'inert' space (see Anderson 2004: 255) opened up the possibility of a space becoming a meaningful 'character' in any personal spatial/temporal narrative on film, helping facilitate with persons their particular experiential, cultural and historical narratives.

A. The in-the-moment human geography 'walking interview' method proposed by Evans and Jones for personal urban storytelling (2011: 849-858) was very influential, but it is an audio interview-based method with GTS applications. *My Jewish London* on the other hand is clearly focused on creative digital film storytelling and as a research project was designed to avoid prescriptive social science interview techniques, which is clearly integral to Evans' and Jones' work. Another difference in the methodologies is that Evans and Jones conceived a decidedly geographic discourse of 'place', rather than a temporal one (2011: 856). The *My Jewish London* research methodology on the other

hand was designed to explore the overall subjective 'experience', and not prescribe what that filmic personal journey experience might be, to potentially explore both spatial 'axes' – geographic and temporal. Nevertheless, the Evans and Jones method provided a very useful parallel to the personal journeys research method, for at its heart it investigated the gaps between the notions of real space and perceived 'place'. The need to see how this worked in media practice, 'how this imaginary is discovered and comprehended at the ground level' (Kenney 2001: 26), was central to their work and to the design of the *My Jewish London* research project.

B. The 'Sense of Belonging' walking/ mapping project in the East Midlands, which was a 2008 collaboration between community arts organisations, asylum seekers and artists in exile.[113] The walks were taped, photographed or transcribed, and in-the-moment experiences of individuals 'away from home' were compared with those of long term residents, by pairing the two groups on each walk (O'Neill and Hubbard 2010b; www.guardian.co.uk/society/gallery/2009/jan/13/sense-of-belonging-exhibition?picture=341562670). What I found useful in the method was that it demonstrated that 'mapped' life narratives could be creative and knowledge-creating; i.e. they could 'function' (Plantinga 1996) as non-fiction documents and as creative media praxis at the same time, generating perceptions of public space that were not fixed.

C. The 'Prisons Memory Archive', drawing on a life-storytelling oral history tradition, was another project that influenced the design of the personal journeys research project. It is a site-specific collaboration between filmmaker and participant, in this case political ex-prisoners filmed in the disused Long Kesh and Maze prison complex outside of Belfast (www.prisonsmemoryarchive.com). A camera followed the participants who were miked up as they walked around the site and recalled their experiences (McLaughlin 2006a: 123-133). I found this work very useful as it demonstrated how personal stories recorded in-the-moment using the device of the travelling 'time image' shot (after Deleuze 1994) could challenge hegemonic historical narratives.

D. The 'Queer is in the Eye of the Newcomer' project involving youth of Toronto who were 'refugees, refugee claimants, and non-status queer and trans youth' influenced the design of this research project. In 'Queer is in the Eye of the Newcomer' the participants were filmed conducting walking tours around *their* Toronto and in the process configured their 'place' within it (Miller 2010).

As mentioned earlier, inspired by the idea of Valerie Hey - that in circumstances where identities are 'simultaneously asserted and "under threat"' a *conceptual-empirical space* [my emphasis] is created

[113] The methodology is similar to that developed by Misha Myers in 2006 in her Plymouth based 'Homing Place' project (Myers 2008b; www.homingplace.org), although she didn't use film as a recording device.

where 'subjects can come to cite themselves in recognised as well as unpredictable ways' (Hey 2006: 452) – I decided to reject the hegemonic safety of 'authentic' interior spaces and explore instead what Jewish public places emerged from the grounded theory data sets gathered on the personal journeys. Those places would very likely be informed by collaborators' assertion of their Jewish selves (these locales were part of their *Jewish London* after all), but might also be informed by trepidation too perhaps (because of potential censure from others: 'authentic' Jews, as well as anti-Semites[114] or homophobes[115]). In either case, the grounded theory methodology used in the research meant that categories of 'place' would be constituted from the data collected in the field, in the *do-ing* of the documentary, in the experiences of particular public spaces for the on-screen collaborators and researcher/filmmaker as well. Any categories that may have emerged before shooting, like home and synagogue, would owe their significance, their particular *place* in the personal journeys, only in the data sets collected in the field.

*An endnote on the particularity of the filmic protocol:* It is clear that the foundations of the filmic protocol for the research films are not new but lie in several collaborative art-based phenomenological projects, and most importantly in several cinéma-vérité filmic innovations embedded in the Marcelline scene from *Chronicle of a Summer*(1961), a scene which has greatly influenced all my personal documentary work as an activist filmmaker: its co-creative 'shared anthopology', its performative elements of on-screen collaborator and filmmaker, its experiential elements, its use of the dialectical tracking shot as in-the-moment (with a decidedly geographic evocation of 'place'), and at the same time as a marker of autobiographical wandering (with a temporal evocation of 'place') (see Evans and Jones 2011: 856).

In this research project, it is not the filmic protocol that is new, but the way it is appropriated in an activist agenda that is: to 'reverse' ethnographic representations, to challenge mainstream media stereotypes by grass roots filmmaking (all enabled ironically in an age of cheap, easily accessible global digital technologies). And despite the research films' release from the 'narrative moorings' (after Juhasz and Lebow 2018), elsewhere in the research films their use of cutaways, voiceover, continuity, spatial and temporal coherency, associative editing, the final cut of the director, all

[114] Hence the existence of the 'Community Security Trust', to provide security advice for Jewish schools, synagogues and community organisations. See their website www.thecst.org.uk.
[115] According to the Metropolitan Police, the number of homophobic hate crimes committed in London doubled over the period 2013/14 and 2017/18 - rising from 1156 to 2079. Reported by James Dunham 29 March, 2018, ITV News online. https://www.itv.com/news/london/2018-03-29/sharp-rise-in-homophobic-hate-crime-on-londons-streets-and-online/

suggest an adherence to a more widely used type of vérité narrative documentary tradition. What is new is the appropriation of this style as a shared anthropological ACTIVIST strategy.

## Ethics

In a previous high profile research project I had worked on involving cross-platform media and L.G.B.T.+ Jewish London personal narratives, a Heritage Lottery Fund project called *Rainbow Jews* (*R.J.*), my name and the project manager's featured quite extensively on online Jewish press releases. Unfortunately both of us were subject to online antisemitism (and homo/transphobia) on anti-Semitic chat lines – a worrying and growing concern according to recent commissioned reports on antisemitism in the U.K.[116] and the EU[117] in general. Therefore, I was particularly sensitive to issues of confidentiality in the design of the *My Jewish London* research project, and in the dissemination of any of its research outcomes. At the point of postproduction, I was able to filter any ethical problems around confidentiality out of the films, problems that were not evident to the collaborators themselves for the most part. In post-production any specific identity indicators – especially visible addresses, 3rd party names – had to be removed from the images (those of Josh, Ed, Roberto, and Robin Bloomsbury).

For those reasons the following decisions were made:

- The films would not appear online[118].
- The data files of 'filmed personal journeys' would be secured on portable hard drives until such time as I clarified to the ethics committee any issues around exposure to the participants of material in exhibitions, screenings, online websites etc.
- The participants would be 'out' and have to some degree a public Jewish 'community' profile, where they were used to a level of public visibility.
- The project would take special care with regard to informed consent, so that collaborators were fully cognisant with the details of their lives that would be under scrutiny. NB in the end nearly all of the participants were in the creative industries, like me, and were used to the personal scrutiny of the creative process.

[116] See 2015 report by the U.K. based Jewish organisation Community Security Trust (C.S.T.).
[117] See 2013 report by EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (F.R.A.).
[118] To protect the participants, and the very personal intersectional nature of the stories (gay, Jewish, London links, family, employment), the research films will NOT appear online on any website, either websites with open access or - as was the case for the *Ritual Reconstructed* project (Arts and Humanities Research Council – A.H.R.C. - funded, 2014/15) – on websites with membership-only log in access.

- I would have a personal friendship with the participants, to increase a sense of mutual regard and trust. As Carolyn Ellis puts it, 'You research with them, rather than look into their lives from the outside… In friendship as method then, there is no leaving the field.' (Ellis 2007: 13)
- Any sensitive street markers or family names identified in the course of the filming would be digitally removed.
- Edited versions of the films - after the rough cut is completed – would be available for viewing and comment by the collaborators.
- With regard to ethics and content of story, the collaborators would have final cut approval, and that any problem areas for them would be re-edited or edited out. However, **aesthetic** decisions based on the mise en scène (framing, shot composition, movement of frame or within the frame et cetera) and editing would remain the decision of the filmmaker.
- No material would be made public without the express approval of the participants[119].

## A new approach to participant feedback: the emotional map versus the questionnaire

Returning to Rouch, his writings and films make clear that the researcher/filmmaker as participant observer must immerse themselves in the activity they are experiencing and recording: they must ethno-look and ethno-think. In turn, the interventionist policy of reflexive filmmaking practice should help facilitate a form of ethno-show and ethno-thinking on the part of on-screen participants. It was the aspiration of the research method that from these experiential filmic events would emerge ultimately a subjective knowledge, grounded in a data set that was 'the result of an endless quest where ethnographers and those whom they study meet' (Rouch 2003: 100-101). The feedback from the on-screen collaborators was also designed to reflect a grounded theory methodology. Each of the on-screen contributors, many of whom are in the creative industries, were asked to produce an 'emotional' map soon after their walk, to summarise their feelings and conclusions around their personal filmed journeys and *My Jewish London*. This doesn't mean that traditional qualitative reflective feedback in the form of questionnaires was not sought. It was. But the aspiration of the research methodology was to offer new creative methods of collaborator

[119] With regard to the final point, at the time of writing, I am negotiating with the London Metropolitan Archive (L.M.A.) to have the PhD films and exegesis added to their collection of L.G.B.T.+ and Jewish London artefacts (this will happen post 2019). The L.M.A. also houses the collections of *Rainbow Jews* (National Lottery funded, 2012-2014) and *Ritual Reconstructed* (A.H.R.C. funded, 2014-2015) for which I produced and directed several films and TV shows. Access to the collection will be by invitation only.

feedback based on their 'creative-artistic' experiences, ones that would reinforce their creative agency. Further, the creation of the 'emotional' maps would also assist in dispelling the notion of a fixed objectified (gay) Jewish identity in a documentary. Rather, the creative feedback method of the 'emotional' map would hold the descriptive referent of the documentary narrative message in brackets again 'under suspension' (Nichols 1994: 96-97) and focus on the creative and performative. The collaborators were encouraged to think of the 'map' as a creative feedback mechanism which in no way needed to be cartographic. It could be of course, or it could be a mental landscape, or explicitly thematic[120]. Whatever, it would reflect their recent experience, and would be supported by an audio recording of their thoughts as they drew their maps.

The 'emotional' map, coupled with the *post facto* questionnaire, completed after the final edit had been viewed and signed off by the on-screen collaborators, offered two rather different avenues of ethnographic feedback from the perspective of the on-screen collaborators. This in turn would give the researcher/filmmaker different types of feedback with which to reflect on the research design, and the categories of analysis.

The next written chapter will extend evaluation of the filmed journey method, but this time with particular reference to the categories of analysis that arose out of the collected field data, data that could not have been predicted from the *a priori* design, research and development of the project.

[120] For writings on the 'emotional' map see Bruno 2002, where an 'atlas of emotion' is conceived of as a mental landscape of their creator, evoking 'places' rather than cartographic representations of spaces in other words.

# Chapter 6 Seven Exploratory Co-Creative Documentary Films

Films on USB

# Points of Arrival

## Chapter 7 Analysis of Emergent Grounded Theory Data

### Grounded Theory Methodology

Grounded theory methodology involves the analysis of data sets or 'categories' that are identified from field data, described and then analysed.[121] As the methodology name suggests, the analysis is 'grounded' in the collected data. The coding mechanism for 'categories' will always be subjective, based on the perspectives and aims of the researcher, but the researcher needs to be able to demonstrate that there is a rationale behind their selection, an attempt to do justice to the data sets from the field (Yin 1994, 2003). As will be demonstrated below, some of the categories already established as part of the filming protocol at the research and development stage became 'progressively focused'[122] over time. Others established themselves well after filming began and were added to a group of already identified field categories. This emergent codification process was clearly dynamic and evolving as any 'creative-artistic' inductive methodology would be, founded on ethnographic principles or not. Such a methodology relies on exploration, not the testing of hypotheses, and remains open to what emerges in *do-ing* the project, in the process of making. Here, the categories of analysis that emerged were based first and foremost on the experiential nature of the filmic encounters with on-screen collaborators.

The following grounded Creative-Artistic categories identified from the field data included:

- Collaborators' journeys: 'Wilderness', 'Exodus' and 'Exile' narratives[123]
    - Exodus - urban migration within London Jewish populations
    - Wilderness - personal spiritual wanderings, and journeys toward Reconstructionism
    - Exile - diaspora, migration
- The 'Jewish' Built Environment - parks, high streets, synagogues, family homes, imagined spaces, hidden spaces, no spaces
    - Jewish public places as 'spatial and locational', and/or 'temporal and historical' (see Evans and Jones 2011: 849-858)

[121] See www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/9780335244492.pdf
[122] See www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/9780335244492.pdf
[123] Subplots that resemble the central 'biblical' narratives drawn out most strongly in the TV series *A Sense of Belonging* (Morrison 1991), and the book on which it is based (Cooper and Morrison 1991).

- ‘Reconstructionist’ Ritual
- Iconology – mezuzah

## Participants’ Engagement with the Planned Shooting Protocol

Inductive grounded-theory methodology involves the researcher/filmmaker moving ‘back and forth’ between ‘the processes of data collection and analysis‘, because grounded theory ‘encourages the researcher to continuously review earlier stages of the research’[124]. In this research project, as a consequence of the problems encountered in the pilot film (Josh’s) - where the shooting protocol was too free and loose (e.g. Josh being too far away and out of reach of the radio receiver to pick up the audio for instance, which meant a loss of live audio in the tracking shots) - different procedures were enacted in the later films to ensure that on-screen collaborators could enact their experiences in ways that worked for them and the filmmaker. From the researcher/filmmaker’s perspective, adapting procedures as required ensured that simple assemblage-edit sequences could be ‘built’ in the editing suite, and that live data recorded in the field would not be lost.

The tracking shot protocol was refined after the second film in the series. From my field notes[125], I am reminded that in this film Roberto would occasionally – like Josh - venture off walking and talking, with little sense of the camera at all, nor my need to reposition the camera to cover the filmed walk on camera. Therefore, I fine-tuned the shooting protocol again, and before each scene was shot I would agree with the on-screen collaborator, camera operator and sound recordist the length and distance covered by each shot in broad terms, as well as the maximum distance between sound recordist/sound mixer and on-screen collaborator with body mic pinned to them, so that the subject would be kept in frame and the spoken words could be picked up. I also requested a brief description of what the collaborator had talked about after each scene had been recorded, so that I could film any necessary cutaways quickly, to build a narrative sequence. Despite the planning, this didn’t always work, which I discuss in my field notes in relation to Robin’s Bloomsbury walk (the penultimate walk in the series): ‘…after each leg of filming, I needed to be briefed on what he was

[124] See www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/9780335244492.pdf
[125] Collated as a whole in November, 2014. See Appendix F

talking about. In some instances, I didn't have the cutaways I needed and had to cover the scenes with material acquired later (e.g. the shot of the lions at the back of the British Museum)'[126].

Referring to my field notes again[127], I can see that I was further concerned about any intimation of an 'interview' in the shooting protocol vis-à-vis the filmmaker's role of participant observer. The problem of any ethnographic interview method was that participants often responded to interviewers 'through the use of familiar narrative constructs, rather than providing meaningful insights into their subjective view' (Miller and Glassner quoted in Czarniawska 2012: 50). For that reason, the filmed personal journey method avoided traditional interviewing. Although the absence of interviews was maintained, prompting was required with certain collaborators in the course of filming. My prompting (audible on some of the film soundtracks) was particularly evident when working with Ed, Nick and Dave. And of the three, Ed was the person who liked most to stop and speak, to be led into his spoken passages and for those passages to be set up for him in some way, despite the narrative content being of his own making. This brought its own problems, as he notes in his questionnaire feedback where he points out that on watching the film, 'I was surprised that my intonation seemed to be "on show", or telling a story, and not more relaxed and conversational.'[128] The conundrum of social actors shielding themselves and self-consciously performing on camera, or freezing in front of it, is one that has been discussed in many writings on documentary film and photography (Owens 1992: 191-198; Bruzzi 2000: 127-152). Josh, Roberto and Robin too remarked on the inevitable cinematic contrivances, for instance Josh in his questionnaire noted 'It felt strange to explain things clearly to an "audience", e.g. what a mezuzah is, that I would not have explained if repeating the exercise without a camera'[129].

Robin made use of those contrivances at times as an actor, with his acute awareness of the camera, potential audiences for the films and his exposure in perpetuity. In his Hackney film (2014) for instance, he required rehearsal time and three takes for the last, to-camera reflection regarding the relationship he felt between a socialist and Jewish messianic age, and the destruction of identity politics.

> The final piece in the Hackney film was an interesting and slightly different experience. I feel fairly happy with the final result in that case, and it was achieved sitting on a bench and having several 'goes' at it. The first two or three were long-winded, not as clear, less authentic, less focussed, and I feel we got to the version that worked by doing it several

[126] Appendix E
[127] Appendix F
[128] Appendix E
[129] ibid

> times. In other words, it wasn't scripted by any means, but improvising it repeatedly enabled me to come closer to what I really wanted to say[130].

Other examples of retakes were Ed outside the Kilburn Arts Centre and Roberto opposite the erstwhile Brondesbury Synagogue.

## The Particularity of the Filmed Personal Journeys

In his essay 'The Storyteller', Benjamin advocates a type of narrative strategy whereby individual events and their spatial arrangements should be 'related with the greatest accuracy, with 'the psychological connection of the events…not forced on the reader. It is left to him to interpret things the way he understands them…' (Benjamin 1992: 89). Whether this can be taken as manifestation of Benjamin's interest in hyper/sur- realism, or his support of a type of narrative structure that bears a striking resemblance to the naturalistic 'aesthetic of reality' advocated by André Bazin (Bazin 1972: 16-60) - a looser causality from one plot point to another, a more threadbare factual plot that bypasses traditional classic (psychological) realist[131] strategies – is arguable.

The very nature of the short-film, tracking shot protocol, and its tangible material connection to the built environment that the on-screen collaborators move along, move within and move through, means that the documentary experience is liberated from its conventional narrative moorings[132]. Spatial tangibility imparts the films with a quality of subjective 'image facts', not the objective 'image facts' argued by Bazin with regard to Italian Neorealism (Bazin 1972: 38). At the same time the research films offer abstracted personal moments that in storytelling terms are non-diegetic (outside the 'material world of the immediate, 'located' story), and differ from a bios of linear 'progress'[133] in conventional realist films. Rather than the conventional construction of character arcs over time with ironed out 'real' motivations and needs of traditional documentaries on Jewish London identity, the research method facilitated a more immediate on-screen subjectivity, with the on-screen co-author *do*-ing of his story to a degree there-and-then, rather than merely being constructed as a subject reflecting a filmmaker's treatment. Only Robin felt the co-creative ambition was seriously compromised. In his questionnaire he says at one point, 'I felt more like the subject of a

---

[130] ibid

[131] See MacCabe 1974 for review of the classic realist film text, one that is based on verisimilitude (linear causal narratives, enigma/resolution, 3-act narrative arcs, etc..)

[132] See A. Juhasz & A. Lebow (2018) manifesto on documentary, *Beyond Story: an Online, Community-Based Manifesto*

[133] See Benjamin 1992: 249

documentary', and reflects on his particular expectations around creative collaboration with me on the project. To contextualise this statement more fully, at the time of filming he was my romantic partner, which no doubt complicated the interactive creative process. In the questionnaire he also talks about 'trying to build an "us-space"' with me[134], and perhaps throughout fretted too much about trying to second-guess what he thought my agenda for him was on film. In fact, that was always his choice.

The chosen personal journey narrative subplots conceived and experienced by the on-screen collaborators - such as they were - fitted into three categories. Interestingly, the categories coincided with subplots that appear in the early C4 TV series *A Sense of Belonging* (Morrison 1991) and in the book which accompanies the series (Cooper and Morrison 1991)[135], themselves drawing on precedents in the Jewish Bible: Exile, Exodus and Wilderness. If the subplots of this TV series develop in a way that suggests in part, at least, a more speculative and subjective editorial approach to documentary taken by Channel 4 in the first decade of its existence, they are still born out of a prescriptive, deductive, journalistic manner typical of mainstream documentary, and confirmed by the makers of the series (ibid). In the research films, the emergence of these subplots appeared to be largely experiential and subjective, emerging as they did for the on-screen co-creators at the point of *do*-ing and reflecting their *Jewish London* experiences. And unlike the planned approach to mainstream documentary, it is the subplot of Wilderness – and its accompanying theme of 'personal spiritual wanderings' (after Morrison 1991) – that dominates the research films.

It is important to qualify the emergence of this theme of wandering. If the theme does emerge in the analysis of filmic data, grounded in the collected filmic data, it begs the question 'how and why'? What appeared to emerge spontaneously in the *do*-ing of the filmed personal journeys might also in part be understood as 'unconscious' predisposition. It is likely that personal journeys were conceived partly at least through the prism of Jewish 'mythical thought' born of narrative models in the Hebrew Bible, where wandering as a cultural trope 'is conceived as a timeless and repeating cycle of events…the kind of conceptual process that makes the present alive in the past' (Wright 1977: 207-208). Bearing in mind this qualification, most of the collaborators chose to associate their wanderings with the genre of Romance[136] - personal journeys that offered redemption, a creative 'transcendent imagination', and the 'primacy of the perceiver in the world he perceives' (Bullock et

[134] Appendix E
[135] The subplots of the C4 series are usefully discussed in the book by Cooper and Morrison 1991.
[136] See White's structural analysis of historical writings, where Romance is identified as a plot mechanism in 19th Century historical writing.

al. 1988: 751-752). To this end, Dave cites in his written feedback a filmic experience of wandering that 'allowed me to think and explore at my own pace. Like a soliloquy'[137]. Nick in his personal journey film found redemption in the form of the interfaith tent he remembered at an earlier London Pride[138]. Robin in turn speculated of a time when his socialist and spiritual selves would realise a universal nirvana, with the final death of identity politics: '[with]…My Marxist communist beginnings and foundation…I think we can get there…a time when divisions between people don't really exist anymore'.[139] Interestingly, several on-screen collaborators also chose to evoke the 'magical' power of nature to transform, by *do*-ing their stories to a large degree in parks – Josh, Dave, Roberto, Nick. This too is a typical conceit of Romanticism, with its spiritual links to nature. Roberto, in his reflection of his filmed personal journey experience stated, 'the park does have something that is very meditative and does bring everything together in some way'[140].

In traditional Jewish documentary narratives, the subplot of Exile - diaspora, and international migration – dominates much narrative development. However, in the research films it is really only a driving force behind the screen journeys of Josh and Robin, and in Josh's case the subplot reverses the stereotypical trajectory on Jewish Exile represented in traditional documentary films. Here, Josh experiences Exile in reverse, where diaspora is the problem, not the solution. Josh's mental pictures on camera seems to bleed well beyond the confines of his 'place' in the Jewish London enclave of Hendon, NW London. In his filmic personal journey, Israel emerges as the solution to a failed London diaspora of 'partial Judaism' (after A.B. Yehoshua[141]), while Hendon – for all its comforting, safe Jewish high streets, its synagogues – evokes a sense of rupture and discontinuity. As he noted in his film,

> For me London is about past, it's about where I was, and Israel is about future. ...This diaspora identity is somewhat fundamentally inconsistent, it's not a whole Jewish identity....it's in pieces[142].

For Josh, adherence to a London story was always going to prove inadequate[143]. If the spiritual wandering theme is usually associated with the 'Wilderness' subplot, Josh's narrative embeds it into the subplot of (reverse) Exile in his search for the meaning of his Jewish subjectivity, and his inherent deconstruction of a unified diasporic identity.

---

[137] Appendix E
[138] Appendix I
[139] Appendix I
[140] Appendix D
[141] see Blumenfeld, 2012, para. 2
[142] Appendix I
[143] For a persuasive historical perspective on the disaffection of young Jews in the U.K. since 1967 see Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010.

Robin's Exile subplot in his Bloomsbury and Hackney films on the other hand proved 'traditional' in the sense that the plot moves from Nazi Germany to London. The son of refugees, Robin's on-screen persona manifested through the prism of a socialist-Jewish Exile subplot. Whilst filming in Stoke Newington, Robin made a spontaneous detour to Walford Road Synagogue to relive a personal family trauma. The dire state of disrepair of an old Orthodox synagogue evoked his family trauma of Nazi expulsion and antisemitism. And responding to Robin's abstracted feelings of spatial and temporal rupture that the synagogue evoked, I, as filmmaker, spontaneously assembled a series of images of the dilapidated building's exterior, to create a complementary associative montage cluster[144] suggesting Robin's emotional state that I was feeling. Like Josh, Robin's insistent on-screen Exile personal journey around diaspora and migration makes the concept of a Jewish London for him somewhat limiting. In fact he made just this point in his written feedback to me: 'the construct *My Jewish London* isn't hugely meaningful to me in my own experience'.[145]

Thirdly, the research films demonstrate a marked absence of the Exodus 'ghetto' narrative[146] mapped out in most traditional documentaries on Jewish London: from the (poor, 'exotic' urban) East End of the past to the (assimilated, affluent suburban) North West London of the present. In the research films, only Robin's personal journey in any way engages with this plot structure, and then in reverse. Robin's filmic personal London journey is one that shifts from the West End to the East End, not the other way round, and from assimilation to Jewish spiritual revival, again a reversal of traditional narrative representation. If the Exodus subplot reflects the statistical evidence of London Ashkenazi (Jews of Eastern European origin) urban migration trends over time[147], the personal journeys method shows it at the very least to be an oversimplification of the Jewish London experience, one that foregrounds the popular 'goldene medina' (Yiddish for 'golden land') rags to riches Ashkenazi myth, but fails to consider urban patterns of London Jewish subgroups such as L.G.B.T.+ Jews, Jews of colour, Sephardi or Mizrahi Jews (Jews of Portuguese, Spanish or Middle Eastern backgrounds). And in the final tally, unlike the 1991 C4 series, *A Sense of Belonging* (Morrison 1991), or indeed many other mainstream documentaries on Jewish London[148], the research films as constituted by the filmmaker and on-screen collaborators suggest a cityscape

---

[144] As per the montage theory of the formalist Soviet filmmaker, Sergei Eisenstein. See Eisenstein 1977: 72-83.
[145] Appendix E
[146] This 'ghetto' model can be traced back to the early 20th Century academic writings of the Chicago School, most typically Louis Wirth 1998.
[147] as evidenced by their attraction to Jewish 'enclaves' and 'clusters' (Vaughan and Arbaci 2011: 130) across North London and South Hertfordshire (Newman 1985: 361).
[148] See Vas, 1962; Brown, Searle & Ralling, 1968; Smith, Heritage & Stein, 1969; Goldschmidt, 1974; White, 1991; Land & Hassid 2003; Littlejohn & Collingridge, 2007; Wall & Engle, 2008; Oord, 2017.

infinitely more nuanced, where 'the suburb [functions] as a continuum of the city's spatial-social complexity' (Vaughan 2015: 1).

In his essay 'A Berlin Chronicle', Walter Benjamin speculates on the idea of 'setting out the sphere of life – bios – graphically on a map… a system of signs…"Lived Berlin"…' (Benjamin 2007: 5). It is this lived experience that I hoped would be evident in the reflective 'emotional' maps that the on-screen collaborators created shortly after their personal journeys on film had been enacted. As the maps were hand drawn and sometimes coloured, I hoped that they might offer collaborators a method of creative feedback which they could 'own', and that enabled them to feed back in a way that potentially was more 'dense' (after Goodman 1984) as a 'system of signs' more complex, nuanced and rather more intuitive than words on a written page (as per the questionnaires they also filled in).

For the most part the 'emotional' maps were produced one or two weeks after the individual walks were completed. The methodological logic of these maps was to offer the on-screen collaborators a complementary creative method for reflection, rather than just offering the questionnaire feedback of a more traditional social science methodology. Like a traditional qualitative ethnographic interview method, my concern was that persons feeding back through questionnaires might respond to questions 'through the use of familiar narrative constructs, rather than providing meaningful insights into their subjective view' (Miller and Glassner cited in Czarniawska 2012: 50). It would be best, therefore, from a researcher's point of view to find a way to triangulate the feedback as much as possible. There were real advantages for collaborators as well. Here, the 'emotional' maps would be hand drawn and marked by the expressive hands of the collaborators. The maps reinforced the idea of co-creative agency, rather than potentially reactive participant feedback. Indeed, I hoped that the maps might facilitate in a creative way a drawing together of contextual threads of lived experience for the contributors, to help consolidate differently their *do*-ing of a 'subject-in-process' (Minh-ha 1993: 105), and add weight to my reflection of the efficacy of the research methodology as exploratory and revelatory for the collaborators.

The journey itself offered the collaborators the possibility to map their experiences of the personal journey along two axes – syntagmatic and paradigmatic. As far as the syntagmatic axis was concerned, Josh, Nick, Ed and Dave produced maps that approximated to cartographic, point-to-point reflections of their experiences of the research project. Nick's was the simplest map, just three boxes connected by arrows. As a recent convert to Judaism, perhaps he felt he had the least developed geographic Jewish London experience to chart. In his and Josh's case, the simplicity of

their linear maps could also be explained in terms of their lack of background in the creative arts. Ed and Dave on the other hand are artists, in sculpture/painting/architecture and fashion/design respectively, so that argument would not account for their linear approach. For these four collaborators, mapping was interpreted rather conventionally. It should be noted that despite its point-to-point linearity, the map Dave produced had an overarching theme in the shape of a bridge, alluding to the bridge where his revelatory Tashlich ritual occurred in the film (see below). Roberto and Robin on the other hand chose to present their stories entirely paradigmatically, and not point-to-point at all. Robin – with his background in the dramatic arts, might be expected to regard the core of any story in terms of its premise. Similarly Roberto – with his background in painting and graphic design – clearly took the opportunity afforded him in the design and execution of an 'emotional' map to encapsulate a personal journey, rather than 'mapping' it in any linear sense.

In her polemic on 'foreignness', Julia Kristeva identifies a productive interrelation of creativity and foreignness, where 'the infinity of cultures and legacies' gives the foreign artist an 'extravagant ease to innovate' (Kristeva 1991: 32). A paradigmatic analysis of the many 'emotional' maps reveals the theme of cultural and geographic shifts, boundaries, dislocation, separation: a sense of what Kristeva refers to as 'foreignness'[149] (Kristeva 1991). For the most part, one can interpret even the simplest of the 'emotional' maps as evidence of a certain creative energy, borne out of a personal spiritual wandering and sense of 'foreignness', at once metaphorical (being outside normative parameters of secular and/or straight London) and literal (many of the collaborators are migrants to London).

As the 'control' in the group of collaborators – the first collaborator - and as a youth leader at the centre of Modern Orthodox 'authentic' Judaism in the U.K., Josh's creation of an 'emotional' map[150] is - even more than his film journey - symbolic of a Jewish London experience that seems to both assert and fear its visibility, its London enclaves. The Barnet's Orthodox Jewish border or Eruv, only intimated in the film and to the uninitiated 'invisible'[151], is clearly symbolised in the map by fencing. And, like Nick's map, Josh's is designed to be read from left to right: an allusion perhaps to the foreignness of Hebrew script, also read left to right. Roberto's very painterly 'emotional' map[152] features Cypress Trees, which in his commentary of the *do*-ing of his map he identifies as a 'fantasy of Israel'[153]. The map also includes the phrase 'Chagall creativity colour' (indicative of a French dream-like landscape, and Chagall's famous stained glass windows in the Hadassah Medical Centre,

[149] The French title of *Etrangers à Nous-Mêmes* is translated as *Strangers to Ourselves*.
[150] Appendix C
[151] In the film, there is only scant reference to the boundary line indicated by Josh's signalling to a flyover in the distance.
[152] Appendix C
[153] Appendix D.

and his tapestry at the Knesset in Jerusalem). Although feelings of disconnection and rupture had been enunciated in the film - as a series of spontaneous 'private' conversations Roberto had with himself as he walked (shot in extreme long shot), or when he stopped by a tree (shot in closer shots avoiding the face) - perhaps the most poignant manifestation of these feelings was evident in the 'emotional' map Roberto created after the filming was complete. Here Roberto represents himself as a sinuous body entwined with that of a lover, as they float on one side of the stream in the park, whilst his family congregate on the other side of the stream, separate from him, in the shadow of a menorah (a Jewish candelabra). Roberto, in describing his 'emotional' map, stated that 'the park does have something that is very meditative and does bring everything together in some way'[154].

In Ed's map[155] 'foreignness' is indicated with vivid colour (red, blue, green, yellow, orange) and red beams of sunshine over his synagogue. His recorded commentary of the *do*-ing of his 'emotional' map also made reference to other places, as he talked about translations from South Africa to the U.K.[156]. His map and commentary of its making also neatly summed up his thematic concerns enacted on-screen around visibility in his personal journey film. If his 'straight' matrimonial home – prior to coming out – is identified with bourgeois 'pretence' and 'hiding', there is also a sense of loss about times passed. The Kilburn art centre – *Bases* – however, celebrates post-closet diversity and visibility with its murals, energy, and cultural inclusivity. Here his commentary recorded during the making of his map included words such as 'experimental', 'range of people', 'rebellious'. A sense of safety and well-being around the synagogue is reinforced in his 'emotional' map, drawn as a synagogue with sun beams radiating from it. Dave's 'emotional' map[157] encapsulates the feelings engendered spontaneously in his personal journey as a bridge – bridging his childhood with his contemporary gay Jewish self. The bridge spans from Canons Park tube station to Belmont United Synagogue, with large Tashlich crumbs flowing underneath in the stream below. These crumbs symbolise the centrality of Lévi-Strauss's notion of bricolage and Reconstructionism in Dave's tinkering of his Jewish world view and experience. Here, as in his film, the 'Tashlich' ceremony forms the key element of the personal journey, as Dave ironically casts away his gay 'sins' as a Jewish male teenager.[158] The 'bridge' to a Reconstructionist gay Jewish consciousness is juxtaposed with the Jewishness of his childhood, symbolised by Belmont Synagogue, and its image of a window with

[154] Appendix D.
[155] Appendix C
[156] Appendix D.
[157] Appendix C
[158] Tashlich comes from the Hebrew word meaning 'to cast', and refers to the casting away of our sins. It is usually performed on the first day of Rosh Hashanah (the Jewish New Year), when individuals symbolically shake out the corners/pockets of their garments into water (a stream, a river etc.). see www.chabad.org

grills, accompanied by the words 'security' and 'unease'. Robin's map[159], the final in the series, resembles more a science diagram than a map, with its use of text, arrows and delineations. This 'map' is a polemical pointer toward Robin's personal journey as performed on-screen over two films: the map utilises the metaphorical image of a gate, arrows and the juxtaposed words of 'family' (biological secular) versus 'family' (adopted and religious); 'Central Europe' versus 'Eastern Europe'; 'West End' versus 'East End'; 'Assimilation' versus 'Coming Out' – indicated with the Hebrew words 'Ba'al T'filah' (Hebrew for 'Master of Prayer') and Chazanut Torah (Hebrew for the cantillation of the bible in synagogue). This diagrammatic mapping of an emergent Jewish subjectivity encapsulates many thoughts, actions and performative threads that emerge in the course of two personal journey films: a movement across geographic and spiritual-cum-political boundaries that his Progressive (revolutionary?) Jewish life has taken. He, more than any of the on-screen collaborators, utilised his artistic energy to create a reflective 'emotional' map that drew out the many cultural and geographic shifts in his Jewish journey across London. Given all this, I am rather mystified by the singular negativity of his statement in his (later) written feedback: 'the construct *My Jewish London* isn't hugely meaningful to me in my own experience'.[160] His 'emotional' map would – and does – suggest otherwise[161], and further suggests that a triangulation of feedback approaches is always useful to the researcher.

## Jewish Experiences and Exterior Places

## Safe places? - the home exterior

Safe spaces, usually interiors, can be associated with collective action and challenge, where there is 'a certain license to speak and act freely, form collective strength, and generate strategies of resistance' (Kenny 2001: 24, quoted in Roestone Collective 2014: 1346). In mainstream U.K. documentaries, the representation of Jewish London inevitably falls in line with signposts laid down by Mainstream ('authentic') Orthodoxy where detail of Jewish experience in public space is kept to a minimum, and largely confined to 'behind closed doors', to the safety of the home interior and the

[159] Appendix C
[160] Appendix E
[161] I am sure that Robin's somewhat contradictory feedback across the two approaches was in part at least a consequence of his personal relationship with the filmmaker at the time of filming. The critical feedback in the written questionnaire was long after the making of the films and the end of the relationship.

synagogue sanctuary.[162] The food-obsessed definition of Jewish experience has been referred to by Kirshenblatt-Gimblett as 'Kitchen Judaism' (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1990: 75-105 cited in Mann 2012: 96). Borrowing the words of Gaston Bachelard, Mann refers to the Jewish house 'as a kind of metaphysical container of memory, a site that may be dipped back into over the course of a lifetime as a 'kind of metaphysical container of memory' (Bachelard 1994: 8 cited in Mann 2012: 18). The data sets of research films of course avoid the clichéd kitchen setting by occurring outside. However, the home exteriors figured in the research films also act as a 'kind of metaphysical container of memory', and trigger many narratives about childhood, early adulthood, sexuality and relationships. Here is a good example of the research films to some degree building on traditional documentary tropes.

Josh, a Modern Orthodox Jewish (and 'Straight') man, began his personal journey rather conventionally as one might expect outside his grandmother's home, by identifying the mezuzah on the door post of her front door. A synecdoche of the Jewish home, the mezuzah is visible in many of the films on the right doorpost of the front door. The mezuzah, in fact, could be described as a synecdoche of hegemonic Jewish experience in general, representing as it does many central tenets of 'authentic' Jewish experience: the home, the family, God's commandments and the word of (Jewish) law made material[163]. As Josh says in his film, the mezuzah is 'one of the first indicators that it is a Jewish home... It is a parchment containing portions of Torah…. And so this is a very public symbol of Judaism for any Jewish household. [And yet] it is quite small and discreet. This is Grandma's house, and for me this is all about family. One of the fundamentals of my Jewish identity is the family. This is a constant. They have lived here for well over 50 years. Dad grew up in this house, and for me this is a fundamental mark of who I am and Jewish identity, and so it feels appropriate to start here'[164]. In his film, Josh's sense of well-being and lack of concern around the visibility of his Grandmother's house as a Jewish home was very clear. Apart from celebrating the mezuzah on the door post, he wore a kippah on his head (a religious skull cap that he wore throughout the film), and he noted his Grandmother's actual street address (later edited out by the

[162] A rare exception is *A Sense of Belonging*, episode 3 (Cooper and Morrison, 1991), where religious Sabbath ritual is conducted informally as a small gathering of like-minded Jews - a 'Chavurah'[162] - in the open air, albeit conducted in a private garden, but this is all too rare.

[163] It is a wooden or metal decorative container containing a scroll with psalms from the bible (Deuteronomy 6: 4-9 and 11: 13-21). The passages in the scroll command Jews to remember the words of God by fixing them to the doorposts of their home and also on their bodies (on male arms and as head ornaments, called 'Tefillin').

filmmaker, in order to protect the family's confidentiality)[165]. The home's exterior was also a trigger for Josh's happy memories of Jewish family meals, including Christmas lunch!

It is interesting that elsewhere in the film series only one gay collaborator celebrated unproblematically the visibility of the Jewish home and the mezuzah. Roberto, in his neighbourhood of Queen's Park indicated in a positive way a Jewish friend's door by pointing to the mezuzah (visible street numbers also removed in post-production for ethical reasons). However Ed, as the eldest collaborator in the series, reflected the sadness of many older gay Jewish men when he recounted outside his erstwhile Jewish (heterosexual marital) home[166] that he was only too well 'aware of the major changes in my life's journey that the locations represented. My leaving of 'home' had been traumatic and cathartic'[167].

## Hidden places - the synagogue exterior

The humble anonymity of the central London exterior of the Montagu Centre (U.K. headquarters of Liberal Judaism) featured in the films of Nick and Robin belied its function as an administration hub, a community centre and a religious sanctuary, a 'place of assembly' (Book of Ezekiel 11:16[168]). On film, the building's exterior elicited from Nick and Robin a genuine sense of homeliness and safety. This is because the Centre was (and remains) a refuge for gay Jewish men. Till 2017, the Centre was home to the Jewish Gay and Lesbian Group (J.G.L.G.) religious services[169], and to this day has on staff a dedicated L.G.B.T.+ liaison officer[170].

The spontaneity of the body language of Nick and Robin on film reinforced a sense of refuge: adjacent to the building Nick asserted his Jewish self by spontaneously displaying his Magen David around his neck. Robin's demeanour was also relaxed as he talked of the Centre's significance to him. In this - his Bloomsbury - film, Robin talked about the Centre's long time support of gay Jewish liberation, and the edit included cutaways of a reassuring Camden L.G.B.T.+ Advice and Safety Project (C.L.A.S.P.) sticker on the ground floor window of the building. The Centre had clearly

---

[164] See Appendix I.
[165] The camera also caught the street number which was pixelated out in post-production for the same reason.
[166] And at the time of filming, his ex-wife still lived there with their eldest son.
[167] See Appendix E
[168] The third of the prophetic books in the Hebrew bible.
[169] At the time of writing J.G.L.G. has announced it is moving its services to the leading Liberal Judaism synagogue in the U.K., the Liberal Jewish Synagogue (L.J.S.) in St. Johns Wood, London.
[170] Its synagogue is now home to Beit Klal Yisrael (B.K.Y.), a community with strong L.G.B.T.+ roots (founded by lesbian feminists in the late 1980s).

become imbued with the personal investment and experience of a refuge, a safe place. However, this was somewhat at odds with the anonymity of the monolithic concrete structure and the security camera over the Centre's entrance in Robin's film. As a 'meaningful location' (Cresswell 2004: 7), it was therefore rather ambivalent as it oscillated between being a marker of assertion and safety, and a marker of invisibility and fear. This sense of invisibility was evident in some way at all the synagogue locations in the films.

In London, many Jewish sanctuaries are 'tucked away from public gaze' (Kadish 2002:387) in what Kershen and Vaughan refer to as a 'strategy of invisibility' (Kershen and Vaughan 2013: 19-21), with the sites of synagogues often positioned down a laneway, usefully out of sight. The Raleigh Close Synagogue in N.W. London featured in Josh's film is a major early 20th century 'cathedral synagogue'[171]. Yet despite its imposing size, on the filmed walk it was arrived at down a discreet laneway, 'tucked away from public gaze'. Issues of community defence arose almost as soon as Josh and the crew arrived on site, having just filmed Josh walking down the laneway leading to the synagogue. Although not captured on film for security reasons, the camera kit aroused immediate, spontaneous anxiety from the Jewish Community Security Trust (C.S.T.) task force guarding the locale. 'What was being photographed?' 'By whom?' 'Why?' A C.S.T. van actually pulled up on the public street next to the crew in a rather intimidating way. This precipitated a wry comment by Josh later in his questionnaire, where he referred to the notions of assertion and safety here and elsewhere in his film: 'comfort [safety] is very much relative – as there are several indicators in the piece of communal fearfulness – from the CCTV, the anonymity of the [youth centre] buildings to the section on the C.S.T. – however, these did not translate into personal feelings of unease at the time'[172]. But they did for the film crew. The incident – only alluded to in the final film – gave 'space' for the researcher/ filmmaker to enter into a spontaneous ethno-dialogue with Josh regarding defence and security. The mise-en-scène of the sequence - the 'tucked away' location, the CCTV cameras and rundown building - and Josh's C.S.T. statement to camera all engendered a real sense of unease and fear regarding Jewish institutions and their public *place* in London.

Invisibility and fear were also evident as organising principles in the data sets collected elsewhere in the field. At the end of Dave's film, just as in the case of Raleigh Close, the camera tracked as he walked along a secluded path leading to his family synagogue the Belmont synagogue in Canons Park. There, he told a cautionary tale spontaneously to camera:

---

[171] i.e. a large, prestigious synagogue, of which there are many in Central London, usually 19th/ early 20th Century. See Kadish 2004.
[172] See Appendix E.

> The community is only about 40, 45 years old, the building has only been here maybe 35 years...What I understand is the brief when they built the shule was that it was supposed to be quite an inconspicuous building, and should be not wanting to cause any trouble from the neighbours or from the outside world. So you can see it's really simple… simple bricks, really a quite plain building. There's no references to anything Jewish from the outside, with the possible exception of the mezuzah, which is on the right side of the door post there. And it's got these grills over the windows. I think it was designed to keep the building secure and to ward off the threat from the neighbours. You know it doesn't really feel the most glam or the most inspiring building, maybe a little oppressive in some ways[173].

And again, as in the Raleigh Close pilot film, the filmmaker spontaneously reacted to Dave's on-camera performance by building a montage of images alluding to fear, security and a 'strategy of invisibility'. Like Raleigh Close, like the Montagu Centre, this was a building whose external design was intended to be invisible to passers-by, 'not wanting to cause any trouble'. Even the filmed mezuzah (encased Jewish religious scroll on door posts – see below) was invisible, being black against a black background. And with grills covering the windows. In his 'emotional' map Dave underscored his/ the community's anxieties around the building's visibility with an image of a window with grills, accompanied by the words 'security' and 'unease'[174]. At the end of this sequence (the end of the film actually), Dave considered his own existential 'unease' outside his family synagogue. Like the Modern Orthodox building he was in front of, as an L.G.B.T.+ Jew Dave remained invisible in this 'authentic' community, a community that officially did not validate his particular Jewish experiences. If all that had been planned prior to filming was a personal journey that would include a nostalgic return to his childhood synagogue, what emerged spontaneously in the *do*-ing of the film were performative acts in front of and behind the camera that told a very different story of Jewish London.

In Roberto's film, invisibility manifested in the form of erasure. The erstwhile Brondesbury Synagogue, location of Roberto's bar mitzvah, had become a Muslim Centre and School. The façade of the imposing building – already featured ironically in the bar mitzvah telefilm, *Barmitzvah Boy* (Rosenthal 1976) - had by now been stripped of its Jewish markings (Magen David etc.) to accommodate Muslim insignia – in the ever continuing effacement and superimposition (palimpsest) of religious spaces across London. In Roberto's film, his material encounter with the building triggers feelings of his first teenage gay sexual encounter at the synagogue, and his later coming out to his mother, at 35, after attending the synagogue that was. Quoting from his reflective questionnaire: 'I felt comfortable … with quite a few memories that I had not visited since I was a young man …

[173] See Appendix I
[174] See Appendix C

outside the Brondesbury Synagogue (as it was then)'[175]. Here, the data set from the field generated spontaneous feelings of the past: 'places' of Roberto's gay and Jewish self, hidden, half forgotten, until placed in a situation that triggered his memory. If the 'authentic' evidence was no longer there, the feelings, experiences were.

Seclusion, as a subset of invisibility, allied with assertion and safety, featured in Ed's film. Coming at the end of Ed's planned personal journey, the New London Synagogue locale (St John's Wood) generated new, unforeseen elements. Ed's clear sense of safety and well-being at the locale (reinforced later in his 'emotional' map, with sun beams radiating from the synagogue[176]), was tempered by his contemplation of his status as a gay man in this – his - congregation. If not under any existential threat, his status at the time of filming (2013) was not equal to that of the straight members, as indicated by his quite dramatic act to camera. Putting a kippah on his head, and draping his tallit (Hebrew for prayer shawl) spontaneously over his shoulders, Ed sat down on the stoop of the synagogue and chanted a prayer in Hebrew. He then contemplated in English the possibility of same sex union in this Masorti Jewish congregation (socially progressive but liturgically more conservative than Reform and Liberal Judaism), a community which at the time of filming did not sanction same-sex marriages[177]. This religious cum political performative act was quite spontaneous and could not have been predicted by Ed beforehand. Here, the prayer ritual of putting on a tallit was reworked spontaneously by him to evoke a meditation on Jewish Halakcha and laws pertaining to the rites of Jewish marital integration. In a sense Ed was assuming the role of gay Jewish 'bricoleur', by tinkering with 'whatever is at hand' (Lévi-Strauss 1974: 17) in his act of religious and political meditation. Quoting Ed: 'There were certainly spontaneous aspects… the way you filmed my close relationship with the shule (Yiddish colloquial term for synagogue) in Abbey Road…'[178]. The place spontaneously triggered both an assertive sense of well-being, a place of safety, and at the same time a feeling of needing to challenge the status quo, as Ed sheltered under the portico of the synagogue.

Finally in Robin's Hackney film, seclusion marks the exterior of his synagogue. If Robin draws comfort and security sitting in the walled garden adjacent to the building used by his religious community of Kehillah in Stoke Newington, it is in fact a rented church hall serving as the venue for this Progressive Jewish congregation. Once again, one is confronted by an anonymous modern exterior whose access

[175] See Appendix I
[176] See Appendix C.
[177] It has since done so (January, 2017).
[178] See Appendix E

is down a secluded path, this time hidden in the shadow of a large Victorian church. Anonymity and discretion are the synagogue's hallmarks.

## Ambivalent places - the high street

In the research films the Jewish personae enact a multitude of attitudes on the streets, having a heightened awareness 'of where they are within the public realm' (Vaughan 2012). This contrasts with mainstream documentary where the Jewish neighbourhood street is usually reduced to establishing shots and cutaways of North London public spaces transitioning between the safety of Jewish interiors, with 'exotic' Haredi (Ultra Orthodox Jewish) street 'extras' scurrying between shops in a rush to get home before the Sabbath.

None of the research films succumb to the stereotypical cliché of the Stamford Hill or Golders Green High Street filmic experience. In Josh's film, there was a spontaneous sense of safety and contentment on his 'Jewish' high street. Josh asserted his sense of self as a Modern Orthodox Jew, sauntering in-the-moment along the 'Jewish' Brent Street in N.W. London – a street safely within the confines of the Barnet Eruv - with a kippah on his head, passing a series of kosher Jewish shops and restaurants, finally settling at a kosher café for lunch. To quote him in the film:

> I guess for me this is one of the most exciting places to be young and Jewish in London because it's normal. Things are just here and just happen to be kosher. They are very much visible in a way that so many of the things we've seen today are much more hidden. It's sort of a normal Jewish existence. This for me encapsulates a lot of what Jewish London is about[179].

For Josh, at that moment, Brent Street NW4 constituted a distinctly Jewish place 'where encounters and informal interaction can bring a sense of community and local identity', transforming Brent Street into a safe place 'of social association and inclusion' for a particular minority group in London (Piragauta 2015: 264). For others who were not Jewish, this subjective transformation would have likely gone unnoticed to some degree.

In the last film of the series, Robin was far less certain about his Jewish visibility in the multi-ethnic locale of Hackney, East London. However, he was prepared to explore spontaneously his Jewish visibility on the street by putting on his kippah outside his apartment building. As he said on camera, walking and in-the-moment:

[179] See Appendix I

> I don't usually wear a kippah, but I thought I might just experiment with visibility on the street, so here I am, as a visible open Jew… I'm not quite sure how I feel with this on my head walking up and down here. It's interesting how it makes me a bit shaky. But one of my whole projects in life is about becoming less assimilated, and so it's an interesting experiment[180].

Elsewhere in the series, London street locales were imaginatively re-envisaged by the collaborators as 'Jewish', even though the location and the recorded mise en scène would belie that fantasy. At the end of his film, Roberto emerged from a central London Middle Eastern grocery eating a pastry, and spontaneously talked to camera. In his mind he made over the busy street location, and re-fashioned it into a 'foreign' 'Jewish Israeli' place: a place which for the filmmaker and crew was the iconic 'Arab quarter' of London's Edgware Road, just north of Marble Arch. But in Roberto's imagination the 'Arab' space was overwritten as an imaginative palimpsest. Just as in his 'emotional' map discussed above, this foreign-born gay Jewish artist (originally from Colombia, with many family members now in Israel) showed an 'extravagant ease to innovate' (Kristeva 1991: 32) Citing his words in the film:

> The masses of dates and figs and fruits that you don't find in other places in London you can find here.... I love coming here with friends and sharing a meal and enjoying the atmosphere and feeling somewhere else, and not in London, somewhere actually quite Jewish, even though it isn't. And although I am invisible as a Jew, I do feel that I am visible in some way... I do share with people when I go to a restaurant and I share that I'm Jewish and it's actually very accepted. And I love coming here with my friends, with my nephew who is from Israel. We have some nice food, and a smoke of a shisha pipe, and we are practically in Jerusalem in the middle of London[181].

Here, Roberto quite spontaneously imposed his subjective vision on what for all intents and purposes was a London 'Arab' high street, and reconnected with his 'culture and family history, preserving the associated traditions in spite of being away from them' (Piragauta 2015: 273).

Elsewhere in the film series, Ed, another 'foreign' artist (born in South Africa), was distracted by his locale which triggered thoughts from elsewhere. In Kilburn, NW London, he passed along a market street with large street murals featuring people of colour, and arrived at the multicultural Brent art centre where he paints and sculpts. Here his mind moved between his experience of being in Kilburn to more abstract thoughts, as he talked spontaneously about his visibility as a foreign gay Jew:

---

[180] Appendix I
[181] ibid

> …here we are at *Bases*, the Brent Adult Education Centre, where I have been coming for quite a few years. I do water colours one morning a week and ceramic sculpture another morning a week. And I think it shows Brent, this part of Brent [Kilburn], as pretty multicultural. And I'm out as a Jewish person and a Gay person here very much. Being a part of a minority in England, in London certainly, feels very comfortable, 'cause I think London is home to so many minorities that we the foreigners somehow feel that we are in greater numbers than the locals. So it's a comfortable pace to live and keep your identity, as part of a minority… in [pre-Apartheid] South Africa… our family were known very well, and were supporters of the small Liberal Party… Jewish people who were really involved in Liberal ideas in South Africa, anti-Government ideas, were generally not religious Jews…[182]

Revisiting Eagleton's theory regarding the phenomenological nature of material being, here on the streets of London Josh, Robin, Roberto and Ed were able to transform themselves '*in the act of* [my emphasis] transforming their material surroundings' (Eagleton 2011: 130), where a 'ready, sensuous, physiological being' was a precondition of a sense of 'place' (ibid: 131). For all four, the street locale facilitated an experience and understanding around what Jewish minority visibility feels like. That level of nuance and intersectional sensitivity is rare in mainstream U.K. documentary.

## Ambivalent places - the park

The efficacy of the shooting protocol in the park locales helped to provide the most creative template for contemplation and abstract thought around the imminent Jewish subject in the research films. The neutral backdrop of the park, coupled with the 'quick', reactive shooting protocol, seemed to produce interesting phenomenological results irrespective of the on-screen collaborators walking or standing still. This would seem to reflect the degree of freedom of thought, 'mobility of thought' (Dubow 2004), that the open spaces engendered for collaborators at the time of filming.

Josh, the Modern Orthodox 'straight' control in the group, pondered in a very distracted (Benjaminian) way on the impossibility of a whole Jewish identity in the diaspora, as he wandered through Sunnyhill Park, Hendon (Barnet). Roberto chose to spend most time in the park of his choice, Queens Park, N.W. London, deep in abstracted thought. Here he relived the story of his childhood in Colombia, the transcultural rupture of his relocation to the U.K. at the age of 10, the painful relationship he had with his father as a closet gay son, and the sense of isolation and

[182] Appendix I

separation he still felt as a middle aged gay Jewish man. In one instance, in Dave's film, the park afforded the gay collaborator the opportunity to enter what Victor Turner refers to as a state (or 'place') of 'liminality', where ritualistic 'scenes of play and experimentation' (Turner 1988:25) did not 'simply express [dominant] cultural values or enact symbolic scripts', but actually affected 'changes in people's perceptions and interpretations' (Bell 2009: 74). Dave made his way on camera from near his parents' home to Stanmore Marsh - to a bridge above a stream. This is a locale he came to in his teens to carry out his New Year Tashlich ritual, translated from Hebrew literally as 'casting off' (of ones sins)[183]. The filming date of the research film was in reality only weeks away from the September 2013 'Rosh Hashanah' (Hebrew for the Jewish New Year), and what had begun as a reflective talk to-camera, turned into a spontaneous act of performative religious ritual. Dave suddenly took the remnants of a pack of crisps he had half finished, walked off the footbridge on which he was standing, and suddenly released the contents into the stream below. In that moment, he was enacting his personal Tashlich New Year ceremony, and confronting what Tashlich had meant to him as a teenager:

> …thinking about people that I'd met or situations I had been in, sometimes with other guys, and thinking "does this make me a bad person, or is this just intrinsically part of who I am?" And I always struggled with that each Rosh Hashanah[184].

Here Dave tinkered on camera with ordinary found elements – the crisps – and incorporated them into his meaningful ritual of healing and reflection. His comments in his feedback questionnaire reinforced the spontaneity of the ritual: 'All came naturally - for example the "Tashlich" scene'; 'This allowed me to deconstruct my youth'[185]. Here Dave, like Ed under the portico of the New London Synagogue, was assuming the role of what Lévi-Strauss calls the 'bricoleur' who by making use of 'whatever is at hand' (Lévi-Strauss 1974: 17), broke down traditional Jewish 'rites…rebuilding them again through new constructions of already existing sets of events.' (Greenfields, Kochberg et al., 2016). A touching affirmation arose from this ritual: Dave did not 'simply express [dominant] cultural values or enact symbolic scripts', but actually affected changes for himself in his 'perceptions and interpretations' (Bell 2009: 74). Here, his filmed personal journey afforded Dave the opportunity to enter a 'place' of 'liminality'. It is interesting to reflect on how prominent a feature the Tashlich bridge was in Dave's 'emotional' map; a further marker of the centrality of

[183] A ritual that many Jews observe during Rosh Hashanah. '"Tashlich" means "casting off" in Hebrew and involves symbolically casting off the sins of the previous year by tossing pieces of bread or another food into a body of flowing water.' (Pelaia 2017)
[184] See Appendix I
[185] See Appendix E

Reconstructionism in his Jewish world view. His reconstruction of the Tashlich ritual achieved an act of reclamation and resistance.

## Non-places

From the beginning, the research methodology had been constructed around the assumption that the notion *My Jewish London* was meaningful to all the collaborators in some way, their being London-based gay-Jewish integrators. This proved to be too simplistic though. Inadvertently, the research method had not accounted for converts to Judaism, who might not have developed a sense of Jewish *place* in London's public spaces. This proved to be the case with Nick. As a recent adult convert to Liberal Judaism, Nick was slightly at a loss as to where to 'locate' his geographic or autobiographic sense of place in *Jewish London*. For the most part, that concept existed mainly in his investment in Jewish ethics, his Jewish friends, and in his synagogue, but not on the streets. As he commented on in personal journey film:

> [Liberal] Judaism to me is more about ethics and treating people as decent human beings, irrespective of what their religion may be or if they don't have one, their ethnic background, their sexuality, etc. etc.. I see those things as much more important than superstitious belief in an increasing scientific age[186].

In the end he and I agreed that he would start his walk at his synagogue, Montagu Centre, as it was the physical hub of his Jewish sense of self, and that his walk would continue through the centre of 'gay' London, Soho Square, and end up in Trafalgar Square where he and I had visited the interfaith tent at London Pride not long before. Because of the limited value of *place* for Nick, his personal journey film was the most abstract in tone, consisting of long philosophical monologues directly to camera, triggered by brief interventions off camera by the filmmaker. Nick chose the comfortable, sunny backdrop of 'gay' Soho Square - with groups of 'cute' gay men in the background - to sit and directly address the camera on a series of points related to race, religion, sexuality, and marginality. Despite my sense of the film having 'failed' in terms of the filmic protocol (travelling shots, walking and talking), and its associated phenomenological effects - as Nick only talked directly to camera at his three chosen locales - his comments in his reflective questionnaire would suggest that the film method *he chose* worked as far as he was concerned. As a Jewish man of colour, his comments touched on something very significant in terms of the experience *he* had of the collaborative

[186] Appendix I

process, that he 'found it easier'… 'to identify as gay, mixed race and Jewish, all simultaneously in this scenario than if it were a "gay" project where ethnic and religious minorities don't often have a voice'.[187] So in Nick's case, his film didn't so much destroy conventional constructs of identity as give voice to them, something he felt very necessary in his case. Certainly he was the only collaborator to engage with the ethnicity versus Jewish debate:

> Is there racism [in the Jewish community]? I think there's this whole shebang about looking Jewish, whether you're too dark, or if someone has blond hair and blue eyes they can't be properly Jewish. There's a lady at our synagogue who is from the Ben Israel [community] from Bombay, who wears a sari and she's been accused of being a convert and a Muslim in disguise. So I think there is… there is subtext about how you look Jewish… In 100 years there isn't going to be a…Jewish look, I'm afraid[188].

In the end, one size did not fit all. Perhaps, the very complex set of intersectional relations that informed Nick's being, ones that he didn't quite yet have a sense of *place* for - how the pieces might fit – meant that a more conventional to camera identity politics film was the best solution as far as he was concerned. Certainly the format the film took was entirely his decision, and allowed him to draw together contextual threads of lived experience that for him added up to something more suggestive, something more provocative – something akin to the construction of a 'subject-in-process' (Minh-ha 1993: 105) – than a traditional 'gay' documentary.

Based on the analysis of the walks of the on-screen collaborators, the research would suggest that if there is not a concrete 'gay Jewish London', there is a gay Jewish London investment in public spaces.

The concluding section proposes that when gay Jewish men are 'placed' in a co-creative environment that allows them to explore their particular Jewish experiences, Jewish 'authentic' stereotypes are de-centred. Here the co-creative results are reflected upon in terms of local gender and religious experiences 'placed' in ways that contextualise Jewish London in new decentred, at-the-margins configurations.

[187] ibid
[188] Appendix I

# Conclusion

The *do*-ing of the filmed personal journeys on the parts of researcher/filmmaker and on-screen collaborators would suggest the following propositions:

- Creative empowerment of communities in documentary does not have to mean resorting to traditional, social science participatory video methods.

- Co-Creative film partnerships in the community - where an activist researcher/filmmaker and community stakeholders each have different spheres of creative responsibility - can be empowering to both parties, although for a minority of on-screen community collaborators co-agency may not be entirely successful.

- The co-creative filmed personal journey generates cine-ethnographic results that are to a degree genuinely spontaneous and revelatory for most on-screen collaborators and researcher/filmmaker alike, with the proviso that occasional prompting of on-screen collaborators by the filmmaker is required (where collaborators prefer it, or 'dry up' on camera).

- The particular 'parallax view' (after Ginsberg) or 'shared anthropology' (after Rouch) of the filmed personal journey is probably largely a consequence of its co-creativity rather than a NECESSARY result of the vérité codes themselves, although it is facilitated by them.

- Building a robust 'fire wall' ethics protocol to protect on-screen collaborators is a mandatory requirement in any filmic research dealing with people's personal lives and experiences, but particularly those from vulnerable minority or marginalised groups.

A focussed analysis of field data generated in the research project would suggest the following context-specific propositions:

- Exploration of the phenomenological in documentary can liberate it from its traditional treatment of historical 'reality' and from its conventional 'narrative moorings'[189] which in turn can help 'destroy' *a priori* identities constructed traditionally along the lines of classic character arcs. In the bargain, this strategy helps 'destroy' fixed stereotypical notions in representation, and a replay of hegemonic 'authentic' identity politics.

- *My Jewish London* would seem to be a meaningful concept as a spatial expression of Jewish experience for many Jewish Londoners. The performative enunciations of the majority of on-screen collaborators, including the straight, Modern Orthodox collaborator Josh, support Laura Vaughan's proposal that Jewish Londoners 'have a more heightened awareness of where they are within the public realm' (Vaughan 2012).

[189] See A. Juhasz & A. Lebow (2018) manifesto on documentary, *Beyond Story: an Online, Community-Based Manifesto*

- A key grounded theory category (or data set) emerging in the filmed personal journeys captured in the field is that of 'spiritual wanderings', largely associated with the subplot of 'Wilderness'. These phenomenological wanderings facilitate for the co-creators in front and behind the camera new 'at the margins' representations that challenge mainstream Jewish London representations emanating from an 'authentic' centre.

- Synagogue and home exteriors, high streets and parks seem meaningful, efficacious locales in the filmed personal journeys of the Jewish Londoners collaborating in the research. Appropriation of locales by the co-creatives helps contest the constrictions of place and geography forged in traditional documentary practice.

- A sense of Jewish London and one's place in it would seem to be partly a consequence of assertion and partly a consequence of anxiety on the part of all collaborators (confirming the polemical position of Hey: 2006).

- For converts to Judaism, locational nature of *My Jewish London* is likely to be less effective, as they have less historical connection to 'Jewish' locales.

- Creative solutions to participant feedback – here in the form of 'emotional' maps – would seem to offer an original research technique for deeper, more 'dense' feedback than more traditional questionnaires or written feedback. 'Emotional' maps enable participants to reflect on experiences more intuitively and on their own terms, rather than terms dictated to by the researcher in the form of concrete question/answer. This would seem very appropriate in inductive, co-creative-artistic working methodologies.

What emerges that is NEW from the research project is as follows:

- A new typology of the extant Jewish London mainstream documentary archive.

- New representations of Jewish London experience, a consequence of co-creative grass-roots activist documentary made possible in the digital age (e.g. new cine-rituals performed at the margins (new content).

- New 'dense' (after Goodman[190]) feedback created through the 'emotional' maps. This knowledge is local – tailored to the LGBT+ Jewish London community, practical and meaningful for the minority community, and potentially empowering. By relying on new methods of triangulation (the emotional maps versus the traditional ethnographic questionnaires), a more nuanced reflective and creative understanding of the content of the filmed personal journeys is achieved for the researcher/ filmmaker.

In other words, it is the *strategic appropriation* of a co-creative 'performative' enunciation in activist grass-roots film that is new, not the technical specifics of the filmic protocol in itself. Here an activist shared anthropology - 'an endless quest where ethnographers and those whom they study meet on

[190] See Goodman (1984) on 'visual density'.

a path…' (Rouch 2003: 101) - results in auto-ethnographic representations at the margins which can then be fed back to the powerful centre of where 'authentic' representations emanate and are validated.

Participation and co-creativity are central to the logic of the new representations. The filmic protocol in itself is largely a 'slimmed-down' documentary technique born out of cinéma vérité, but when applied in the support of a local ACTIVIST grass-roots agenda enables new representations which can then be fed back to the centre (centrifugal forces) – from whence the stereotypes are generated and perpetuated. Thus the films have the potential to support an agenda for change – activist film from the margins to the centre of power. This is what's new.

It is significant that when the film scheduler at JW3 (at the centre the Jewish cultural life in NW London) viewed the creative results of the filmed personal journeys, he turned them down and pointed out that the films were not suitable for screening in a cinema, but were better suited to a website. Reading between the lines, what was being intimated by the scheduler was that the media artefacts did not meet expectations of a mainstream film documentary narrative on Jewish London. Indeed, the filmed personal journeys marked a clear activist strategy for the filmmaker and on-screen collaborators to vacate a position where they and the viewer were forced to experience everything Jewish through a lens of authentic stories, generalities, and familiarities: through a lens of well-trodden identity politics and objectification. By taking up a position that attempts to 'destroy' in some way the dramatic narrative arc - to vacate the elliptical nature of filmed stories, by focusing on the tracking shot of persons on a walk - the codification process in the filmed personal journeys to some degree defies the constitution of prescriptive identities of mainstream documentary. In *My Jewish London*, self-present identity has been replaced by a personal and local experience born to a large degree of spontaneous co-creative performativity of the moment. The research results would suggest that in the *do-ing* - in the very act of enunciation - documentary can affect new understandings, *different* meanings (Scheibler 1993: 140). The phenomenon of the personal wandering on camera in chosen public locales has liberated most Jewish men in the study from fixed stereotypical notions of themselves, by helping decentre hegemonic 'authentic' identities through which they are often forced to compare themselves in traditional 'relational' documentary representation.

The research logic of the filmed personal journey has helped community stakeholders in this study experience themselves differently, more immediately, and in the process facilitated their

transforming of their local material surroundings (Eagleton 2011: 130). As examples, in his film Dave had pondered outside his family synagogue, the Belmont United Synagogue, considering whether United Judaism would ever accommodate him as an 'out' gay man. Since the making of the film, Dave's organisation, Keshet U.K., has co-authored the first guidebook on the wellbeing of L.G.B.T.+ pupils in Modern Orthodox schools, produced with the Chief Rabbi of the United Synagogues movement (Mirvis 2018). Ed too went on to challenge his synagogue's 'sitting on the fence' strategy regarding same-sex marriage, something he explored at the end of his film. After the making of his film he was part of a dialogue with his local St John's Wood Masorti movement that finally facilitated the introduction of same-sex marriage at the New London Synagogue in 2017.

In the end, do the research films capture a specifically gay Jewish London place, as opposed to an alternative Jewish London space/place? On the evidence of cinematic locales alone – home and synagogue exteriors, high street, park – there is no hyphenated 'Gay-Jewish' London identified in the *My Jewish London* films. However, where a gay Jewish cinematic place is to be found is in the particular performative investments across the city, in different localities. One might expect the park to allude to gay experiences – cruising, erotic pleasure or danger, etc. However, it only plays a major defining role in this way in one film, Dave's, where it is central to his story of his teenage gay Jewish existence as he remembers and performs it on camera. Elsewhere the park as a gay trigger is limited to brief references (Robin Bloomsbury, Roberto, Nick), and then the references do not cross-reference to any Jewish experience particularly. The location that seems to generate the most deliberation on 'Gay-Jewish' public space in London is the synagogue. As a leading edifice reflecting Jewish belief systems, Jewish law, social justice, inclusivity and community, the Progressive synagogue has served as the central pillar in the construction of positive on-screen subjectivities in *My Jewish London*. For L.G.B.T.+ Jews in general, the Progressive Judaism movement and its synagogues have fostered a tangible sense of refuge for over nearly half a century. It continues to do so, as the principal Jewish agency supporting initiatives in L.G.B.T.+ rights, L.G.B.T.+ ritual celebration, interfaith initiatives and L.G.B.T. migration. It is worth noting that *My Jewish London* assumes Jewish Londoners with personal Jewish histories in the capital, most importantly family histories. The logic of the research methodology does not seem to apply very convincingly to converts, certainly recent converts, for whom an autobiographic notion of Jewish 'place' has little meaning.

Returning to Eagleton's critique of identity politics in favour of the personal, the material subject, one can see direct parallels with the Marxist writings of Doreen Massey. She too comments on the

efficacy of the 'local' as transformative – community activism, emplaced communities - in the face of globalisation and its apparent erasure of democratic on-the-ground experiences (Massey 1991). Kim Knott in turn has appropriated the local as a perspective on religion (2009: 159), where religious 'places' can be seen to act as loci for and interplay of local versus more 'global' interconnections of identity and territory (Knott 2009: 158). The *My Jewish London* of *do*-ing of activist documentary puts particularity - the co-creative, the personal, the immediate, the spontaneous, the local – to the fore of its reflexive practice. And like the arguments of Knott, any understanding of religious identity as singular, univocal, as 'global', is dispelled in the research results which offer a series of highly nuanced, personal, off-centre, local views of Jewish experience in London. Rather than pandering to the pressures of the mainstream, to those 'centripetal forces' of representation which draw signifying codes irredeemably to the mainstream centre, toward an authentic 'collective identity' described by Schnoor and others, here interest shifts off-centre as a consequence of the 'centrifugal forces' of reverse ethnography, where representation is directed 'outward' toward the margins, in a strategy giving voice to different perspectives largely silenced in the mainstream. The filmed personal journeys do more than pay lip service to representations of those marginalised within a wider community; they legitimate representations *at* the margins. It is a *different* view that is constructed, not a lesser marginalised view defined in relation to an 'authentic' centre.

The value of the research method as reverse ethnography is reinforced by the filmic results with Josh, the one Modern Orthodox heterosexual Jewish male amongst the on-screen collaborators. Rather than simply replaying to-the-centre stereotypes of Jewish male authenticity, his film at times evidences a feeding back to the centre a critique of the representation of a univocal, singular, authentic Jewish male voice. His wandering on camera through the park in particular leads to a wondering about his existence as a London Jew and where he challenges the whole notion of a coherent Jewish diasporic identity: 'this diaspora identity is somewhat fundamentally inconsistent, it's not a whole Jewish identity....it's in pieces'[191].

Of course, it is a risky strategy, vacating a given politics of identity; but for minority and marginalised groups that means also vacating an inevitable position of the 'other' too, understood by 'the dominant social and political groups…as a negative foil' (Charmé 2000: 140). The experiences of the collaborators in the research films liberates them from the contrived minoritisation identities

[191] See Appendix I

consolidated through the narrative moorings of mainstream documentary[192]. Here, the filmic *activism* in all of its elements combines to destroy the conventionality of the well-rounded minority identity, and instead replaces it with subjective 'image facts' situated in their immediate material context, offering new insights, new perspectives.

The research has suggested that documentary representation conceived *differently* – at the margins, away from what mainstream documentary is supposed to be - can be part of a process of empowerment for minority or marginalised communities, who become active champions for change through the process of co-creative participation. Armed with the centrifugal power of co-creative documentary practice at the margins, mainstream codes can be challenged and replaced by grass roots activist codes. If mainstream codes can be challenged, so can the hegemonic, centripetal (to the centre) forces that maintain them, but in ways that foreground creativity, not just illustration, a criticism I have of traditional participatory video. With this in mind, the activist research logic of *My Jewish London* in 2018 was presented to the congregation of central London's principal Reform Synagogue, West London Synagogue (W.L.S.), as part of its educational project, the *Lyons Learning Project*, which sets out to 'offer transformative educational experiences, increase Jewish literacy and a commitment to Jewish life' (see https://www.lyonslearning.org.uk/). As such, the Project was an ideal environment to discuss the centrifugal aspect of the research, and to encourage the W.L.S. community to make their own Jewish London stories using a similar auto-ethnographic logic. One film, made by the community's Rabbi Neil Janes, proved to be an interesting off-centre experiential documentary. Rather than take a mainstream deductive, expositional approach, what was explored by Rabbi Neil was an off-centre locational meditation on the intersection of bios and memory, as he shifted from Edgware Middlesex to central London. His filmed personal journey (filmed on his i-phone) chose NOT to dwell on the exposition of his professional life and the centrality of W.L.S. in it, but rather like Josh's film it offered an exploratory, phenomenological perspective on traditional Judaism told at the margins.

At the time of writing, I am contributing to an A.H.R.C. research project entitled *Empowering Design Practices* (*E.D.P.*), which is a 'five-year collaborative research project [2014-2019] exploring how community-led design can help empower those who look after historic places of worship to create more open, vibrant and sustainable places that respect and enhance their heritage' (https://www.empoweringdesign.net/). The project is funded by the Arts and Humanities Research

[192] See A. Juhasz & A. Lebow (2018) manifesto on documentary, *Beyond Story: an Online, Community-Based Manifesto*

Council, under its strand 'Connected Communities and Design'. Part of our research work focuses on London synagogues, where we are exploring through qualitative, inductive research methods the idea of centripetal and centrifugal forces – those social and cultural dynamics emanating from within the immediate community, and those dynamics emanating from without – that inform traditional synagogue design, synagogue use (religious and secular), locations, new builds and 'popups'. Influenced by the *My Jewish London* research project, the *E.D.P*. research project is exploring the implications of the 'reverse' forces model, where community understanding across U.K. faith groups – their codes, values and practices - might be understood as 'forces' acting from the margins to the centre as well as from central cores outward. As *E.D.P.* researchers, we are seeking ultimately to find general patterns that might be applied across all of the principal U.K. faith groups, with regard to their use of sanctuary spaces and the built environments surrounding them (inside and outside the buildings).

Exploring forces or codes from without, with the same keen interest and respect as those at the mainstream core do from within, I hope provides a useful polemical corrective in the understanding of the shifting needs, values and representations of all religious communities with strong institutional centres.

# Bibliography


Abrams, N., (2010) 'Hidden: Jewish Film in the United Kingdom, past and present', in *Journal of European Popular Culture*, vol 1, no 1, pp 53-68.

Abramson, S.J., (2010) *Anglo-Jewry and 'Authenticity': British Jewish Youth Movements, Informal Education and the Communal Contestation over 'Authentic' Judaism*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. London School of Economics and Political Science.

www.amosgitai.com/film.php [Accessed: 13 August 2002].

Adams, T.E., and Holman Jones, S. (2008) 'Autoethnography is queer', in N. K. Denzin et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Adams, T.E., and Manning, J. (2015) 'Autoethnography and Family Research', in *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, vol 7, December, pp 350-366.

Alderman, G., (1994) 'British Jewry: Religious Community or Ethnic Minority?', in Webber J. (ed) *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*, London: Littman library of Jewish Civilisation.

Allen, R., and Gomery, D., (1985) *Film History Theory and Practice*, New York: Knopf.

Alpert, R., (1998) *Like Bread on the Seder Plate: Jewish Lesbians and the Transformation of Tradition*, New York: Columbia University Press

Althusser, L., (1994) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', in Harrison C. and Wood P. (ed) *Art in Theory 1900-1990*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Amin, A., (2002) 'Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity', in *Environment and Planning A*, vol 34, pp 959-980.

Anderson, J., (2004) 'Talking whilst walking: a geographical archaeology of knowledge ', in *Area*, vol 36, no 3, pp 254-261.

Arthur, P., (1993) 'Jargons of Authenticity', in Renov, M. (ed) *Theorising Documentary*, London: Routledge.

Aston, J., Gaudenzi, S., and Rose, M., (2017) *i-docs: The Evolving Practices of Interactive Documentary* , New York: Columbia University Press.

Astruc, A., (2009) 'The Birth of the New Avant-Garde: La Camera-Stylo', in Graham, P. et al (ed) *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, 2nd edition, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baker, C., (2013, April). *Postsecular Critical Theory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Geographers.

Barthes, A., (1977) *Image Music Text*, London: Fontana Press.

Barthes, A., (1993) *Mythologies*, London: Vintage Books.

Bazin, A., (1967) *What is Cinema?* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bazin, A., (1972) *What is Cinema? Volume II*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bazin, A., (2009) 'La Politique des Auteurs', in Graham P. (ed) *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, London: BFI and Palgrave Macmillan.

Bell, C., (2009) *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benjamin, A., (1993) *Art, Mimesis and the Avant-Garde*, London: Routledge.

Benjamin, A., (1999), 'Citizenship and Community', paper presented to the London: Post-Colonial City Conference, Architectural Association, London, 12-13 March, 1999.

Benjamin, W., (1992) *Illuminations*, London: Fontana Press.

Benjamin, W., (2007) *Reflections*, New York: Schocken Books.

Benjamin, W., (2009) *One Way Street and Other Writings*, London: Penguin Classics.

Bersten, R., (2008) 'Marginalia: Living on the Edge ', in *Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review*, vol 4, no 1, pp 12-18.

Birulés, F., (2009) 'Interview with Judith Butler: "Gender is Extramoral"'. [Online].

Available at: http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2009/butler160509.html [Accessed: 26 August 2016].

Blanchot, M., (1993) *The Infinite Conversation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bloomstein, R., (2005) 'Human rights: does anyone care?', in Haggith T. and Newman J. (ed) *Holocaust and the Moving Image*, London: Wallflower Press.

Blumenfeld, R. (2012, March 18). 'A.B. Yehoshua: Americans, Unlike Israelis, Are Only Partial Jews'. *Ha'Aretz*. Retrieved from http://www.haaretz.com/a-b-yehoshua-americans-unlike-israelis-are-only-partial-jews-1.419240

Botticello, J. (2007) 'Lagos in London: Finding the Space of Home', in *Home Cultures*, vol 4, issue 1, pp 7-24.

Boyarin, D., and Boyarin, J. (1993) 'Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity', in *Critical Theory*, vol 19, no 4, summer, pp 693-725.

Brauch, J., et al (ed) (2008) *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*, Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Brecht, B., (1987) 'The Modern Theatre is the Epic Theatre', in *Brecht on Theatre,* London: Methuen.

Bromberg, S., (2013) 'The Anti-political Aesthetics of Objects and Worlds Beyond', in *Mute Magazine* 25 July 2013. [Online]. Available at:

http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/anti-political-aesthetics-objects-and-worlds-beyond [Accessed: 31 October 2018].

Brook, S., (1989) *The Club: the Jews of Modern Britain*, London: Constable and Company Limited.

Bruno, G., (2002) *Atlas of Emotion*, London: Verso.

Bruss, E., (1980) 'Eye for I: Making and Unmaking Autobiography in Film', in Olney, J. (ed) *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

Bryman, A., (2004) *Social Research Methods*, 2nd Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buber, M., (1965) *The Knowledge of Man*, New York: Harper and Row.

Buber, M., (1994) *I and Thou*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd.

Buck-Morss, S., (1999) *The Dialectics of Seeing*, London: MIT Press.

Bullock, A., Stallybrass, O., and Trombley, S., (ed) (1988) *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*, 2nd edition, London: Fontana Press.

Butler, J., (1993) 'Imitation and Gender Insubordination', in Abelove, H., Barale, M., and Halperin, D., (ed) *Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, New York: Routledge.

Butler, J., (2006) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London: Routledge.

Casey, E., (2001) 'Between Geography and Philosophy: What Does it Mean to be in the Place-World? ', in *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol 9, pp 683-693.

Charmé, S., (2000) 'Varieties of Authenticity in Contemporary Jewish Identity ', in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol 6, no 2, pp 133-155.

Charmé, S., Horowitz, B., Hyman, T., and Kress, J., (2008) 'Jewish Identities in Action: An Exploration of Models, Metaphors, and Methods', in *Journal of Jewish Education*, vol 74, pp 115-143.

Chauncey, G., (1996) 'Privacy Could Only Be Had in Public: Gay Uses of the Streets', in Sanders, J. (ed) *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

www.collinsdictionary.com

Cooper, H., and Morrison, P., (1991) *A Sense of Belonging*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Cowgill, L., (1997) *Writing Short Films*, Hollywood, Ca: Lone Eagle Publishing Company.

Coyle, A., and Rafalin, D., (2001) 'Jewish Gay Men's Accounts of Negotiating Cultural, Religious and Sexual Identity', in *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, vol 12:4, pp 21-48. https://www.creativityandcognition.com/research/practice-based-research/ [Accessed 12 April 2019].

Cresswell, T., (1996) *In Place/ Out of Place*, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Cresswell, T., (2004) *Place: a short introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Community Security Trust, (2013) *Antisemitic Incidents Report 2012.* [Online]. Available at: https://cst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202012.pdf [Accessed: 19 November 2016]

Community Security Trust, (2015) *Antisemitic Incidents Report 2015.* [Online]. Available at: https://cst.org.uk/publications/cst-publications [Accessed: 17 April 2016]

Czarniawska, B., (2012) *Narratives in Social Science Research*, London: Sage Publications Ltd..

Davidson, J., (2003) *Phobic Geographies: the phenomenology of spatiality and identity*, Aldershot: Ashgate Press.

Deleuze, G., (1994) *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, London: Athlone Press.
www.dictionary.com

Douglas, M., (2010) *Purity and Danger*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge Classics.

Dubois, P., (1995) 'Photography *Mise-en-Film*: Autobiographical (Hi)stories and Psychic Apparatuses', in Petro, P. (ed) *Fugitive Images*, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Dubow, J., (2004) 'The mobility of thought: Reflections on Blanchot and Benjamin', in *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, vol 6, no 2, pp 216-228.

Dunham, J., (2018) *Sharp rise in reports of homophobic hate crime, on London's streets and online.* [Online]. https://www.itv.com/news/london/2018-03-29/sharp-rise-in-homophobic-hate-crime-on-londons-streets-and-online/ [Accessed: 12 December 2018]

Dunlop, S., (2013) *Visual Methods in the Study of Religion.* [Online]. Available at: https://scholar.google.co.uk/scholar?q=sarah+dunlop+visual+methods+in+the+study+of+religion&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholart&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwigi76y_qbLAhXI0xoKHd6LBRAQgQMIGjAA [Accessed: 4 March 2016]

Duttlinger, C., (2007) 'Between Contemplation and Distraction: Configurations of Attention in Walter Benjamin', in *German Studies Review*, vol 30, no 1, pp 33-54.

Eagleton, T., (2011) *Why Marx Was Right*, London, Yale University Press.

Eisenstein, S., (1977) *Film Form*, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ellis, C., (2007) 'Revealing Lives: Relational Ethics in Research with Intimate Others', in *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol 13, no 1, pp 3-29.

Ellis, C., (2009) *Revision: Autoethnographic Reflections on Life and Work*, Walnut, CA: Left Coast Press.

https://www.empoweringdesign.net/ [Accessed 8 March 2019].

Evans, J., and Jones, P. (2011) 'The walking interview: Methodology, mobility and place', in *Applied Geography*, vol 31, pp 849-858.

Faulkner, S., and Hecht, M. (2011) 'The negotiation of closetable identities: A narrative analysis of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered queer Jewish identity', in *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, vol 28 (6), pp 829-847.

Fausto-Sterling, A., (1997) 'How to Build a Man', in Rosario, V.A. (ed) *Science and Homosexualities*, London: Routledge.

Fonrobert, C., (2004) 'From Separatism to Urbanism: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Rabbinic "Eruv"', in *Dead Sea Discoveries: a journal of current research on the Scrolls and related literature*, vol 11, no 1, pp 43-71.

Foucault, M., (1979) 'What is an Author', in *Screen*, vol 20, no 1, pp 13-33.

Foucault, M., (1990) *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1 An Introduction*, New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M., (1994) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock Publications.

F.R.A. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2013) *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*. [Online]. Available at:

http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/discrimination-and-hate-crime-against-jews-eu-member-states-experiences-and [Accessed: 17 April 2016].

F.R.A. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2013) *European Union lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender survey.* [Online]. Available at:

http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/eu-L.G.B.T.+-survey-european-union-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-survey-results [Accessed: 24 June 2016].

F.R.A. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2018) *Antisemitism Overview of data available in the European Union 2007-2017.* [Online]. Available at:

http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/antisemitism-overview-2007-2017 [Accessed 8 March 2019]

Freud, S., (1990) *Art and Literature*, London: Penguin Books.

Gaines, J., and Renov, M., (1999) *Collecting Visible Evidence*, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Gaudreault, A., (1990) 'Detours in Film Narrative. The Development of Cross-Cutting ', in T. Elsaesser (ed.) *Early Cinema Space Frame Narrative*, London: BFI Publishing.

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

Gilman, S., (1985) *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ginsburg, F., (1988) 'The Parallax Effect: Jewish Ethnographic Film', in *Jewish Folklore and Ethnology Review*, Special Issue vol 10, no 1, pp 16-17.

www.theglasshouse.org.uk/

Goffman, I., (1959) *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goheen, P., (1993) 'The Ritual of the Streets in Mid-19th Century Toronto', in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* vol 11, pp 127–145.

Goodman, N., (1984) *Languages of Art*, 2nd Edition, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Graham, D., (2013a) *2011 Census: Initial insights into Jewish neighbourhoods*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, D., (2013b) *2011 Census: Thinning and Thickening*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, D., Boyd, J. and Vulkan, D., (2012) *2011 Census Results (England and Wales): Initial insights About the U.K. Jewish Population*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, D., Staetsky, L. and Boyd, J., (2014) Jews in the United Kingdom in 2013: Preliminary findings from the National Jewish Community Survey, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, D. and Vulkan, D., (2010) *Synagogue Membership in the United Kingdom*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, P., (ed) (2009) *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, London: British Film Institute.

Greenfields, M., Kochberg, S., Milne, E.J., Rathgeber Knan, S.S., (2016, July) *Reconstructing Rituals: Using bricolage to (re)negotiate faith based rituals with the Jewish L.G.B.T.+ community*. Paper presented at the Vienna meeting of the International Sociological Association.

Hardy, F., (ed) (1979) *Grierson on Documentary*, London: Faber and Faber.

Hartley, J., (1999) *Uses of Television*, London: Routledge.

Heath, S., (1973) 'Comment in "The Idea of Authorship"', in *Screen*, vol 14, no 3, pp 86-91.

Hebdige, D., (1982/1983) 'Posing…Threats, Striking…Poses: Youth, Surveillance, and Display', in *SubStance: A Special Issue from the Center for Twentieth Century Studies*, vol 11/12, Issue 37-38, pp 68-88.

Heidegger, M., (1988) *Being and Time*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Hey, V., (2006) 'The Politics of Performative Resignification', in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol 27, no 4, pp 439-457

Hodgson, J. and Wickstead, H., (2015). 'Different Perspectives II', In: *The Future of Practice Research Symposium*. Goldsmiths, University of London: HEFCE, p 2.

Holloway, I., (1997) *Basic Concepts for Qualitative Research*, London: Blackwell Science.

Holmlund, C., and Fuchs, C. (1997) *Between the Sheets, In the Streets: Queer Lesbian, Gay Documentary*, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Hornstein, S. (2008) 'Tales of the Diaspora in the Fluid Atlas of Virtual Place', in Brauch, J., Lipphardt, A. and Nocke, A., (ed) *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*, Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Iversen, M., (1994) 'What is a Photograph', in *Art History*, vol 17, no 3, pp 450-464

Jackson Jr., E., (1995) *Strategies of Deviance*, Indianapolis: Indiana State University.

Jakobsen, J., (2003) 'Queers are like Jews, Aren't They?', in Boyarin, D. et al (ed) *Queer Theory and the Jewish Question*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Juhasz, A. and Lebow, A., (2018) *Beyond Story: An Online Community Manifesto*. [Online]. Available at: https://vols.worldrecordsjournal.org/#/02/03 [Accessed: 4 January 2019].

Kadish, S., (2002) 'Constructing Identity: Anglo-Jewry and Synagogue Architecture', in *Architectural History*, vol 45, pp 386-408.

Kadish, S., (2004) '"Cathedral Synagogues" of England', in Jewish Historical Studies: Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, vol 39, pp 45-78.

Kahn-Harris, K., and Gidley, B. (2010) *Turbulent Times: The British Jewish Community Today*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Kaplan, M., (2010) *Judaism as a Civilisation*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Kenney, M. R., (2001) *Mapping Gay L.A.: The Intersection of Place and Politics*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kershen, A. and Vaughan, L., (2013) 'There was a priest, a rabbi and an imam', in *Material Religion*, vol 9, issue 1, pp 10-35.

Knott, K., (2009) 'From locality to location and back again: A spatial journey in the study of religion', in *Religion*, vol 39, no 2, pp 154-160.

Kochberg, S., (ed.) (2002) *Introduction to Documentary Production*, London: Wallflower Press.

Kochberg, S., (2012) 'The Industrial Contexts of Film Production', in Nelmes, J. (ed) *Introduction to Film Studies*, 5th edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Kochberg, S., (2016) 'Ritual Reconstructed Project, 2014-2015', in *Jewish Film and New Media*, vol 4, no 2, pp 186-191.

Kohler Riessman, C., (2011) 'What's Different about Narrative Inquiry? Cases, Categories and Contexts', in Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative Research*, 3rd edition, London: Sage Publications.

Kosofsky Sedgwick, E., (1990) *Epistemology of the Closet*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Krauss, R., (1994) *The Optical Unconscious*, London: MIT Press.

Kristeva, J., (1991) *Strangers to Ourselves*, Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J., (1998) 'Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and in Practice', in Coles, A. and Defert, A. (ed) *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity*, London: BACKless Books.

Kugelmass, J. (1988). 'Between Two Worlds: Notes on the Celebration of Purim among New York Jews, March 1985'. In J. Kugelmass (ed.), *Between Two Worlds: Ethnographic Essays on American Jewry*, New York: Cornell University Press.

Kuhn, A., (1978) 'The Camera I: Observations on Documentary', in Screen, vol 19, no 2, pp 71-83.

Kunin, S., (2001) 'Juggling Identities among the Crypto-Jews of the American Southwest', in *Religion*, vol 31, no 1, pp 114-137.

Lambert, N., (2008) *Jews and Europe in the Twenty-First Century: 'thinking Jewish'*, Edgware Middlesex: Vallentine Mitchell.

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

Lévi-Strauss, C., (1974) *The Savage Mind*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Lévi-Strauss, C., (1977) *Structural Anthropology 2*, London: Peregrine Books.

Lévi-Strauss, C., (1989) *Myth and Meaning*, London: Routledge.

Lipphardt, A., Brauch, J., and Nocke, A., Hornstein, S. (2008) 'Exploring Jewish Space: An Approach', in Brauch, J., Lipphardt, A. and Nocke, A., (ed) *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*, Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Lomsky-Feder, E., and Rapoport, T., (2003) 'Juggling Models of Masculinity: Russian-Jewish Immigrants in the Israeli Army', in *Sociological Inquiry*, vol 73, no 1, February, pp 114-137.

https://www.lyonslearning.org.uk/ [Accessed 8 March 2019].

MacCabe, C., (1974) 'Realism in the cinema: notes on some Brechtian theses', in *Screen*, vol 15, no 2, Summer, pp 7-27.

Macdonald, K., and Cousins, M. (1998) *Imagining Reality*, London: Faber and Faber.

Mann, B. (2012) *Space and Place in Jewish Studies*, London: Rutgers University Press.

Massey, D., (1991) 'A Global Sense of Place', in *Marxism Today*, June, pp 24-29.

McLaughlin, C., (2006a) 'Inside stories, memories from the Maze and Long Kesh Prison', in *Journal of Media Practice*, vol 7, no 2, pp 123-133.

McLaughlin, C., (2006b) *Prison Memory Archive*. [Online]. Available at: www.prisonsmemoryarchive.com [Accessed 1 August 2013].

Meeth, L. R. (1978). 'Interdisciplinary studies: A matter of definition' in *Change: the magazine of higher learning*, vol 10, no 7, p 10.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1976) *The Primacy of Perception*, Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1981) *Phenomenology of Perception*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, L., (2010) 'Queer is in the Eye of the Newcomer', in *InTEnsions Journal*, Issue 4, Fall, pp 1-24.

Milne, E-J., Mitchell, C., and De Lange, N., (2012) *Handbook of Participatory Video*, Plymouth, U.K.: AltaMira Press.

Minh-ha, TT. (1993) 'The Totalizing Quest of Meaning', in Renov, M. (ed) *Theorising Documentary*, London: Routledge.

Mirvis, E. (2018) *The Wellbeing of LGBT+ Pupils: A Guide for Orthodox Jewish Schools*, London: United Synagogue with Keshet UK.

Myers, M., (2008a) 'Situations for Living: performing emplacement', in *Research in Drama Education*, vol 13, no 2, pp 171-180.

Myers, M., (2008b) *Homing Place project.* [Online]. Available at: www.homingplace.org [Accessed: 1 August 2013].

Newman, D., (1985) 'The Changing Distribution of the Anglo-Jewish Community', in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, vol 10, no 3, pp 360-376.

Nichols, B., (1991) *Representing Reality*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Nichols, B., (1994) *Blurred Boundaries*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Noonan, C., (2008) *The Production of Religious Broadcasting: The Case of the BBC*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Glasgow.

O'Neill, M. and Hubbard, P., (2010a) 'Walking, Sensing, Belonging: ethno-mimesis as performative praxis', in *Visual Studies*, vol 25, no 1, pp 46-58

O'Neill, M. and Hubbard, P., (2010b) *Sense of Belonging project*. [Online]. Available at: www.guardian.co.uk/society/gallery/2009/jan/13/sense-of-belonging-exhibition?picture=341562670) [Accessed: 1 August 2013].

Owens, C., (1992) *Beyond Recognition*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pascal, R. (1960) *Design and Truth in Autobiography*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Peach, C. (2005) 'The ghetto and the ethnic enclave', in Varady, D.P. (ed.) *Desegregating the City: Ghettos, Enclaves and Inequality*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pelaia, A., (2017) *Tashlich, a Primary Ritual of Rosh HaShanah.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-tashlich-2076496 [Accessed: 20 July 2017]

Perkins, V.F., (1990) *Film as Film*, London: Penguin Books.

Petric, V., (1993) *Constructivism in Film*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Piragauta, A., (2015) 'Sociability and Ethnic Identity', in Vaughan, L. (ed.) *Suburban Urbanities*, London: UCL Press.

Plantinga, C. (1996) 'Moving Pictures and the Rhetoric of Nonfiction Film: Two Approaches', in Bordwell, D. and Carroll, N. (ed.) *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*, London: University of Wisconsin Press.

Pollock, G., (1989) 'Agency and the Avant Garde: studies in authorship & history by way of Van Gogh', in *Block*, vol 15.

Pratt, M.L. (2008) *Imperial Eyes*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Pryluck, C., (1988) 'Ultimately We Are All Outsiders: The Ethics of Documentary Filming', in Rosenthal, A. (ed.) *New Challenges for Documentary*, London: University of California Press, Ltd.

Pudovkin, V.I. (1974) *Film Technique and Film Acting*, 3rd edition, London: Vision Press Limited.

https://www.rainbowjews.com/ [Accessed 01 May 2019].

www.rainbowjews.com/about-us/the-rainbow-jews-team/our-steering-committee/ [Accessed 18 August 2013].

Rappaport, R., (2002) 'Enactments of Meaning', in Lambek, M (ed) *Anthropology of Religion*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Rascaroli, L., (2009) The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film, London: Wallflower Press.

Reisz, K., and Millar, G., (1987) *The Technique of Film Editing*, 2nd edition, London: Focal Press.

Rendell, J., (2004) 'Architectural research and disciplinarity', in *Research*, vol 8, no 2, pp 141-147.

Renov, M. (ed) (1993) *Theorising Documentary*, London: Routledge.

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

Riessman, C., (2011) 'What's Different about Narrative Inquiry? Cases, Categories, Contexts', in Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative Research*, 3rd edition, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

https://ritualreconstructed.com/ [Accessed 6 August, 2018].

Roestone Collective, (2014) 'Safe Space: Towards a Reconceptualisation', in *Antipode*, vol 46, no 5, pp 1346-1365.

Rojek, C., (1997) 'Leisure in the writings of Walter Benjamin', in *Leisure Studies*, vol 16, no 3, pp 155-171.

Rouch, J., (2003) *Cine-Ethnography*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sartre, J.P. (1948) *Portrait of the Anti-Semite*, London: Secker & Warburg, Lindsay Drummond.

Scheibler, S. (1993) 'Constantly Performing the Documentary: The Seductive Promise of *Lightning Over Water*', in Renov, R. (ed) *Theorizing Documentary*, New York: Routledge.

Schloer, J., (2008) 'Jews and the Big City: Explorations on an Urban State of Mind', in Brauch, J., et al (ed) *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*, Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Shneer, D. and Aviv, C. eds. (2002) *Queer Jews*, New York: Routledge.

Schnoor, R., (2006) 'Being Gay and Jewish: Negotiating Intersecting Identities', in *Sociology of Religion*, vol 67, no 1, pp 43-60.

Scholem, G. (1992) *The Correspondence of Walter Benjamin and Gershom Scholem*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Schon, D., (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. [Online]. Available at: http://resources.educ.queensu.ca/ar/schon87.htm [Accessed 1 August 2015].

Sebald, W.G. (2002) *The Rings of Saturn*, London: Vintage Books.

Silberstein, L. (1994) 'Others Within and Others Without: Rethinking Jewish Identity and Culture', in Silberstein, L. and Cohn R. (ed) *The Other in Jewish Thought and History*, New York: New York University Press.

Shatz, D., Waxman, C., and Diament, N., (1997) (ed) *Tikkun Olam: Social Responsibility In Jewish Thought and Law*, Lanham, Maryland: Jason Aronson.

Sheldrake, P. (2014) *The Spiritual City*, Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.

Silverman, K. (1992) *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*, London: Routledge.

Staetsky, L., and Boyd, J., (2014) *The Exceptional Case? Perceptions and experiences of antisemitism among Jews in the United Kingdom*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Tagg, J. (1993) *The Burden of Representation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Taylor, D. (2003) *The Archive and the Repertoire*, London: Duke University Press.

Taylor, R., and Christie, I., (1988) (ed) *The Film Factory: Russian and Soviet Cinema in Documents 1896-1939*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Toal, D., (2002) 'Editing in non-fiction and documentary film', in Kochberg, S. (ed.) *Introduction to Documentary Production*, London: Wallflower Press.

Totaro, S. (2003). Introduction to André Bazin, Part 2: Style as a Philosophical Idea. *Off Screen*, *7*(7). Retrieved from http://offscreen.com/view/bazin3

Truffaut, F., (2009) 'A Certain Tendency in French Cinema', in Graham, P. et al. (ed) *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, 2nd edition, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Turner, G. (2006) 'The Mass Production of Celebrity: "Celetoids", Reality TV and the "Demotic Turn"', in *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol 9, no 2, June, pp 153-165.

Turner, V. (1988) *The Anthropology of Performance*, New York: PAJ Publications.

Valentine, G., (1999) 'Imagined Geographies: Geographical Knowledges of Self and Other in Everyday Life', in Massey, D. et al. (ed.) *Human Geography Today*, Cambridge U.K.: Policy Press.

Valentine, G., (2008) 'Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter', in *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 32, no 3, pp 323-337.

Vaughan, L., (2012) 'tutorial notes' email to author, 5 October.

Vaughan, L., (2015) (ed) *Suburban Urbanities*, London: UCL Press.

Vaughan, L., and Arbaci, S. (2011) 'The Challenges of Understanding Urban Segregation', in *Built Environment*, vol 37, no 2, June, pp 128-138.

Vertov, D., (1988) 'We. A version of a Manifesto', in Taylor R. and Christie I. (ed) *The Film Factory: Russian and Soviet Cinema in Documents 1896-1939*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Waterman, S., and Kosmin, B. (1987) 'Ethnic identity, residential concentration and social welfare: the Jews in London', in Jackson P. (ed) *Race and Racism: Essays in Social Geography*, London: UN.W.in Hyman Ltd.

Watson, S., (2005) 'Symbolic spaces of difference: contesting the eruv in Barnet, London and Tenafly, New Jersey', in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol 23, pp 597-613.

Watson, S., (2006) *City Publics: The (Dis)Enchantments of Urban Encounters*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

White, H., (2014) *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in 19th Century Europe*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wieseltier, L., (2000) *Kaddish*, New York: Vintage.

Williams, C. (ed) (1980) *Realism and the Cinema*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Winston, B., (2000) *Lies, Damn Lies and Documentaries*, London: British Film Institute.

Wirth, L., (1998) *The Ghetto*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, U.S.A: Transaction Publishers.

Wollen, P., (1982) *Readings and Writings: Semiotic Counter-Strategies*, London: Verso Press.

Wollen, P., (2002) *Paris Hollywood: Writings on Film,* London: Verso Press.

Wright, W., (1977) *Six Guns and Society,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yin, R., (1994) *Case Study Research - Design and Methods. Applied Social Research Method Series (5)*, London: Sage.

Yin, R., (2003) *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. 3rd Edition, London: Sage.

Young, J., (2016) email to author, 7 October.

## Filmography

Bailiff, K. (Series Producer), & Durlacher, C. (Producer and Director). (2012). Arnold Circus [Television series documentary episode]. In *The Secret History of Our Streets*. London: BBC.

Brown, G. (Presenter), Searle. A. (Director) & Ralling, C. (Exec. Producer). (1968). Who are the Cockneys Now? [Television series documentary episode]. In *One Pair of Eyes*. London: BBC.

Cannell, C. and Solomon, G. (Producers) & Cannell, C. (Director). (2005). *The Monastery* [Television series]. London: BBC2.

Charker-Philips, L. (Series Producer), & Draper, S. (Producer and Director). (2012). *Jewish Mum of the Year* [Television series]. London: Channel 4.

Doust, R. (Producer and Director). (2016). *My Big Gay Jewish Conversion* [Online TV broadcast]. London: BBC3.

Faupel, H. (Exec. Producer), & Schreuders, T. (Producer and Director). (2002, March 24). *For Love and God* [Television broadcast]. London: BBC1.

Foulkes, H. (Exec. Producer), & Langan, D. (Producer and Director). (2015). Judaism [Television series documentary episode]. In *My Life: My Religion*. Salford: BBC2.

Gitai, A. (Director). (1989). *Berlin Jerusalem* [Motion Picture]. Israel/ France: Agav Films/ Centre National de la Cinématographie.

Godard, J.L., & Gorin, J.P. (Directors). (1972). *Tout Va Bien* [Motion Picture]. France: Anouchka Films/ Vieco Films/ Empire Films.

Goldschmidt, J. (Producer and Director). (1974). *Just One Kid*. London, Birmingham: ATV.

Haber, R. (Director). (1992). Oy Gay [Documentary short film]. In C. Farthing (Producer), *Out*. London: Channel 4.

Hastings-Smith, L. (Series Producer). (1999). *Tempting Faith* [Television series]. London: Channel 4.

Isaacs, M. (Director). (2007). All White in Barking [Television series documentary episode]. In Fraser, N. (Exec Series Producer), *BBC Storyville*. London: BBC2.

Kochberg, S. (Director). (2003). *Irene Runge: My Way* [Documentary]. U.K.: Wallfower Films.

Kochberg, S. (Director) & Paskin, S. (Presenter and Writer). (2010). *L'Esprit de L'Escalier* [Documentary]. U.K.: University of Portsmouth Films.

Land, A. (Presenter), (2003, August 31). In Z. Hassid (Producer and Director), *Some of My Best Friends are…Jewish!* [Television broadcast]. London: Channel 4.

Lamming, G. (Writer) & Gold, J. (Director). (1963). West Indians [Television series documentary episode]. In *Today*. London: BBC.

Lanzmann, C. (Director). (1985). *Shoah* [Documentary]. France/ U.K.: Historia/ British Broadcasting Corporation.

Littlejohn, R. (Writer and Presenter) & Collingridge, D. (Producer and Director). (2007). The War on Britain's Jews? [Television series documentary episode]. In *Dispatches*. London: Channel 4.

Maguire, S. (Producer and Director). (1997). Dame Henrietta's Dream [Television series documentary episode]. In *Omnibus*. London: BBC1.

Morrison, P. (Series Producer). (1991). *A Sense of Belonging* [Television series]. London: Channel 4.

Oord, R. (Producer and Director), (2017). *Canvey – The Promised Land* [Television broadcast]. London: BBC.

Renais, A. (Director). (1955). *Night and Fog* [Documentary]. France: Argos Films.

Renais, A. (Director). (1958). *Toute La Mémoire du Monde* [Documentary]. France: Les Films de la Pléiade.

Rosenthal, J. (Writer). (1976). *Barmitzvah Boy* [Television Drama]. London: BBC.

Rouch, J. and Morin, E. (Directors). (1961). *Chronicle of A Summer* [Documentary]. France: Argos Films.

Schama, S. (Writer and Presenter), & Kent, N. (Executive Producer). (2013). *The Story of the Jews* [Television series]. London and New York: BBC and WNET.

Smith, N. and Heritage, T. (Directors) & Stein, B. (Producer). (1969). *Some of My Best Friends*. London: Creative Presentation Production.

Soudry, N. and Uscinska, K. (Series Producers and Directors). (2008). *A Match Made in Heaven* [Television series]. London: ITV.

Taylor, A. (Director). (2007). *Examined Life* [Documentary]. Canada: Sphinx Productions and the National Film Board of Canada.

Vas, R. (Director, Editor). (1962). *The Vanishing Street* [Documentary]. U.K.: Jewish Chronicle/ BFI Experimental Film Fund.

Walker, S. (Director). (1997). Jewish Wedding [Television series documentary episode]. In S. Lambert (Series Producer), *Modern Times*. London: BBC2.

Wall, A. (Exec. Producer), & Engle, V. (Producer and Director). (2008). *Jews* [Television series]. London: BBC4.

Wenders, W. (Director). (1987). *Wings of Desire* [Motion Picture]. West Germany/ France: Road Pictures Filmproduktion/ Argos Films.

White, S. (Director). (1991). Volvo City [Television series documentary episode]. In R. Ackerman (Producer), *Cutting Edge*. London: Channel 4.

Zajdermann, P. (Director). (2006). *Judith Butler: Philosophy of Gender* [Television broadcast]. Paris: Arte.

# FORM UPR16

**Research Ethics Review Checklist**

University of Portsmouth

**Please include this completed form as an appendix to your thesis (see the Postgraduate Research Student Handbook for more information**

| **Postgraduate Research Student (PGRS) Information** | | | **Student ID:** | 635748 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PGRS Name:** | Searle Kochberg | | | |
| **Department:** | FMC | **First Supervisor:** | Dr Esther Sonnet | |
| **Start Date:** (or progression date for Prof Doc students) | | **Sept 2011** | | |
| **Study Mode and Route:** | Part-time ☒ | MPhil ☐ | MD ☐ | |
| | Full-time ☐ | PhD ☒ | Professional Doctorate ☐ | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title of Thesis:** | My Jewish London: Performance and Identity in Co-Creative Documentary Practice |
| **Thesis Word Count:** (excluding ancillary data) | 41,787 words |

If you are unsure about any of the following, please contact the local representative on your Faculty Ethics Committee for advice. Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the University's Ethics Policy and any relevant University, academic or professional guidelines in the conduct of your study

Although the Ethics Committee may have given your study a favourable opinion, the final responsibility for the ethical conduct of this work lies with the researcher(s).

**UKRIO Finished Research Checklist:**
(If you would like to know more about the checklist, please see your Faculty or Departmental Ethics Committee rep or see the online version of the full checklist at: http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research/)

| | |
|---|---|
| a) Have all of your research and findings been reported accurately, honestly and within a reasonable time frame? | YES ☒ NO ☐ |
| b) Have all contributions to knowledge been acknowledged? | YES ☒ NO ☐ |
| c) Have you complied with all agreements relating to intellectual property, publication and authorship? | YES ☒ NO ☐ |
| d) Has your research data been retained in a secure and accessible form and will it remain so for the required duration? | YES ☒ NO ☐ |
| e) Does your research comply with all legal, ethical, and contractual requirements? | YES ☒ NO ☐ |

**Candidate Statement:**

I have considered the ethical dimensions of the above named research project, and have successfully obtained the necessary ethical approval(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Ethical review number(s) from Faculty Ethics Committee (or from NRES/SCREC):** | FO:06/12-0061 |

If you have *not* submitted your work for ethical review, and/or you have answered 'No' to one or more of questions a) to e), please explain below why this is so:

N/A

| | |
|---|---|
| **Signed *(PGRS)*:** | **Date:** 24 Sept,2019 |

**JPR16** – August 2015