

Middlesex University Research Repository:

an open access repository of
Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Bolas, Terry, 2007.
The Screen Education Years, 1960-1982; The Academic Accession of
the Abject Art.
Available from Middlesex University's Research Repository.

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this thesis/research project are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge. Any use of the thesis/research project for private study or research must be properly acknowledged with reference to the work's full bibliographic details.

This thesis/research project may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from it, or its content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s).

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:
eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

THE SCREEN EDUCATION YEARS 1960-1982

THE ACADEMIC ACCESSION OF THE ABJECT ART

A thesis submitted to Middlesex University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Terry Bolas

School of Arts and Education

Middlesex University

August 2007

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores approximately two decades in the history of the Society for Education in Film and Television (SEFT). During the 1960s and 1970s not only did film appreciation metamorphose into media education, but what had been a marginal discipline operating at grass-roots level in schools became established in the Academy in a variety of forms. Film study provided the basis from which continental theory and cultural politics might be explored. During this period also the term 'screen education' came to have a particular currency where each element of its designation was separately scrutinised.

There were two organisations which oversaw the transition, the Society and the British Film Institute. In the later 1960s the BFI's Education Department operated increasingly like a university department. Such was the antipathy to this development among BFI governors that the franchise for developing theory was in effect handed to the Society and its journal *Screen* during the mid-1970s. But *Screen*'s writers eschewed the role of academics. They were self-declared intellectuals seeking opportunities to try out theories acquired from European thinkers.

While much interest has been evidenced about the journal *Screen* in the 1970s, the institutional framework of its operation and SEFT's other involvements with the development of media education have received little attention. SEFT had started as the Society of Film Teachers (SFT) and to demonstrate its continuity as a teachers' organisation a complementary journal *Screen Education* grew in size and prestige. It has been the function of this investigation to begin to explore these un-researched areas and to attempt to provide a framework on to which the fragmentary record may be attached.

The investigation of these developments has been complicated by the absence of any consistent archiving of relevant materials. If only limited documentation has survived, the timing of this research has meant that many of the individuals from the period under review were still accessible. Therefore interviews with some fifty people have provided an important resource that has helped to supplement the interrupted written record.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all who have assisted in my researches for this document. Those who have made themselves available for interview are listed in Appendix I. Many of them have also loaned or given me materials for my research. Since the fragmentation of the documentary record was a particular problem for this enterprise, access to material in private collections was important in supplementing what existed in archives.

Like many researchers before me, I have found the British Film Institute National Library Staff to be ever resourceful and persistent in tracking down elusive pamphlets and elderly documents. In Appendix II I acknowledge the other specialist resources upon which I needed to draw extensively and thank the individuals who facilitated my access to them.

Two, now retired, professors were totally supportive of this project from my first mooted it: Manuel Alvarado and Barry Curtis. Both have remained committed to it and each has contributed formally in a supervisory role and informally as a veteran of the period under review. My research commenced at the Surrey Institute of Art and Design, University College where Professor Alvarado was then based. It continued at Middlesex University with Professor Curtis. I am grateful to Professor Adrian Rifkin at Middlesex for his support and for organising the continuation of Manuel as a supervisor once I had transferred to Middlesex. My thanks go finally to Patrick Philips, also of Middlesex, the third member of my supervisory trio.

As a student/pensioner my undertaking this project was made possible only with the funding support of a studentship, initially from the Surrey Institute and then from Middlesex University. It is my sincere hope that this finished product justifies the financial investment by those institutions, for which I shall always be grateful.

TJB
August 2007

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
CONTENTS	iii
CAUTIONARY NOTE	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE DISCRIMINATION AND POPULAR CULTURE	21
CHAPTER TWO LOCATING FILM EDUCATION: THE BACK OF BEYOND	51
CHAPTER THREE THE UNIVERSITY ON OLD COMPTON STREET	80
CHAPTER FOUR THE FELT INTERVENTION OF <i>SCREEN</i>	111
CHAPTER FIVE <i>SCREEN</i> SAVIOURS	140
CHAPTER SIX SEFT UNLIMITED	171
CONCLUSION	204
REFERENCES	219
BIBLIOGRAPHY	244
APPENDIX I	266
APPENDIX II	267

CAUTIONARY NOTE

Each chapter heading indicates a short span of years that will, in general, be covered in the succeeding text. The intention is that the reader will find this approximate indication of the chronology helpful. However, when attempting to offer an interpretation of events, providing an account that simply follows a straightforward timeline is unlikely to be wholly practicable.

INTRODUCTION

I remember my delight as a young teacher in the early 1960s when I discovered there existed a society for those who considered film was a sufficiently significant part of British culture for it to deserve a proper place within formal education. I rapidly joined the Society for Education in Film and Television (SEFT) and soon found myself on its Committee, then became its Honorary Secretary in 1965. Some 25 years later, when as a long serving headteacher I was entitled to a term's sabbatical, I became a Visiting Fellow in the English and Media Department of the University of London Institute of Education. This was autumn 1989 and my personal brief for the term was to take stock of what had been achieved for media education at this point. I then learned that what I expected to be my starting point - SEFT - had just gone out of existence. My researches continued minus SEFT, though I was both concerned and intrigued that an association which had existed for almost 40 years (during a period when media education had been marginal within educational institutions) had managed to disappear at the point when media studies in particular was better represented in formal education than it had ever been. So the potential for this research has been on my agenda for some time.

This investigation will seek to steer a middle course between two terrains explored by others. There has been much scholarship invested in broad cultural studies of the United Kingdom from the perspective of the second half of the 20th century, while other scholars have looked in detail at the theories which nurtured the rise of film study and subsequently of media education within the UK. This investigation considers aspects of a flexible institutional apparatus that both operated within the culture and yet facilitated the study of a marginal discipline. It seems highly improbable that today a similar intellectual journey might be taken by committed and gifted 'amateurs' or that a significant aspect of the culture remains unexplored outside the Academy, still awaiting the arrival of such determined theorists as happened upon film in the 1970s. This account will endeavour to trace how a pioneer movement organised and evolved in very particular circumstances.

There is one overarching research question which dominates this investigation: how did the study of film and television, and subsequently of media, shift its position from the margins of the curriculum in secondary education in the 1950s to become firmly established and widely available in higher education at the end of the 20th century? To position SEFT in the history of UK film education it was necessary to research the early years of the film appreciation movement in the 1930s, particularly since several pre-war activists would become part of the founding committee of the Society of Film Teachers in 1950. SFT became SEFT in 1959 and continued until the late 1980s when the Society was disbanded. There was inevitably a mismatch between the extensive period I felt I needed to research and that which I would finally investigate in detail and upon which this account would be based. To have attempted to condense such a lengthy span of time into a PhD thesis would clearly have been an inappropriate exercise.

I knew from my research for my MA dissertation that the intervention of the journal *Screen* in the 1970s was a key moment.¹ But in that exercise I had focused on the journal itself - as had many other commentators. This investigation had to step back and ask additional questions. How was the phenomenon of *Screen* possible? How did it fit into and then transform the dynamics of the screen education movement? The 1950s - during which period the Society's interest was in film - was one of steady growth and achievement. However the changes over the following two decades were to be more important because they were more influential. More answers to my primary research question would be found there. Having been personally involved in the movement in the mid-to-late 1960s I was aware of the preliminaries that preceded the arrival of *Screen*. But while it was possible to build a sequence of events around *Screen*, there was more to SEFT than *Screen* and it was important to ensure that the period under investigation had a broader coherence. This introduction will attempt to establish that the period from the redesignation of SFT as SEFT until the final issue of *Screen Education* in 1982 does match the criteria. Once this period has been defined, then further subsidiary questions about key organisations, players, events and publications will emerge.

During the period of approximately two decades - the 1960s and 1970s - there was the greatest momentum for change. The two most influential organisations, the British Film

Institute Education Department and the Society for Education in Film and Television, were manifestly different operations at the start of the 1980s from those they had been at the end of the 1950s. My research then involved finding the individuals, identifying the publications, investigating the events and unearthing the supporting documentation. As I tackled each of these avenues of inquiry, so a hierarchy of lower-level research questions would be formulated, some of which would form the basis of my interview enquiries with key players.

If the key research question asks, 'How did they do it?' There is a further question this provokes, 'Why did they bother?' Some 40 plus years ago, I felt able to answer it confidently,

In the beginning there were enthusiasts: teachers who enjoyed the cinema and wanted to communicate their enthusiasm to the next generation. They saw in film an art form which children enjoyed spontaneously. More significantly film did not have the same built-in hierarchy of values that literature had. There was no rift like that between what the children read from choice and what the school, for a whole variety of reasons, selected for them to read. The screen education movement therefore had its origins in the enjoyment of the local cinema programme -- something which would never be forgotten.²

It is not a statement I would need to contradict today, but I would have to add that at the time of writing in most institutions screen education was frequently extra-curricular: the film society and film-making club.

As film and television study began to find niches within the timetable the mood changed. 'Often it seems tensions develop between film teachers and their colleagues, for it is somehow implied that film is subversive in the school context.'³ Nobody had felt threatened while film was associated with out-of-school activities. It was even acceptable in the mid-1960s as a 'Newsom' subject.⁴ Few objected to what was considered a distraction for the early school leavers.⁵ In further education it was similarly tolerated as part of the Liberal Studies programme for block and day release students. But when in schools film and television courses competed with more traditional subjects in option block choices, there developed an interventionist anti-media attitude. Some teachers felt they had a duty to advise able students against making a decision with, they implied, adverse long term career implications.

There was another form of intervention with unexpected consequences when, in the 1970s, schools and colleges began to introduce 'educational technology'. The welcome this provoked was reserved for the hardware that supported visual aids. The benefits it was presumed to introduce were those of both facilitating and reinforcing the transfer of existing patterns of knowledge. I observed at the time how benignly this invasion was viewed and what might be the consequences of taking this limited perspective.

...it is not seen as a problem in the way that popular culture was. What evidence there is suggests that children are far more adept at mastering the techniques of the visual media than their teachers, understandably so since teachers are essentially experts with words whose tradition is a literary one and who owe their present position to their expertise in written examinations. Unlike the children and students of today their education was based on reference to a very wide range of books as directed by their teachers. They were not regularly exposed to television from an early age where the channels are so few that there is little opportunity for selection and everyone's terms of reference are the same. We have therefore a situation where the experience of children is not only highly specialized but is common to a whole age group.⁶

It now is accepted as unremarkable that children will readily access, explore and find ways of engaging with technological change and as a consequence educators must aim continuously to connect with these developments. In the 1970s, however, it was the Trojan horse of educational technology that encouraged a cohort of dissident insiders to move on to the attack. There were by this stage teachers and lecturers who readily recognised the contradiction of welcoming change but only as long as it made easier the communication of the familiar. They were of the generation that had in the 1960s expressed dissatisfaction at university where both the organisational structures they encountered and the courses they attempted had served to alienate rather than educate them. They still had personal educational agendas with unfinished business. This fuelled their engagement with screen education, with media and with cultural studies. What better arena for dissident energy than the territory disowned and discredited by most of their predecessors and some of their contemporaries?

In my researches interviewees recalled how frequently they had encountered and fought against institutional opposition to screen/media education. Usually it seems the very existence of this opposition served to validate the importance they wanted to give to those aspects of media education they intended to introduce. Even now it is still possible to find

spectacular evidence of a situation bedevilled by contradiction. Christine Geraghty has put the following on record.

Nearer home, Professor Graham Sellick, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London was reported as having told the Headmasters' Conference that "so-called academic courses in media and cultural studies" were valueless', a rather dispiriting comment for those of us who have the temerity to teach such subjects in his august institution.⁷

As someone who had been an active 'screen educationist' in the 1960s, I was familiar with the 'histories' which formed the introductory sections of accounts of the evolution of media education. I was regularly disturbed at the emphases that were routinely given only to developments post-1970.⁸ In the 1960s I had encountered and worked with not only the emergency trained cohort of teachers from the late 1940s but also their predecessors, the activists who had been developing aspects of film appreciation since the 1930s. It was from these two groups that SEFT's founding body the Society of Film Teachers had emerged in 1950. This limited investigation cannot do justice to the pioneers of the period from the 1930s to the late 1950s, but this introduction will need to make reference to some of the key developments of those years.

This was a movement from the grassroots up, and not a higher education project which had been modified as it reached down into the schools. All the more intriguing therefore that SEFT survived the lean years and died in a time of plenty when film and media were finally being accepted in the Academy. I perceived myself as having played a part in a movement but had to acknowledge I was largely ignorant of its origins and did not understand its ending. In order to answer my research question confidently I had therefore to include in my investigations how SEFT had started and then trace the history through to its demise. Why had it ceased precisely when its potential for recruiting new members had so significantly increased?

During the immediate post-war period buying a cinema ticket was one of the very few options available in the years of austerity, hence the popularity of cinema-going. Perry Anderson has described the British cultural environment of the post-war period as a very restricted one, almost entirely dependent on European emigré thinkers, with one exception - F. R. Leavis.⁹

Indeed it would be a modified Leavisite approach that would provide a framework for addressing popular culture in the 1960s. Significantly Anderson makes no accommodation toward film in his survey of the British scene; but his chosen parameters were those of the British Academy. It was in this period when film was marginalized or absent from cultural debate that SFT was formed by teachers who felt the need to acknowledge that there was a cultural significance in where their pupils spent so much time and to which they responded so strongly.

The independent journal *Sequence* and the BFI's *Sight and Sound* were available in the late 1940s to a limited, mostly metropolitan readership.¹⁰ However the only sustained and readily accessible writing about the cinema was that provided by newspaper and journal reviewers which John Ellis painstakingly scrutinised in his research on the 'quality film' of the period.¹¹ In the absence of any more substantial writing about the cinema, these reviewers filled the void. Their status was both acknowledged and subsequently endorsed when - on the formation of the BFI's Film Appreciation Department - a select group of these reviewers was invited to participate in *Critics' Choice*. Each month they met for lunch and voted on the film of the month. Their selection and their comments on other new releases were published and circulated to the BFI's membership in *Critic's Choice*, an insert into the regular National Film Theatre programme.¹²

For the first decade of its existence the Society of Film Teachers drew heavily on what these reviewers had written. Extracts from their press cuttings provided critical support for the selection of films recommended in its *Viewing Panel Reports*.¹³ Whilst there might be disagreements over individual films, there was, as Ellis has shown, remarkable consensus both in what was considered as a 'quality film' and also in their approach to analysing individual films. Inevitably these traits were carried over into the approaches to film found in the SFT documentation, perhaps most notably when films were analysed by separating out the perceived contributions of the various specialist practitioners operating on the film set. Presenting film appreciation as the recognition of a series of specialist tasks, was a method that readily accommodated the inexperienced would-be film teacher.

No one was entering the schools as a trained film teacher. The process of becoming a film teacher was a self selecting one where the film enthusiast looked for ways of introducing the study of film into her/his particular institution. But s/he would already have been appointed for possessing subject teaching skills in another area of the school curriculum.¹⁴ Thus with such disparate backgrounds there was not just an absence of any shared strategy for teaching about film, but perhaps also a reluctance to acknowledge this absence as a problem. Consequently the accounts of more confident and established film teachers published by SFT were likely to be very influential. These often drew on the film assessments of the journalists/reviewers in the newspapers and periodicals. Members of SFT Viewing Panels used the BFI library in the 1950s to draw on the published thoughts of the reviewers to add authority to their reports on individual films. Twenty years later Ellis would look at the same reviews in order to understand how their authors had operated as cultural intermediaries. After twenty years what had been authoritative and influential for one generation of film teachers had become evidence of ideological transition for the next. The shift in intellectual positioning those twenty years represent is where the focus of this inquiry will be located.

During the 1950s both SFT and BFI were comfortable with the proposition that a more discriminating audience would, by its very existence, ensure that films of a better quality would be produced.¹⁵ It was never explained how this might work in practice, nor was the process of discrimination investigated. Perhaps this was a consequence of the extensive use of the term 'film appreciation', a formulation that itself was never adequately defined, but which implied that with time it was possible to achieve a state of passive connoisseurship.

There was one contemporary publication that began to address some associated issues, albeit from the fringes of the Academy: *Preface to Film* by Michael Orrom and Raymond Williams.¹⁶ It was planned to be the first of a series of publications which had been 'brought into being to associate creative workers in a number of artistic fields in the production of films of a new and distinctive kind'.¹⁷ Thus, while SFT and BFI saw a discriminating audience as the means by which films would be improved, others within film production wanted the improvements to be generated on the set, while recognising this to be achievable only with access to public money.

Williams is insistent from the outset that he is not attempting to provide a theory of film¹⁸ and in this respect his stance reflects that of the necessarily pragmatic SFT. In Orrom's piece, with its emphasis on detailed technical explanations, he seems to be both addressing and promoting a mystique around the mechanics of film production. It was possible therefore for him to speculate that, once the technical potential was understood, more original and inventive forms of film-making would be explored. While the general population went to the cinema, and while SFT members were connecting with the films shown there, these authors were convinced that film as an art form had yet to be realized. Meanwhile those who considered film to be undermining an established high culture denounced the cinema.¹⁹ It was in this doubly hostile environment that SFT members made their claims for the emerging importance of the mass media in the nation's consciousness.

Preface to Film is in effect two separate essays. Williams writes on 'Film and the Dramatic Tradition', Orrom on 'Film and its Dramatic Techniques'. Williams's contribution is dominated by his much greater familiarity with drama than with film. He discusses the concepts of naturalism and realism by ready reference to the theatre and the work of specific playwrights. His instances from actual films are few and fleeting.²⁰ His essay demonstrates how at this time the qualities of popular cinema had not impinged even on an academic as potentially sympathetic as Williams.²¹ He leads into Orrom's essay, expecting that only by understanding the techniques of cinema will the search for new conventions of film-making be found. These conventions will be different from those of the theatre and allow cinema as an art form to come closer to expressing 'the structure of feeling' which 'lies deeply embedded in our lives' but which devices of naturalism in the theatre have failed to articulate.²² By considering film as an emerging and still unrealized art form, Williams avoids engaging with the popular commercial cinema.

Orrom's account marshals evidence from a range of films, both classics of European silent cinema and Hollywood films of the early 1950s. Almost all are found lacking in the guiding principles the author cites as necessary to escape from the 'rigidities of naturalism'²³ - the convention perceived as restricting the development of cinema. He discounts the popular

cinema as a rudimentary and transitional form. In the film proper, montage is to be replaced by the use of cutting solely to provide alternative objective observations of a scene. The fluidity of the moving camera is the fundamental technique of preference. Screen acting will become more like ballet; speech and music will be in balance on the soundtrack, while décor and lighting will be deployed to true psychological significance.²⁴ Given the certainty with which these prescriptions are made, it is interesting to note that the home-grown film movement which emerged later in the 1950s – Free Cinema – was to demonstrate the total antithesis of this approach. *Preface to Film* offered little to those teachers seeking ways to engage with the popular cinema. There were very few texts available on which film teachers might draw. Those that were became disproportionately influential.²⁵ SFT's modest introductory publications attempted to fill the gap for the less confident.

Pioneering teachers had started in the 1930s with general agreement that they were developing 'film appreciation', probably drawing on the United States model where there was already the practice of 'movie appreciation' in both schools and higher education.²⁶ By the 1980s film had lost its dominance and the descriptive terminology had broadened out to 'media studies' and 'media education'. Between the film appreciation decades (1930s - 1950s) and the media education decades of the 1980s (and later) were the 1960s and 1970s. These were the transitional years of 'screen education' which form the substance of my thesis.

The term 'screen education' was coined in 1959 by the Society of Film Teachers with its move to extend the Society's remit to include television and the need to change the Society's name appropriately.²⁷ The BFI Education Department was never able to accommodate the term for institutional reasons and used 'film and television teaching/study' instead. But 'Screen Education' gained authority from its use in the titles of three SEFT journals. The first *Screen Education* was published from 1959 to 1968. Then *Screen Education Notes* emerged from the back of *Screen* in 1971 and continued until 1974 when it became *Screen Education* again. It ceased publication finally in early 1982.

In the 1960s and 1970s UK viewers had the choice of just three television channels. The big technological change during the period was the introduction of colour television, but

compared with other broadcasting innovations this made least change to the practice of television study. The introduction of Channel 4 in 1982 and then the spread of home video recording and viewing would produce a very different environment in the 1980s which would transform not only television study but also approaches to cinema.

In the 1960s and 1970s access to film viewing was controlled and communal. Films were to be seen projected on 35mm in cinemas or in 16 mm in institutions like schools, colleges, universities or film societies. Films became available for hire on 16mm well before they might subsequently be broadcast on television. In the present century where cinema exhibition of film has become little more than the trailer for subsequent DVD sales, it is important to recognise just how different were those 'screen education years' for filmgoers and to appreciate what an influential introductory role was therefore assumed by those who screened films in an educational environment. Perhaps even more significant were the interventions of those in BFI Education who selected the material teachers were to use in the classroom during those two decades. Their choice of material for film extracts would have a determining effect on the shape of screen education.²⁸ The BFI Lecture Service which provided speakers throughout England and Wales on behalf of the Institute and the British Film Academy drew only on a tiny number of regular contributors, thus reinforcing the apparent unity of the message.²⁹

But if the background elements of these two decades remained stable, it was also the case during this period that developments in this embryonic subject area were transmitted by SEFT and the BFI Education Department. Teachers would dispatch identical letters requesting help to each organisation, since to the outsider there was no obvious way of distinguishing between them and the priorities each had for supporting practitioners.³⁰ Indeed such was the mutually shared role of the two organisations that each felt obliged to publicise the existence of the other.

But in practice the two bodies were very different in their operation in these two decades. The Education Department under Paddy Whannel had in the 1960s become, as I intend to demonstrate, an 'Academy in waiting' where Departmental members were encouraged to

develop research interests and where the establishment of film study at university level was considered to be an essential bridgehead. SEFT had been very energetic in the early 1960s and had produced a series of no-nonsense publications which might be sent to those teachers who had questions about getting started as screen educationists. These two organizations, having developed distinct differences in the 1960s, swapped roles in the 1970s. This exchange of activities was not the result of consultation and assessment. It was *force majeure* in the shape of intervention by a small group of BFI Governors in 1971. Under the Chairmanship of Asa Briggs they produced their Report on the BFI Education Department.³¹

This was the report which resulted in the resignations of Paddy Whannel and five of his colleagues³² but which, as a consequence, enabled SEFT to have total operational independence from the BFI. The concentration of resources on its new journal *Screen* was part of a move to explore more theoretical territory which in turn attracted an intellectual élite to the Society while the Report imposed blight on the Education Department which would persist for almost a decade. The Governors insisted the Department, now renamed as Educational Advisory Service, should play only a supportive and not a developmental role in film and television education. The consequences are explored in the chapters that follow. But it is remarkable that no one, not even those who resigned in protest, has retained a copy of the report. The BFI's own archive of Governors' papers has no copy. Of course it may be that what the report said was actually less significant than the construction the BFI establishment of the time was able to put upon it.

Much of the literature I have needed to consult for this research has been original documentation rather than secondary texts. There is however one aspect of my enquiry about which I have found three decades of regular reference and detailed commentary in numerous books: the SEFT journal *Screen*. Such has been the influence of this journal, and specifically of its intervention in the 1970s, that the authors of almost all new works of film theory have felt bound to acknowledge *Screen's* contribution. *Screen* rapidly attracted serious academic attention, particularly from scholars in the United States. The first PhD to be completed as a study of *Screen* was submitted by Rosen to the University of Iowa in 1978.³³ Perhaps the first home-grown attempt to address the importance of *Screen's* intervention came with

Easthope's contribution in *The Politics of Theory* in 1983.³⁴ In 1985 *The Cinema Book* makes multiple references to *Screen* as the source of controversy in various debates, though without featuring the journal as a phenomenon of itself.³⁵ This was followed in 1988 by Rodowick's *The Crisis of Political Modernism* and Lapsley and Westlake's *Film Theory An Introduction*.³⁶ By the 1990s the authors of film theory compendiums in the English-speaking world might wish to dissociate themselves from 'Screen theory' but could only do this if they first addressed the specifics of what *Screen* had promulgated. This may be detected in *Post Theory* (1996)³⁷, *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies* (1998)³⁸ and *Reinventing Film Studies* (2000)³⁹.

While its theoretical positions have generated extensive and learned responses, curiously there has been little interest in how the journal came about and how, in a decade when film/cinema journals were created, blossomed intermittently, faltered and disappeared, somehow *Screen*, then regarded as the most impenetrable of them all, was in regular quarterly publication. Indeed some of those who were closely connected with *Screen* in the 1970s lacked curiosity as to its provenance as comments by Heath, MacCabe and Wollen have in subsequent years revealed.⁴⁰ On the other hand *Screen Education* in its 1970s' manifestation has received scant attention, but as I intend to demonstrate, this journal made the more lasting contribution to the evolution of media education. For these wider areas of inquiry that I wished to pursue, there was relatively little by way of commentary. My priority has therefore been the search for the original documentation, or the part of it that has survived.

I have my own archive, maintained from the 1960s, containing most SFT/SEFT publications. Since so much of the Society's record has proved to be incomplete, its journals have acquired increased importance. The emphasis with which they document developments helps to provide evidence of what may be taken as the priorities of the time. Alongside the SEFT journals I have the publications of BFI Education. In the 1960s and early 1970s, the most prolific of these were the duplicated accounts of teaching practice mostly from secondary schools and further education colleges. Both BFI and SEFT produced occasional publications, addressing specific sectors of the growing movement. In the 1970s when SEFT's resources went into *Screen* and *Screen Education*, the BFI's publications became more substantial with

a series of Television Monographs and the duplicated documentation supported the sequences of revision best characterized by the ILEA Sixth Form Film Study Course.⁴¹

I knew from my own direct experience and from remarks made by my successors on the SEFT Committee that the careful minuting of meetings had always been required. My initial expectation was that somewhere I would find the sequence of minutes which would provide an outline for the history. First I had to discover what archive materials existed and where they were located.⁴² When researching for my 2003 MA dissertation *Projecting Screen* I had been made aware of the SEFT Archive within the National Arts Education Archive in Bretton Hall, part of the University of Leeds. This had proved to be a miscellany of SEFT documents from the 1970s and very incomplete. It was impossible to reconstruct a consecutive sequence of minutes for any of the various SEFT committees of that period.⁴³ Material from BFI Education (covering a slightly later period) subsequently also went to Bretton Hall.⁴⁴ Although these provide only an incomplete record, I have drawn substantially on material from both archives.

When *Screen* was moved to its new Glasgow base in 1989, SEFT documentation had gone there too. However no one had any idea what the archive might contain as all the SEFT material that accompanied *Screen* in the move had been stored unsorted for almost two decades. With the support and co-operation of *Screen* Editors Annette Kuhn (who carried out a preliminary sorting of the material) and John Caughie (who made study facilities available to me in Glasgow), I was able to go through the boxes in November 2005. The Glasgow *Screen* Archive has material from the 1980s, generally from the setting up of *Screen incorporating Screen Education* until the Society's demise. Like the Bretton Hall material it is incomplete but as with the SEFT Archive this *Screen* Archive provided a crucial source of material.

Where I have undoubtedly benefited has been from the coincidence of the timing of my research with the work being undertaken by Geoffrey Nowell-Smith on the history of the BFI.⁴⁵ Professor Nowell-Smith has gathered together several researchers who, like me, are investigating other organisations which overlapped with the work of the BFI. These contacts have led me to valuable material of which I would almost certainly otherwise be unaware.

My researches have undoubtedly gained hugely from the co-operation I have received from Dr Christophe Dupin, the BFI history project's principal researcher.

Dr Dupin has been assiduous in making me aware of any discoveries that he has made that have a SFT/SEFT connection. He has both found documents of which I was aware but which after fruitless searches I had assumed to be lost and he has also drawn my attention to documentation of which I was unaware. As an example of the former I would cite the early BFI Film Appreciation Department publication *Are They Safe at the Cinema?* which, though absent from the BFI library, was found by Dr Dupin lurking on a Berkhamsted shelf.⁴⁶ In the latter category he found among the papers of the former National Film Archive Curator, Ernest Lindgren, a complete sequence of correspondence covering the setting up of an 'independent' SEFT in 1971/2.⁴⁷

Many of my interviewees have generously provided me with what SEFT or BFI documentation they had retained. The most substantial collection I received came from Manuel Alvarado who passed on to me material from his periods as SEFT Education Officer, *Screen Education* Editor, Institute of Education lecturer and Head of BFI Education. The time span of these documents from the 1970s to the 1990s provided me with a framework into which copies of other archive material might usefully be fitted.

Research into the early years of film appreciation was only possible because of the meticulous storage of even the flimsiest documents in the BFI National Library and in BFI Special Collections. This was complemented by the British Library where early school textbooks with film content were archived. Other archives that had small quantities of material with specific relevance were those of the University of London Institute of Education, the National Union of Teachers, the British Academy of Film and Television Arts and the Independent Film and Video Producers' Association. The National Archives provided substantial background papers to the 1950 Wheare Report on *Children and the Cinema*.

If the paper archive was scattered and incomplete, this made all the more important the fifty or so interviews I have conducted to supplement and test out my research. In many cases I was

renewing acquaintance with former colleagues or associates, unseen for some thirty plus years. There was however a frustrating - if revealing - problem in contacting potential interviewees. Whereas it proved easy to reach those 1960s' activists who had remained within the advisory or media teaching world, those who had continued in schools and moved on or retired proved impossible to trace. This was not perhaps unexpected in that a career structure in film/television education had not been available in the 1960s. In those days promotion came from reverting to a more conventional subject or pastoral specialisation.

Interviewing required careful research and preparation beforehand so that interviewees generally had advance notice of my questions. Since I often had some personal knowledge of many of the interviewees before I contacted them, I was aware of the 'small world' that had contained film/media education during its formative years. It seemed to me therefore always prudent to ensure I began each interview by establishing the career moves in each individual's progress in order to avoid any embarrassment which might follow from ill-informed cross-referencing of respective roles.

The lack of a proper record of the Society's activities made the interviews important as a means of filling in the gaps between documents. There were several stages to the interview process. The first was research. Since many of the events I wished to discuss had taken place up to five decades before the interview, it was important to have specific references to trigger memories. Sometimes this resulted in interviewees taking time to unearth their own evidence of the past. Generally the clearer the timeline I had constructed before the interview, the better the process of infilling. The second stage was the construction of the questions beyond the itinerary of the personal history. A lesson learned in headship training had been that one should always frame the question so it had the potential to destroy rather than reinforce the thesis one was developing. This I found to be especially important since interviewees, who were as a rule glad someone was taking a serious interest in what they considered an important history, would not necessarily be inclined to confront the constructions I was putting on events.

Transcribing the tapes was a lengthy process. I tried to make the written record as complete as possible. Frequently in answer to a question I would hear a statement of apparently peripheral interest and relevance. It was tempting to press on and omit such references, but I maintained the complete record. With interviews taking place over a period of four years, it gradually became clear that what may have seemed a marginal interest at the outset might assume much greater significance later.

In order to provide a context for the detailed body of my research into the 'screen education years' which follows, it is necessary here to provide a resumé of the thirty years of 'film appreciation' that preceded my chosen period. My investigation into the 1930s and 1940s revealed that during these decades there was interest in both film appreciation and film-making in a variety of educational environments. The BFI was the focus for much of this with *Sight and Sound* providing regular accounts of the Institute's activities. The pamphlets which the Institute produced in the 1940s were numerous but appear to have been commissioned at random and without reference to each other. The BFI's policy, both during and after the war, of employing seconded teachers as teacher organisers or travelling representatives (who would promote the general use of film) preceded the setting up of its Film Appreciation Department in 1950.

In the post-war period and particularly once educationists had perceived the implications of the changes which would follow from the 1944 Education Act, film appreciation sections began to appear in textbooks for the English lesson. Enterprising authors saw the potential which would follow the raising of the school leaving age for allowing less traditional subjects access into schools. It would be in the new secondary modern schools, where the constraints of examination syllabuses were absent, that film would find its first niche in formal education.

There had been extensive use of 16 mm film projection during the war years as a means of providing both instruction and entertainment. Film as a consequence was perceived as being both accessible and influential, particularly by those who had been conscripted into the services or other forms of war work.⁴⁸ When, in order to meet the post-war demand for teachers, emergency one-year training courses were introduced for those who were

demobilised, this ensured a very different cohort of students was recruited. Leslie Heywood, a teacher trainer and founder member of SFT, recalls that at Borough College the first such intake insisted that, before any formal teaching began, the members of the Students' Union should be fully briefed about the 1944 Education Act.⁴⁹

At Gaddesden emergency teacher training college in Hertfordshire, lecturer E Francis Mills introduced his students to a proto-film course in their spare time.⁵⁰ Mills, while at the London School of Economics in the 1930s, had both experimented with, and written about, film appreciation classes.⁵¹ His post-war students contained the nucleus of activists who would take the initiative along with Mills in exploring the potential for the Society of Film Teachers, in particular Tony Hodgkinson and Paul Alexander.⁵² An East London teacher, Stanley Reed, who had been making films with children in the 1930s was also very active at this time.⁵³

When the Home Office set up a departmental committee in 1948 to investigate Children and the Cinema, that Committee's readiness to take evidence would provide an appropriate 'official' opportunity for these committed enthusiasts to argue the case for film appreciation. The Report appeared in 1950 containing a few paragraphs which signalled some recognition of the potential importance of film appreciation.⁵⁴ Material in the National Archives reveals that the Committee's chairman K C Wheare, an Oxford don, was particularly responsive, sending a memo to committee members asking them to consider the place of film appreciation. The Report recognised that introducing film appreciation would require trained teachers and noted this as an issue.

1950 was also important for two other developments. In spring 1950 Stanley Reed became the BFI's first Film Appreciation Officer under Director Denis Forman. In the autumn, with support from both Reed and Forman, the Society of Film Teachers was constituted. The founding members had built on the constituency of students who attended the 1949 BFI Summer School and had assembled a substantial group to form the first committee.⁵⁵ What seems notable now is that the Society saw the strategic advantage of involving from the outset those who were not teachers but who would be sympathetic from their positions as Local Education Authority administrator, government inspector, academic researcher and

educational journalist. A series of tragic circumstances resulted in the deaths of all four of these key people.⁵⁶ As a result, the Committee remained for many subsequent years essentially an assembly of teachers and teacher trainers

In the 1950s, there were however close links between the Society and the British Film Institute with Institute representation being guaranteed on the SFT committee. Hodgkinson succeeded Reed as Film Appreciation Officer and was in turn replaced in 1957 by Paddy Whannel, a member of SFT. Although styling itself the Film Appreciation Department, the BFI operation consisted for most of the decade of two people, the Film Appreciation Officer and his Secretary, Molly Lloyd, who subsequently became Lectures Officer in an enlarged department. Such were the links between SFT and the BFI that it was a regular feature at conferences for SFT Committee members to speak alongside BFI representatives.⁵⁷ In this way the diminutive Film Appreciation Department might appear more substantial and the Society of Film Teachers more influential, since it was the latter organisation which was able to draw on, and demonstrate, classroom expertise.

Whannel was, before joining the BFI, a schoolteacher who had been part of the emergency training programme at Alnwick College. But once in post at the BFI, he proved to be an extremely competent administrator, manager and educational thinker. Reed had at this point become Secretary of the Institute and he and Whannel worked together very successfully to promote the use of film in schools. Significantly the departmental name was now changed to the Education Department. Whannel was active in promoting the work of his Department both within and outside the metropolitan area, where the bulk of SFT activity was located. In the London area, Whannel established close links with an umbrella organisation, the Joint Council for Education through Art. This body had a brief but very effective life in the late 1950s when it promoted the notion that if the Artist, the Critic and the Teacher came together, a better understanding of their shared enterprise might be achieved. That enterprise was about the reception of popular culture.⁵⁸ The provincial aspect of Whannel's promotion of film study was delivered by the BFI's lecture service. BFI records reveal that although the delivery might have been undertaken anywhere in England or Wales, those who gave the lectures were always from London. It was a case of the BFI providing a liberating orthodoxy.⁵⁹

The Society's principal contribution to the development of screen education came from its regular publications, *Film Teacher* (bi-monthly) and *The Film Teacher's Handbook* (annually).⁶⁰ H R (Ray) Wills edited *Film Teacher* from September 1956 and would continue as Editor of the Society's journal until October 1968. The BFI's *Film Guide* was a monthly wall-chart to which schools subscribed. It contained information about current film releases and drew attention to particular aspects of the creative process, as appropriate to a particular film. A detachable slip was to be removed by the teacher before displaying the chart. These slips contained the first BFI inspired materials for teacher use.⁶¹ Adult students of film might enrol for either the BFI's evening course provided under the auspices of the Extra Mural Department of London University or for its annual Summer School, always held outside London. SFT members were to be found in both these activities, as students and sometimes as lecturers.

SFT depended for income on the subscriptions of its members and on a small annual grant from the BFI. More importantly it depended on volunteer effort, mostly from those who were full-time school teachers. In such an atmosphere of camaraderie the Society tended to be an inclusive, encouraging organisation. The priority was to welcome those who were interested in the area and not quibble over their methodology. At the BFI, where Whannel was able to recruit Peter Harcourt to strengthen the professional aspect of the work, there was less acceptance of all comers. The teachers promoting the work through SFT were self-taught. Whannel wanted to see a more systematic approach with teacher training playing a bigger role.

SFT could not remain a controversy free area. The growing importance of television in the lives of schoolchildren was a reality. Some film teachers, while recognising this, were reluctant to accept that television's ephemeral output should be considered alongside the established art of the film. Others saw both film and television as related aspects of popular culture, together with other media. The debate within SFT was a protracted one. At the 1953 AGM the Society considered its approach to both television and 3D.⁶² Its initial response to the place of television was to set up a sub-committee. In 1958 the AGM voted against the

inclusion of television within the Society's remit. The debate continued for another year, with the *Film Teacher* arguing against the acceptance of television and *The Film Teacher's Handbook* arguing for it. A decisive vote in 1959 took television on board. SFT became SEFT (Society for Education in Film and Television), film appreciation was superseded by screen education and the Society's journal was renamed *Screen Education* and the *Handbook* became the *Screen Education Yearbook*.

Very early in 1960 a substantial report was published to which BFI, SEFT and teacher trainers had all contributed. *Film and Television in Education for Teaching* was intended to promote the study of film and television in teacher training colleges.⁶³ Publication was timed to coincide with the increase from two to three years in the period of study required to become a teacher. Here was an opportunity for screen education to gain a place in the colleges. At the launch conference in the National Film Theatre it did appear that, ten years after the start of SFT, progress was being made.⁶⁴ Where college principals were sympathetic, the report helped but, as Jane Allen subsequently noted, its influence was very limited.⁶⁵

The Report contains several appendices, one of which is pertinent to the period under investigation in the following chapters. Appendix (vi) contains a substantial extract of a review of the film *Room at the Top* by Paddy Whannel.⁶⁶ It is offered as a model of good practice in making a critical assessment of a film and is introduced thus:

The reader will find the examination of character and personality provocative and the contrast between the novel and the film a contribution to an understanding of the role of film as a vehicle for the presentation of human qualities.⁶⁷

This justification for quoting the review reflects the attitudes of the period. The review's importance in the context of this study is that it demonstrates how Whannel, with his Leavisite attention to textual detail and exploration of the film's moral ambiguities, distances himself from the 'quality' reviewers and begins to mark out the territory where the critical debates around film education would develop in the 1960s.

CHAPTER ONE 1960-1963

DISCRIMINATION AND POPULAR CULTURE

The fields of media studies and image analysis are developing fast. We urgently need development of checkable research strategies ... When we are developing those techniques, we must not kid ourselves that we can avoid involvement in the controversies in the political field about these issues. But in any particular case, the implication is that we cannot know in advance exactly where we will be standing. We know only one group that we oppose: those who refuse to analyse, choosing again exactly the same moralistic censorious role that I have described in the 1950s. Their 'refusal to theorise' must be our first target.

Martin Barker, commenting in 1984, on how the 1950s' campaign against horror comics must not become the model for shaping responses to media education.

*In October 1960 the NUT Conference puts popular culture permanently on the educational agenda. During the 1960s the Conference's legacy is still to be found in a range of books aimed at different parts of the educational market. Almost simultaneously the respectful critical position for worthy films still preserved within the BFI comes under attack from **Oxford Opinion**. These new critics, whose preference is for detailed textual analysis, also produce a legacy in **Movie**, a potential rallying point for a younger generation of film teachers. While key SEFT officers engage with the popular culture debate, its journal **Screen Education** is in danger of missing the big picture.*

As the 1960s started and there were certain key events that occurred then which were to have long term consequences for the development of media education and that would impinge on SEFT and its activities. It is possible to associate the start of the momentum for change with two books published in the late 1950s that had focused on cultural issues and provoked debates: *The Uses of Literacy* and *Culture and Society*.¹ But if the territory that these works explored had excited the intellectuals, the coming of commercial television and its popular appeal stirred the population at large. Controversy increased as to whether the BBC or commercial television would be granted the third television channel with the result that the Pilkington Committee was set up in 1960 to decide the matter.²

SEFT's new journal *Screen Education* soon found itself in a crowded film publications environment. Journals appeared which challenged *Sight and Sound: Definition* (1960), *Motion* (1961) and *Movie* (1962). *Movie* had developed from *Oxford Opinion*, which had set out directly to confront *Sight and Sound*. *New Left Review's* new film critic Lee Russell was in reality Peter Wollen, who had replaced Paddy Whannel in 1962. UNESCO

publications focused more directly on film and television in education, with the appearance in 1961 of *Teaching about the Film* where the Dutch author J M L Peters drew heavily on BFI and SEFT experiences.³ Later in 1964 *Screen Education* was published in UNESCO's Reports and Papers on Mass Communication series where the writings of leading SEFT members, Hodgkinson and Higgins, predominated.⁴

Although not directly involving SEFT, there was a development which both SEFT and the BFI had promoted for a long time. A university presence for film was finally found at the Slade School of Art, under the aegis of University College, London, with the appointment of Thorold Dickinson as Lecturer in Film at the commencement of the 1960/61 academic year. A committee would subsequently be set up in 1965 to investigate the possibility of a national film school – an item that had occurred repeatedly on the agenda of the Governors of the British Film Institute since 1958.⁵

The election of a Labour Government in 1964 would lead to the appointment of a Minister for the Arts who then responded positively to the pressure that had been coming from the BFI about a change in its funding mechanism. Whereas previously the Ministry of Education had been cautious in responding to requests from both BFI and SEFT, the re-named Department of Education and Science would agree to fund the BFI and its Education and Regional Departments, in particular, benefited as a consequence. SEFT would benefit too from the establishment of a BFI funded BFI/SEFT joint appointment in 1967. These developments will form the basis of the next chapter.

A new identity was emerging in the population, the 'teenager', a term which quickly replaced the adolescent as a descriptor. In the 1940s the adolescent, making the transition from school child to worker at age 14, had been seen as potentially vulnerable in a world of austerity. The next cohort in the 1950s, leaving school at 15 and entering better paid employment, were potential consumers entering a society of increasing affluence and increasingly perceived as not vulnerable but menacing. By 1960 this phenomenon was coming under academic scrutiny. It was with the conjunction of these and other cultural events that an anxiety was articulated at the National Union of Teachers' Annual Conference at Easter 1960 and only a few months later, a conference 'Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility' was organised. SEFT featured prominently in one of its sessions and in the follow-up publication.

'Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility' in October 1960 is recognised as a 'landmark' event in the evolution of what came to be identified as Cultural Studies.⁶ Two emerging areas of intellectual investigation coincided at the Conference: cultural studies and what would become media studies. It is important to note a certain similarity in their origins: each had developed at the margins of formal education. Cultural studies had, in Steele's view, evolved in the extra mural classes of universities,⁷ while film and television study had begun among the non-examinable students in the secondary modern schools. In the period from 1945 to 1960, it is reasonable to infer that both the adult and school students in these very different institutions were largely drawn from the working class. Such students would have fewer preconceptions of how their teachers should select and present objects for study. It was the distance from the élite core teaching bases of the university campus and the grammar school that gave their tutors and teachers the freedom to experiment. Subsequently, by the mid-1960s, both cultural studies and media education were to have separate embryonic academic institutional bases - in the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and in the Education Department of the British Film Institute.

Undoubtedly, the conference was in part a response by a particular professional group to the writings about popular culture of Raymond Williams and Richard Hoggart though Laing is clear in citing the 'rapid expansion of the television audience (particularly for ITV)' as the trigger for the concern⁸. But both Fred Jarvis and Brian Groombridge, key figures in the organisation of the conference, whilst not disregarding the intellectual stimulus provided by Williams and Hoggart, each separately emphasised another key influence: *Blackboard Jungle*.⁹ Screenings of this film in 1955 had led to 'audience participation' where young audiences had in some venues responded (perhaps less to the depiction of a school out of control than to the rock 'n' roll soundtrack accompanying the credits) by vandalizing those cinemas. Press coverage - and outrage - had been considerable. Predictably its depiction of United States inner urban secondary school chaos would have registered with teachers in the United Kingdom as a portent of the future for British education. The vandalizing of cinemas persisted. The level of concern was such that *Screen Education* published an account by the manager of a small cinema in a Welsh mining village who described the problems he had with his teenage patrons. He

pinned his hopes of producing a more responsible generation through the popularity of the 'Boys and Girls Own Cinema', as his cinema's own Saturday matinée was described.¹⁰

In the early 1950s during the trial of Christopher Craig and Derek Bentley for the murder of a policeman, Craig's defence sought to implicate his frequent cinema-going as a contributory cause of his delinquency. This had fed concern about the negative effects of cinema.¹¹ Now there was a parallel discourse to which *Blackboard Jungle* contributed. Furthermore it was an American film, and one American cultural product had recently been dealt with: by the law. Horror comics, in effect American imports, were outlawed in 1955 as a result of the Children and Young Person's (Harmful Publications) Act. As Martin Barker's research has shown, the essential impulse behind those who campaigned for this legislation was the anti-Americanism of the British Communist Party.¹² The extent of this covert influence had been somewhat disguised by the presence of an organisation, which at that time enjoyed public esteem: the National Union of Teachers, which had joined the campaign, albeit belatedly. Undoubtedly, some NUT members had perceived their union's intervention as an appropriate response to an alien form of culture, to judge by the references to it at the October conference.¹³

A further strand in the influential elements, and one emphasised by Groombridge was *The Teenage Consumer* published in July 1959.¹⁴ Its author, Mark Abrams, defined the teenage consumer as a young person who had disposable income, who was predominantly working-class, who was very influenced by the trends set in the United States, and who was distinctive by her/his patronage of the mass media. Teachers might only encounter the younger versions of such teenagers, prior to their becoming wage earners, but they would have had plentiful hearsay evidence that supported Abrams's thesis. There had been official recognition in 1959 of how the media, teenagers and education coincided in the school room (and where responsibility was assumed therefore to lie) when the Crowther Report had pronounced:

Because they [mass media] are so powerful they need to be treated with the discrimination that only education can give ... There is also ... a duty on those who are charged with the responsibility for education to see that teenagers, who are at the most insecure and suggestible stage of their lives, are not suddenly exposed to the full force of the mass media, without some counterbalancing assistance.¹⁵

At the union's Annual Conference at Easter 1960, a motion was put forward and carried unanimously. Although the wording suggests that it might have arrived at conference fully formed and with subscribers, Jarvis's recollection is that its content evolved during the conference.

Conference, whilst recognizing the vital part played by teachers in developing the moral and cultural standards of the nation and its children, considers that this is a task in which others must co-operate.

Although today more young people than ever are actively engaged in intellectual pursuits and appreciate or participate in the creation of art, literature, music or drama, Conference believes that a determined effort must be made to counteract the debasement of standards which results from the misuse of press, radio, cinema and television; the deliberate exploitation of violence and sex; and the calculated appeal to self interest.

It calls especially upon those who use and control the media of mass communication, and upon parents, to support the efforts of teachers in an attempt to prevent the conflict which too often arises between the values inculcated in the classroom and those encountered by young people in the world outside.¹⁶

Several features of the conference organisation would have been simply impossible by today's standards. All the speakers who were invited during May and June accepted for the following October. No one declined. No one expected or received any payment. Speakers who were not London based were put up in the homes of the organisers. Indeed, for a union to organise such a conference on a non-industrial topic was very unusual. The NUT had recently become the first union to establish a public relations and publicity department and it was this department's first big project under its new lead officer, Fred Jarvis.¹⁷ Admission was by free ticket, the funding for the conference coming from an unspent fund that had been accumulated in readiness for industrial action that had not taken place. The NUT Executive felt that using the money in this way would be acceptable to members. Although no speakers were paid, the Union did pay for a verbatim record of the whole conference, which included all contributions from the floor. Undoubtedly, the comprehensive nature of this permanent conference record contributed to the enduring status of the event.

The list of conference members does demonstrate both a potential attendance of some five hundred people from three hundred organisations and an absence of teachers.¹⁸ Such was the pressure from organisations wanting to be there, that the members who voted to have the conference were largely excluded. To address this issue, the NUT produced a *Study Outline* to the conference, edited by Groombridge, which was made available to NUT

branches and members in 1961.¹⁹ The guide is a careful exercise in drawing out from the various speakers' contributions threads of the main themes of the conference.

The task that the original Easter Conference motion specifically wished to be addressed was that of 'developing the moral and cultural standards of the nation'. The phrase was echoed in the NUT President's introduction to the October event.

This is not the first time that, in the interest of the child, teachers have had to express their concern for moral and cultural standards. A few years ago, we conducted a vigorous and successful campaign against 'horror comics'.²⁰

The frontispiece of the *Verbatim Report* defines the event as:

...a Conference of those engaged in education, together with parents, those directly or indirectly concerned with the welfare of children and young people, and people involved in the mass media themselves to examine the impact of the media of mass communications on present-day moral and cultural standards.²¹

NUT General Secretary Ronald Gould's introduction to the *Verbatim Report* concludes optimistically with the expectation that reading the report will make 'those in the mass media' 'ensure that these media are used to raise moral and cultural standards'.²²

The wide range of extra-educational organisations in attendance at the conference is probably accounted for by this ostensible aim of engaging with moral and cultural standards. In practice most of the platform speakers had been invited because they would have something to say that was relevant to the scrutiny of popular culture, not of morals. Indeed, the styling of the conference had clearly separated what was being addressed – popular culture – from the issue of responsibility. Quite why the conference juxtaposed popular culture with personal rather than social responsibility is never explained. Given the conference's scheduling in autumn 1960 when it coincided with the formation of the anti-nuclear weapon Committee of 100, it was perhaps a time when it seemed appropriate for individuals to identify their personal commitment as had the hundred named individuals who were protesting against the establishment of nuclear submarine bases in Scotland.

The conference was opened by R A Butler, the Home Secretary, whose credibility with an educational audience derived from his period as Secretary of the Board of Education when he had successfully steered the 1944 Education Act through Parliament. In what he

presumably intended as a supportive gesture, Butler, remembering how a change in the law had appeared to offer a resolution to the horror comics campaign, made it clear if any of the issues to come before the conference were susceptible to being solved by legislation, then he would be ready to listen.²³ Butler was not the only speaker to refer to the Children and Young Persons (Harmful Publications) Act. It had been cited in the NUT President's introduction²⁴ and later from the floor, Horace King (an NUT sponsored MP) proposed 'the successful horror comics campaign' as a model for action.²⁵

Whannel and Reed were influential in the design of the conference, and in advising on speakers.²⁶ Reed was an NUT member and had assisted the union in setting up the making of its publicity films: *I Want to go to School* and *Our School*. Whannel brought in the format and contacts from the Joint Council for Education through Art, where the creative artists and the educationists were placed in direct dialogue. Here rather than the creative artists, it was the producers of the media who were lined up: Gerald Beadle, Director of Television Broadcasting at the BBC, Norman Collins, Deputy Chairman of Associated Television, Mary Grieve, Editor of *Woman* and Cecil King, Chairman of Daily Mirror Newspapers. All appeared in the session 'the responsibilities of the provider'. The creative artists were Huw Weldon, Colin Morris, Karel Reisz and Francis Williams who addressed 'the restrictions of working in the media'.²⁷

These sessions were scheduled for the final day when as it were the case for the prosecution had been made. But in their addresses to conference, King and Collins moved on to the attack. King predictably gained press headlines with his comment

In point of fact it is only the people who conduct newspapers and similar organisations who have any idea quite how indifferent, quite how stupid, quite how uninterested in education of any kind the great bulk of the British public are.²⁸

Collins decided to turn the accusation towards the teaching profession: 'the overwhelming mass of the letters we get are illiterate, they are ungrammatical, they are deplorably written'. But it was not the illiteracy alone that he condemned but also the content of the letters requesting fan material and the screening of 'music hall type' programmes, 'I hold the teachers very largely responsible, if that is the attitude of the people in their teens and early twenties'.²⁹ If the organisers had hoped to achieve a consensus, there was to be none.

Higgins and Waters from SEFT were the only teachers to address the conference, making their contribution on the previous afternoon. Their tape recordings of children discussing films and the screening of a school made film would have been novelties for many in the audience. Their cinema session was deliberately separated from the debate about television, which was included with radio. Unlike the other media under scrutiny, films were not represented on the platform by any one engaged in film production. Only later when speaking at the television event did G H Elvin (speaking on the half of the Trade Union Group, the Television and Radio Safeguards Committee) draw attention to how he felt the SEFT contribution had served only to distract the audience.

This afternoon, I was very disappointed at the way the session at the National Film Theatre went; teaching teachers how to teach children film appreciation is all very well, but that session did not face up to the purpose of this conference.³⁰

Yet the terms of the Higgins/Waters presentation had been set by Whannel at the outset.

It is because we in this particular session want to make a stand upon the question of values and our own personal commitments, because we want the matter to be stated in positive terms, that we have given over most of our session, not to talking about what we can do about it but demonstrating what two teachers are doing about it in their schools every day.³¹

As Higgins later put it 'we should not regard the film as a problem at all but as an opportunity to open a vast world of rich experience to young people'.³² Although Whannel defined his task as giving 'an extended introduction to Don Waters and Tony Higgins', he had chosen to insert at short notice an extract from the film *Nice Time* at the start of the session.³³ He explained this last-minute addition of the film as his reaction to the morning's proceedings at which

I was really disturbed about the general view that things are as they are, they will continue to be like that and all we have to do is some more research, and in the meantime not do anything rash, perhaps have a few conferences.³⁴

Nice Time, with its direct social comment, perhaps demonstrated Whannel's exasperation. It was his hasty attempt to challenge the inertia and hand wringing that the conference appeared to be inviting. He on the other hand clearly saw the conference as an important opportunity to promote the kind of work with which he was already heavily involved.

We need within education to develop the whole movement which already exists for extending that part of education which deals, not with the giving of knowledge but with the evaluating of experience, extending that into the area where people really are experiencing all these things, such as popular music, films, television and so on.

We have to extend that and embrace that area within education and critical judgment terms.³⁵

It is then additionally clear that by having as speakers two experienced practitioners, in Higgins and Waters, Whannel was determined not only to change the terms of the debate from what should happen to what was already happening but also to highlight the potential quality of debate about popular culture.

Higgins outlined his approach which was to discuss with children what films and television programmes they had seen and to attempt to ask general questions of them about what might now be considered issues of narrative, stereotyping and representation. But he had a further strategy. Having established the kind of films or programmes that children enjoy, the teacher then attempts to steer them towards preferred examples: '...the answer to bad television is good television'.³⁶ The school film society, he argued, by judicious screenings can develop and widen children's taste. This was open to interpretation. There were some for whom widening taste meant moving children away from popular culture while others saw the importance of exploration within popular culture.

Waters took up the case for the screen education lesson and demonstrated how the availability of the short film extract had made teaching film within the constraints of the school day possible. But his greatest enthusiasm was for film-making. When children were making a film, Waters argued that for him the priority was the end product (the finished film that demonstrated accomplishment) not the means (the lessons that might be learned from the film-making experience). Having the opportunity to be creative in a form that was such a central part of their popular culture was for Waters a process the value of which it was 'difficult to overestimate'.³⁷

It seems likely that the conference audience would have been sympathetic to what was being demonstrated and few would have challenged Higgins's closing statement that 'the purpose of education in film and television...is to help children to enjoy to the full all that is best in film and television'.³⁸ Higgins reported directly to SEFT members about the Conference which he chose to describe as 'the NUT mass media conference'.³⁹ His session with Waters had occasioned a positive response. What concerned him was that most of his audience had had no idea that such work was taking place in schools. This

would have perhaps been a matter of greater concern for SEFT if most members of the audience had been teachers but given the wide representation from civil society which dominated the audience numerically, this display of ignorance was perhaps unsurprising.

Since so few teachers had been able to attend the very conference which NUT members had voted into existence, clearly there was a need both practical and political to find a way of engaging as many members as possible in the subsequent debate. The task of trying to attempt to edit down the 348 foolscap pages of the *Verbatim Report* fell to Groombridge, who had to find a structure that would contain the conflicting emphases of different speakers and of the responses that they had drawn from the floor. This became *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility: A Study Outline*.⁴⁰

Whereas concern over moral and cultural values had been emphasised in previous pronouncements, Groombridge begins by offering two rather different reasons for the conference being called and ones that probably more accurately reflected the aim of Jarvis and others engaged in the planning of the conference:

- (1) to discover to what extent other organisations concerned with education and social welfare shared both its anxiety over some features of the contemporary cinema, television, journalism and pop songs, and its desire to improve their quality;
- (2) to enable representatives of these organisations to discuss the problems and opportunities created by the mass media with some controllers of the media and with some of the writers and artists attempting to work creatively within them.⁴¹

Groombridge was an active member of the BFI's lecture panel and he and Whannel had collaborated previously. Their shared views are best summarised in an article for the *Times Educational Supplement* in early 1960 which anticipates certain of the reasons for the conference outlined above.

It is important for the educationists to know the difficulties they face, rather than denounce the media as such; conversely, it is important for the producers to meet those who are responsible for their audience's taste.⁴²

They see a danger in there being two kinds of outsider: both the children and their teachers.

Both sets of outsider are agreed that there are two cultures, popular and traditional, vulgar and respectable which are mutually exclusive and enemies.⁴³

The children associated the traditional and respectable culture as not being for them while their teachers 'look on appalled at the candy floss world which their charges revel in'.

With this as a model for what teachers face, the authors detect three distinct responses. There is the teacher who resolutely defends his own standards by refusing to acknowledge any value whatever in popular culture. There is a less confrontational teacher who seeks gradually to wean his pupils away from popular and recruit them to the highbrow arts –but this concerns the authors who ask: ‘Does the small group of recruits for the highbrow arts justify leaving the rest to attend to their own critical defences?’⁴⁴

The authors then opt for a third possibility.

It suggests that [the popular arts] have already produced works of art in their own kinds, and that by the proper enjoyment and study of these, standards and criteria appropriate to these new forms can be worked out.⁴⁵

As illustration of good practice in this respect, SEFT and its approach to the cinema is offered as a successful model, where children ‘can be led to understand the role of discrimination in heightening enjoyment in other arts at the same time as they learn to take films seriously’. The authors, perhaps recognising the readiness of the SEFT journal *Screen Education* to accommodate all comers, provide their resumé of good practice.

“Film appreciation” should be more than a narrow understanding of the techniques of film-making. It involves awareness that technique expresses a style, and that through style a director conveys his personal vision and scale of values about the purposes of life and society. Equally, the teacher should beware of pushing film study in the direction of an academic historical survey of the cinema.⁴⁶

Unsurprisingly, Groombridge allows his extracts from the SEFT speakers at the conference to have a sizeable section of space in his chapter in the *Study Outline* on ‘The educational response and the practitioner’s voice’. It was strategically important – both at the conference and in the *Study Outline* – that a solution should be there to be found already in operation, and in the hands of an established teachers’ organisation with a ten year track record of ‘considered experience’.⁴⁷

Almost within days of the NUT Conference, the Council for Children’s Welfare published *Family Viewing – a study of early evening television*.⁴⁸ Prominent among its authors once again was Tony Higgins, Chairman of SEFT, and there was the predictable plug for the Association, which ‘has already advanced far in this field and has devised various methods to help children get the best out of television’.⁴⁹ The SEFT methods are: classroom discussion, encouraging children to ‘watch the better programmes’ and ‘the

formal study of television as a classroom subject along the same lines as the study of the older arts and means of communication'. The advance that was being claimed seems to have been the transfer of the approach of viewing and discussing film to the inspection of individual television programmes.

The basis for the study had been the monitoring of programmes shown between 6 pm and 8 pm from November 1959 to April 1960, where 'ten monitors in two groups watched every ninth programme'.⁵⁰ This report had been set up in the wake of the dismissal by both BBC and ITA of the recommendations contained in *Children and Television Programmes*, the report of the BBC/ITA Joint Committee.⁵¹ In its title, *Family Viewing* embodies both the dilemma and the solution. Since parents and children were assumed to watch these potentially inappropriate programmes together, the report is clear as to where responsibility lies: with both Television Authorities and with parents. It is 'a dual responsibility, with parents taking an increased share as the evening advances'.⁵² When it comes to encouraging children to discriminate, then it is a shared responsibility between parents and teachers.⁵³

Clearly, there was a view that popular culture was getting out of hand, and there was the need in society for some group to be prepared to take responsibility to head off the threat. Perhaps in the context of the Cold War, the engagement with popular culture was perhaps perceived as the battle of the home front. The home front battle had at least one specific focus: the Pilkington Committee set up to advise on where control of the third television channel should be allocated. SEFT submitted evidence to the committee as detailed in *Screen Education 8*. SEFT used the opportunity to attack the ITA which had 'not carried out its responsibility under the 1954 Television Act' to ensure that the ITV companies produced programmes of a high general standard of quality.⁵⁴ It also used the opportunity not only to promote the work of SEFT, but to make a plea in general for money.

We recommend therefore that the importance of providing children with education in television should be acknowledged and that to encourage the provision of this education and help more fully those already engaged in it, SEFT should receive regular sufficient financial assistance.⁵⁵

A rather more considered response, also involving Higgins in its construction, was published in *New Left Review* as a Television Supplement. This was the joint work of Higgins, Whannel and Raymond Williams. Although delivering recommendations to the

Pilkington Committee, the Supplement has a major section on 'Tasks for Education' with separate recommendations as to what the education service should be targeting.⁵⁶ Given that BFI/SEFT representatives were involved in producing the supplement, the recommendations are unsurprising, but defined here in rather broader terms. *NLR* calls for 'courses in critical appreciation of the mass media' so that film and television are no longer distinctively identified. Teachers should have the opportunity to be trained 'in the field of popular communications'.⁵⁷ Whereas the SEFT evidence to Pilkington wanted to see a Television Institute established as an offshoot of the BFI, *New Left Review* wants an independent 'institute of communications research' to help 'those teachers and lecturers in popular communications subjects'. The Supplement concludes with the repetition of a familiar argument about the role of education in relation to the media.

In the end, the quality of the service provided will depend upon the critical awareness of the audience, the sense of responsibility on the part of those who serve that public, the conditions in which the service is received, and the cultural life of the society as a whole.⁵⁸

There were several publications other than Groombridge's *Study Outline*, which appeared after the NUT conference and which declared a specific connection to it: *Britain in the Sixties: Communications* (1962), *The Popular Arts* (1964), *Discrimination and Popular Culture* (1965) and *Understanding the Mass Media* (1966).⁵⁹ *Britain in the Sixties: Communications* contains a reference to the conference in the Acknowledgements where Williams describes it as 'the most remarkable event of its kind ever held in this country'. The book draws heavily on the verbatim record of the conference. The early chapter on the history of communication is a development of the paper that Williams gave on the opening day. The fourth chapter, 'Controversy', quotes extensively from subsequent conference speakers. The concluding chapter, 'Proposals', seeks to move forward from the conference's expressions of concern by allocating tasks to both education and to media institutions. But it is clear as Steele has noted that Williams at this stage 'still deplored the contemporary incarnations of mass media'.⁶⁰ Consequently he has radical proposals for keeping commercial interests away from the channels of communication and for extensive public ownership, repeating the call for state involvement that had characterised *Preface to Film*. Williams does not attempt to theorise what he is observing; he perhaps hoped to use the momentum of the conference to press for change.

The structure of *The Popular Arts* is designed to be inclusive. The chapter on 'Topics for Study' extends across different media, but nevertheless specific topics tend to be located within particular media. 'The Avenging Angels' deals with crime writers, specifically Spillane and Chandler, where the authors then opt for Chandler as embodying good popular art. 'The Young Audience' is about popular music, but it is clear where the author's preferences lie.

Throughout this chapter, we have constantly made comparisons between pop music and jazz. This is because, though there are many individual pop songs worth listening to, in general jazz seems an infinitely richer kind of music, both aesthetically and emotionally.⁶¹

Here the Leavisite approach is transferred to the popular arts, where the worthy and the unworthy are contrasted. Stuart Hall has maintained that the authors were mindful of the strong influence of Leavis among English teachers and felt that taking a Leavisite approach would make the ideas of the book more marketable amongst a cohort of committed teachers and more likely to be put into practice as a consequence.⁶² Since both Hall and Whannel were essentially Leavisite in their approach at this stage, perhaps this was an inevitable marketing strategy. The negotiation with the publishers was conducted by Whannel, who promoted the book on the basis of its substantial reference section and its suggested 'Projects for Teaching'. Unfortunately, this would prove to be a problem for a book of nearly 500 pages. By the time it was published some of the suggested material was likely to have been superseded or replaced, given the very nature of the media with which the book was dealing. The authors' dilemma is embodied at the end of the chapter on 'The Young Audience' where there is an extended end note (added just before going to press) on The Beatles. The authors struggle appropriately to acknowledge this emerging phenomenon and yet also to place it in the context of their existing thinking.⁶³

Discrimination and Popular Culture claims the greatest direct connection with the conference and yet had none.⁶⁴ It does reflect certain aspects of the conference in that media are separated and written about in isolation and by different authors. It also has an unsympathetic introduction, perhaps rather closer to the thinking of the original sponsors of the NUT annual conference motion, which sought to apportion blame to the providers of popular culture. Published as a paperback original, it became sufficiently successful to achieve a substantially revised hardback second edition ten years later.

Much of *Discrimination and Popular Culture* was unequivocal in its opposition to popular culture. In the Editor's Introduction Thompson states:

The hypothesis of this book is that the shortcomings of popular culture are with us, because the mass media just listed have become the expression and mouthpiece of a particular type of civilisation.⁶⁵

He quotes extensively from the speakers at the Conference and implicitly draws authority from an assumed association with the Conference, at which he states:

The most predictable thread running through the proceedings was the express hostility of teachers towards the way in which the mass media are used at present.⁶⁶

This might have been an accurate reflection of the feelings that produced the original Easter Conference motion, but it can hardly be true of the October Conference itself, since there were hardly any teachers able to be present, other than those representing professional associations.⁶⁷ On the issue of responsibility, Thompson is clear that 'those who control the mass media, must be made fully responsible to the society in which they live'.⁶⁸

An important part of Thompson's thinking is in accord with what SEFT and BFI were saying about the importance for all schools to address the various forms of popular culture with the strategy of teaching children to discriminate between good and bad.⁶⁹ He also stresses the importance of there being a supply of trained teachers from the training colleges.⁷⁰ Seizing on the freedom available in the curriculum in the 1960s for schools to innovate, Thompson promotes an élitist notion of experts in the sphere of cultural health, who would keep alive 'our distinctive national culture', a phrase that is not adequately explored.⁷¹ The model offered for the practice of the cultural health team is curious, if not quaint: it is that of the peasant in the Middle Ages who, by attending Mass, 'learnt unconsciously something of the standards of art and music and oratory, which were the pride of Europe'.⁷² He concludes by re-instating the familiar case that the pioneers of film appreciation had promoted.

No great improvement can be expected till more and better education makes its impact and the media are met by a consciously discriminating public.⁷³

Discrimination and Popular Culture rather upstaged the original conference, on the existence of which the book had justified its own publication. Indeed, Robert Hewison

subsequently believed that the book was a collection of the 'almost despairing papers' given at the Conference⁷⁴.

The last of the books inspired by the conference is subtitled 'a practical approach for teaching' and acknowledges a debt not only to the conference but also to Hoggart, Williams, Thompson, Leavis, SEFT and *The Use of English*. The author, Nicholas Tucker, had also seen *The Popular Arts* in manuscript. Thus *Understanding the Mass Media* represents a summation of the contemporary attitudes and became the first book to promote in detail ways of teaching the range of the mass media. Its structure is a legacy of the conference in that each medium is isolated and described separately, following the structure in which individual speakers at the conference had made their presentations. The author does not attempt to offer approaches that look across the media to see what attributes they might have in common. The book is directed to the innovative teacher and provides such teachers with practical classroom strategies for approaching the various media.

*Screen Education*⁷⁵ published by UNESCO in 1964 also derived from a conference, the International Meeting on Film and Television Teaching held in Norway in 1962. Most of the book is written by Hodgkinson, who was about to leave for a teaching post in the USA.⁷⁶ He uses the occasion both to establish a wider use for the term 'screen education' to cover teaching film and television and also to attempt an analysis of what that term might involve from a more theoretical perspective, drawing on a range of sources. His argument begins with an examination of what screen language might be, though he does not make any attempt to follow the model of screen grammar that Spottiswoode had introduced. Instead he deals with the issues of production, reproduction and interpretation, where the combination of the various means of communication and reception possible through film and television serve to emphasise the power of screen language.⁷⁷ What then has to be addressed is how the educator should respond to the omnipresence of the screen language.

Here Hodgkinson draws on the work of Hoggart and Williams. From the latter, he concludes that 'the intermediaries - the controllers of the media - have become or are becoming the most important parties to communication'.⁷⁸ From Hoggart he infers that a means of communication so publicly processed must result in a 'bland culture'.⁷⁹ Hoggart

had been influential in the Pilkington Report and accordingly Hodgkinson quotes from that report's findings: 'What the public wants and what it has the right to get is the freedom to choose from the widest possible range of programme matter. Anything less than that is deprivation'.⁸⁰ Concerns of the period about mass media were particularly focused on the effects on children. Hodgkinson diverts from his general case to quote from the Wheare and Nuffield reports and reverts to the Wheare Committee's solution of the necessity of producing through the schools a more discriminating public.⁸¹ This then begs the question of how to achieve this end.

If the means for achieving this is to be found, Hodgkinson argues that there is a prior need to get recognition for film and television as forms of art as a first step to their inclusion in the school curriculum. Starting from an organisational position, he draws on the work of Herbert Read, who had argued that what a child could cope with educationally was closely related to its development with age. Read believed that only at 14 were children capable of logical thought, 'and any attempt to force an early development of concepts is unnatural, and may be injurious'⁸². Hodgkinson modifies this to the extent of lowering the age of logical thinking to 11 or 12, but does not challenge Read's assumption. The new lower age designated for the onset of logical thinking would conveniently allow screen education into the secondary school curriculum from year one.⁸³

Having argued that the children are ready for screen education, the need is to define art in such a way that both film and television qualify for inclusion in the curriculum. Williams's work assists here, since he demonstrates that new art forms are regularly resisted by those who see themselves as the custodians of the existing arts, so that Elizabethan drama and 18th-century novels were similarly discounted by the élite minority of their contemporaries. The ephemeral nature of television proves particularly challenging to its acceptability as an art form. But what it does enable is for children to become familiar with 'the basic conventions of the language' long before they attend school.⁸⁴ Hodgkinson is therefore in the curious position of acknowledging that children may read this visual language, which is 'unconsciously assimilated', but following Herbert Read he would then argue that only at secondary school age may the teacher intervene to educate them in the 'formal qualities of screen art'.

Once the children are in a state of preparedness, what then are the aims of screen education? Here again Read is invoked and specifically his argument that 'the work of art, however concrete and objective, is not constant or inevitable in its effect: *'it demands the co-operation of the spectator.'*⁸⁵ Hodgkinson, takes this engagement of the child spectator with the screen's images as a starting point for screen education. What the child then proceeds to do with the empathy that s/he feels is to contribute her/his self – 'which renders discussion of films and television such a rewarding and vital part of screen education'.⁸⁶ This then leads into an extensive quotation from a published account of discussions following screenings in a further education college. The experience of the teacher had been that his students were less concerned with the stance taken by filmmakers and more concerned with their own emotional responses to circumstances portrayed in the films.⁸⁷ Acceptance of this emotional unburdening by individuals, as an aim of screen education underpinned certain thematic approaches, which culminated in the use by the Humanities Curriculum Project of extracts from film and television fictional narratives as neutral evidence in discussions on topics such as war and youth.⁸⁸

Having identified this overriding aim of personal revelation through discussion, Hodgkinson needs to find a methodology. Once again he draws on Read and the latter's prescription for the three activities involved in art teaching: self expression, observation and appreciation.⁸⁹ Self expression had traditionally been manifested in the film-making area of screen education, where SFT had promoted the idea of the group-made film. Whatever educational justification had been advanced for this procedure, it did make a virtue of necessity. Classes were large; film-making equipment was expensive; film stock and processing were costly. Hodgkinson feels the need to accommodate the views of those like Don Waters, who argued not only for the value of the group film-making experience but also for the simulation of professionalism that it encouraged.⁹⁰ However, Hodgkinson also anticipates the kind of work that would be developed a few years later at Hornsey College of Art when he foresees the use of 8 mm cameras and portable tape recorders, allowing 'untutored forms of self-expression in a truly individual fashion'.⁹¹

Observation as a method would seem to accommodate many of the more traditional activities expected of children in relation to their viewing of films. Here Hodgkinson abandons Read and draws on Williams who proposes 'teaching the institutions'.⁹² Much of the first decade of SFT had been focused on the scrutiny of the finished product, rather

than on any process of mediation by which that product had been developed and presented. By introducing the concept of institutions in *Screen Education* the author was initiating the process of establishing a significant area of investigation for media education in the future.

The third method - of 'appreciation' - might have been presented as screen education coming full circle back to its film appreciation origins. But whereas film appreciation had started at a time when audiences were unfamiliar with television, now teachers were faced with media saturated children, so that their first task was to arouse enthusiasm for what might be an over familiar experience. Here both Read and Williams are invoked: the former to advocate the teaching of enjoyment, the latter to demolish the received and often repeated wisdom that by learning to appreciate the good, recognition of the bad would follow automatically.⁹³ Hodgkinson, having got to this point, withdraws from the challenge of where it might lead and concludes by asserting that it is the enthusiast who must lead the unspecified way.

What Hodgkinson then does in a separate chapter that takes the form of the appendix is to promote a specimen screen education syllabus that he had developed and used over the first three years of a mixed secondary school. It is a curious mixture, which is probably the result of a process where the curriculum content was being revised in phases. The first year is distinctly old-fashioned in its concentration on the mechanics of film and photography, the history of the cinema and the introduction of notions of film grammar. By contrast, the second year is mostly about institutions and about other media. The final year combines both the thematic and genre approach and ends – albeit only 'for suitable classes' -- with film-making.⁹⁴

It becomes difficult to disentangle ends and means at this point:

*...the factual knowledge which the children acquire in this subject is of no value whatsoever except in so far as it enables them to approach these deeper and more valuable aspects of their education with confidence, understanding and a degree of objectivity.*⁹⁵ [Hodgkinson's italics]

The value of the course is that

...when the children have thoroughly acquired the habit of close analytical looking and listening, we enjoy each other's confidence, share a common language and enthusiasm, and are able to discuss freely the many questions of human behaviour,

social *mores*, moral attitudes etc, which the best films and television programmes illumine.⁹⁶

While one might readily accept that the knowledge of optics and of cinema history might be of limited value to the non-specialist, the author's argument is compromised. To spend a year looking at institutions and other media and then state that knowing this information is valueless, is an extraordinary claim when he is advocating discussion of human behaviour, which must inevitably be proscribed by those very institutions and agencies that he has taught about. But then issues of representation did not find their way into his syllabus.

UNESCO produced a number of publications about film and media in the early 1960s (and continued to do so regularly in subsequent decades). One of the most substantial was *Teaching about the Film* by J M L Peters, Director of the Netherlands Film Institute.⁹⁷ Drawing heavily on examples from British and American films (copiously illustrated with stills) and on the work of SEFT and BFI, the book seemingly aimed to be definitive on the subject. Its assertions were so emphatic that later screen educationists would have been able to quote from it as being sufficiently authoritative as to illustrate the limitations and idiosyncrasies of film teaching being undertaken at the time.

Such was the author's desire for precision that there is a detailed appendix, identifying the skills and capacities of children in relation to film at any given age between 7 and 18. The four elements by which their progress may be determined are: understanding film language, aesthetic appreciation of films, critical assimilation of film content, and methods and practical possibilities. These in turn are tabulated against three aspects of the students' general mental development: perception and thinking, aesthetic receptiveness and creativity, and interest and criticism. So extreme were the claims being made that the book seems to have had negligible effect on film teaching developments in Britain. One of Peters's statements is notable, not for its insight but for its persistent legacy.

Film-teaching (or film education) means helping young people to develop a critical defence towards those films which rely for their primary attraction on the display of technical novelties, on expensive-looking stars and on other superficial factors properly belonging more to the sphere of advertising, rather than on the true and inherent qualities of the cinema. Young people should, as far as possible, be helped to immunize themselves against the spell-casting power of films which use such means.⁹⁸

The medical metaphor of immunization that Peters uses here was probably still thought appropriate at this stage of the post-war period, when children were becoming used to receiving a series of injections to ward off the diseases that had previously been life-threatening. Indeed S W Harris, President of the British Board of Film Censors, had used the term 'immunisation' in *The Film Teacher* in 1952, as a way of dealing with the 'spread of infection'.⁹⁹ But it is clear that in Peters's view this 'self immunization' process was not to be regarded as the whole of film education. During the 1960s, the phrase was not used and Peters's book had little influence beyond being listed in bibliographies, having been superseded in UNESCO's publications by *Screen Education*. As has been shown, there had always been a current of concern about the influence of the media on children, and this had been regularly addressed by those who wished to promote media education.¹⁰⁰ But it was only when later media educationists wanted to describe a history for their area that the related term 'inoculatory' was introduced. The re-emergence and persistence of this shorthand and dismissive term of reference is relevant to this investigation.

Roy Knight writing a lengthy editorial introduction to the BFI produced *Film in English Teaching* in 1972 traces the history of film in English teaching. At no point does he make mention of the 'inoculatory' approach.¹⁰¹ Yet four years later Jim Cook and Jim Hillier emphasise the 'protective or inoculatory' approach in their paper introducing the BFI/SEFT 1976 Film and Television Studies Conference.¹⁰² Len Masterman makes reference to 'the old inoculation theories' in 1980.¹⁰³ Ten years later James Halloran and Marsha Jones refer to the 'inoculatory or moral approach' and it is their paper that is subsequently quoted by the BFI in 1992.¹⁰⁴ None of these sources is able to direct readers to articles where media teachers make the case for the inoculatory approach, because none exist. The common authorities quoted are Leavis and Thompson,¹⁰⁵ the Spens Report,¹⁰⁶ the Crowther Report¹⁰⁷ and the Newsom Report.¹⁰⁸ None of these sources use the term 'inoculatory'.

The authority for the prevalence of the 'inoculatory approach' derives from Graham Murdock and Guy Phelps of the Leicester Centre for Mass Communication Research researching on behalf of the Schools Council in 1973.¹⁰⁹ The Council had initially thought that the conclusions of the research would enable them to make suggestions about 'relatively simple curriculum reform, perhaps with regard to media-appreciation classes or

media-based teaching generally'¹¹⁰. But Murdock and Phelps were not subsequently instructed to discover what media teachers were doing. The focus of their research on behalf of the Schools Council evolved from that initial brief to become:

- (a) the ways in which mass media impinged on the school situation, and
- (b) the relationship between children's use of, and attitudes towards, the media on the one hand - and teachers' attitudes towards the media on the other.¹¹¹

Subsequently after further modification

...it became the main aim of the study to determine the extent to which the differences in patterns of social relationships and systems of communication between schools on the one hand and leisure environments on the other are complementary or contradictory.¹¹²

Halloran, Director of the Leicester Centre, later revealed that the researchers' ultimate conclusion was 'about the quality of the relationship between teachers and pupils and the assumptions on which these relationships rest and, beyond that, about the kind of society we want'.¹¹³

It is essential therefore to understand in the light of these statements that Murdock and Phelps were not reporting on the teaching strategies of those who were designated as teachers of media or of those who had timetabled film or media lessons; they were looking at teachers' attitudes more generally. Part of their research was to compare the attitudes of those who taught science and those who taught English. The latter group included those who were expected in some schools to introduce their pupils to aspects of media. Whereas science teachers generally were required to teach only science, the researchers found that the English specialists were often to be found also teaching subjects other than English, and to feel as a consequence all the more strongly that their fundamental role was essentially the 'transmission of literary values'.¹¹⁴ Therefore some teachers of English were on the defensive when completing the research questionnaires about their attitudes to the media, whereas science teachers did 'not need to be on the defensive, since not only is their basic subject matter relatively unambiguous, but they also spend the majority of their time teaching it'.¹¹⁵

Murdock and Phelps found among a sample of English teachers that there were four distinct approaches to media:

Approach 1 Media material seldom if ever introduced into lessons.

Approach 2 Media material not introduced and any attempt by pupils to introduce it is resisted.

Approach 3 Teachers actively combat the countervailing influence of mass media by exposing examples to criticism (the 'inoculation' approach).

Approach 4 The positive approach.¹¹⁶

The most frequently quoted part of the research is where the authors, carefully putting quotation marks around the word 'inoculation', state that this third approach 'commanded considerable support from both the comprehensive (32 per cent) and secondary modern schools (36 per cent) in our sample'.¹¹⁷ But what does not get quoted is the description that follows which reveals in detail that the approach they are describing stems from an attitude to the media similar to the attitude to certain films of the 1950s, as identified by Peters.

Underlying this approach is a particular view of the process of media influence. According to this view, the mass media can be seen as a series of machines controlled by self-seeking, and occasionally evil, men. These machines send out sounds and images which enter the uncritical minds of the passive audience and then turn them into compliant zombies who will willingly accept the implanted ideas, and may even act them out and behave in an anti-social manner.¹¹⁸

The language that the researchers use to describe the attitude of these teachers is surely designed to signal to the reader that the inoculatory approach is a designation to be applied only to those instinctively hostile to the teaching of media, not a description of an authentic teaching strategy.

In more recent times, it is clear that the term 'inoculating' has come to be used as a portmanteau reference into which a wide range of past approaches may be bundled. Buckingham, citing Halloran and Jones and Masterman, states

This process of training students in 'discrimination' and 'critical awareness' has been described by subsequent critics as a form of 'inoculation' – in other words a protection against disease.¹¹⁹

Over time the various references to 'inoculation' have been taken out of context and used indiscriminately to include and discredit a wide range of earlier approaches to media education

If the NUT Conference inaugurated a period when it became legitimate to explore a wider cultural landscape from the educational perspective that SEFT had promoted, there were

contemporaneous developments in which the traditional approaches to film criticism in the wider society were being revalued. These more analytic approaches were associated with a new generation of university educated film critics. Almost all had no formal film education and indeed their subject specialisms covered a wide range of both the arts and the sciences. What they had in common was years of frequent and regular visits to local cinemas to watch and enjoy mainstream films. That they were able to draw so productively on this ordinary experience was a practical vindication of what SEFT had long maintained: that simply by going to the cinema and enjoying that experience, it was possible to acquire the necessary skills to become a discerning viewer.

50 Famous Films 1915-1945 was published by the BFI at the point when Huntley had replaced Reed as Controller of the National Film Theatre.¹²⁰ Described in the Foreword by Director Quinn as 'one of several innovations', the book was designed for NFT regulars, who would have a permanent collection of the programme notes of what were the NFT's most predictable archive screenings. Authors of the notes on individual films are not credited and their comments follow no set pattern or length. It was, in effect, a collection of miscellaneous programme notes of rather more than 50 films, chosen without any coherent structure but masquerading as a serious BFI publication. The film reviewers of *Oxford Opinion* (specifically Ian Cameron and Victor Perkins) pounced, seeing it as 'worth examining for the light it throws on the standards and prejudices of this country's cinematic establishment'.¹²¹ Previously, according to Cameron, they had planned that in that issue they would 'devote our space to a dissection of that distressing journal [*Sight and Sound*]'. But instead *50 Famous Films* provided a better target for attacking film criticism in Britain, as it demonstrated 'the pallid philanthropy that has always provided its criteria for evaluation'.¹²²

Cameron was then approached by the Federation of Film Societies to write a piece for their journal *Film*, where the argument was presented in a more condensed form. Cameron saw traditional criticism as judging a film, 'on the acceptability of its social and political attitudes', where a significant proportion of the review might be the plot synopsis.¹²³ At the basis of his criticism was the accusation that *Sight and Sound* and the *Monthly Film Bulletin* demonstrated intellectual laziness. What they did not do was talk about style.

To judge a film on anything other than its style is to set up the critic's own views on matters outside the cinema against those of its maker.¹²⁴

Responses came both from Penelope Houston, Editor of *Sight and Sound* and Peter John Dyer, Editor of *Monthly Film Bulletin*. Houston devoted six pages of the autumn 1960 edition of *Sight and Sound* to her reply to the original *Oxford Opinion* article.¹²⁵ Her tone is patronising and she seeks to present *Oxford Opinion* as parroting the ideas of others: 'A lot of this comes from *Cahiers du Cinéma*, along with the list of admired directors.' Choosing to interpret *Oxford Opinion*'s engagement with film style as 'reviewing a film in terms of half a dozen striking shots', her punch line was that 'cinema is about the human situation, not about spatial relationships'.¹²⁶ Dyer maintained the patronising distance in *Film* when he responded to Cameron's article in an earlier issue of that publication.

I wouldn't employ them, because of their judgment, or rather their lack of it; and because it follows that they will enjoy neither influence nor staying power.¹²⁷

Their much vaunted obsession with style is backed up by nothing in their own criticism to encourage one to believe that they know the first thing about style.¹²⁸

The NUT Conference had had an agenda about ways of approaching popular culture and of raising the expectations of its audience. At the same time the debate triggered by *Oxford Opinion* was confronting some of the issues that were around in the Popular Culture debate. A group of Oxford graduates was championing the most popular of popular art forms and challenging the assumptions of those whom they perceived as defending those 'quality' films from which the cinema was supposed to draw its credibility as high art. The 1950s had seen such intergenerational differences being the source material for controversy in various art forms.

If there was a detectable difference in attitude among those attending the NUT conference, where some were hostile and others accepting, it had perhaps been anticipated by art critic Lawrence Alloway, writing in 1957. He described what he saw as an essentially fundamental, generational split. Born in 1926, he distinguishes the characteristics of his generation in two ways.

(1) We grew up with the mass media. Unlike our parents and teachers we did not experience the impact of the movies, the radio, the illustrated magazines. The mass media were established as a natural environment by the time we could see them.

(2) We were born too late to be adopted into the system of taste that gave aesthetic certainty to our parents and teachers.¹²⁹

The implication of this argument is that the older conference members were likely to be separated from the younger because each cohort had a fundamentally different concept of cultural normality.

Alloway wrote on a range of topics connected to the visual and popular arts in the 1950s. He also lectured on film, but did not publish any writing on the subject at the time, although he did later.¹³⁰ However, as a successful and influential art critic in the late 1950s, he made radio broadcasts of some film reviews. Towards the end of this broadcasting period, in December 1960, he devoted a broadcast not only to praising the 'impressive film criticism' to be found in *Oxford Opinion* but additionally to dismissing the writings of its opponents at the BFI as 'stale and boring'¹³¹.

Now it seems to me that the Oxford critics have this sense of the movie as something complex and extensive, whereas the BFI writers and the weekly ladies have lost both their wonder and their curiosity.¹³²

He also detects a similar spirit of rebellion in the Cambridge journal, *Granta*, which was following Oxford's lead. Charles Barr, then reviewing films for *Granta*, acknowledges the shift toward the Oxford journal's 'purposeful and committed line on cinema', which accelerated when Barr became Associate Editor of *Granta*.¹³³ Alloway does have one major criticism of both *Oxford Opinion* and *Sight and Sound*. 'Both groups are equally neglectful of the iconography of the movies'.¹³⁴ By the time that the *Oxford Opinion* writers had become editors of *Movie*, they were more persuaded by Alloway's arguments and it was in *Movie* that Alloway's writings about cinema were finally published.¹³⁵

To have such controversy around British Film Criticism encouraged the London Region of the Federation of Film Societies to set up a debate in the following January where Penelope Houston, Peter John Dyer and John Gillett would appear for *Sight and Sound*.¹³⁶ Consequently, when Cameron, Perkins and Shivas turned up to put the *Oxford Opinion* case, they expected to be opposed by *Sight and Sound/Monthly Film Bulletin*. Instead however the BFI was represented by Paddy Whannel and Alan Lovell who had apparently volunteered to stand in for Houston and Dyer.¹³⁷ Unsurprisingly, the account of proceedings as reported in *Film* was not quite the antagonistic heavyweight encounter that its readers might have expected. Indeed, whilst listing the *Oxford Opinion* three as present, the *Film* account diplomatically avoids identifying who was actually opposing them.

The critical debate staged by the London Regional Group at the end of January did not lead, as was hoped, to an advance into more fruitful fields of argument.¹³⁸

Although Cameron had a piece in a subsequent issue of *Film*,¹³⁹ it seems that he reserved his major response for *Screen Education*.¹⁴⁰ He writes mostly about the evolutionary process that the *Oxford Opinion* writers had gone through as they reviewed films for that journal and in the process discussed their shared responses as a group. He begins however, by rounding on the institutional critics and in particular on Houston's attempt to discredit *Oxford Opinion* when she accused them of being attracted to 'jazz and the excitements surrounding it'. What excitements Cameron asks: 'alcoholism? drug addiction? prostitution?'¹⁴¹ Though, as he acknowledged elsewhere, Houston's original response had been very effective in making a much wider readership aware of *Oxford Opinion* than that journal would ever have achieved on its own.¹⁴²

A decade earlier, involvement in the Oxford based journal *Sequence* had provided a route for its editorial team of Gavin Lambert, Lindsay Anderson and Houston to various roles within and for the BFI, as Houston acknowledged.¹⁴³ If they had a banner to fight under that would have been Anderson's 'Stand Up, Stand Up'. The *Oxford Opinion* writers were different. They appeared to eschew a political stance.

In view of our stated ideas about form and content, it is ridiculous to say that we 'prefer form to content', or that we 'refused to talk about meaning'. What we refuse to talk about is whether we agree with the attitude expressed in the film, and to judge it on that basis. This does not prevent us from going as far as we are capable in working out its meaning.¹⁴⁴

When the same authors persevered and produced the first issue of *Movie* in Summer 1962, it started to become clear that what they were committed to was detailed textual analysis. When he wrote for *Screen Education*, Cameron was still at the point of needing to refute Houston's claim that 'cinema is about the human situation, not about spatial relationships'. Cameron dismissed this misinterpretation of the *Oxford Opinion* position by likening it to informing a reader that the novel was not about punctuation.¹⁴⁵ As Cameron's byline in *Screen Education* explained he was 'Late of *Oxford Opinion*, now teaching in London'. The first issue of *Movie* was a year away, and the piece in the SEFT journal was enabling Cameron to disengage from what was clearly an unproductive debate. As he concluded:

In the end, the only way in which one can support one's critical theories is by writing criticism, rather than arguing about it. I'm fed up with writing about criticism. I'd rather write about films.¹⁴⁶

It seemed briefly that *Screen Education* would be the vehicle for the continuation of this debate when Dai Vaughan, Co-editor of *Definition*, replied to Cameron.¹⁴⁷ *Definition* was a new film journal that first appeared in February 1960. Its principal editors were Alan Lovell, Boleslaw Sulik and Dai Vaughan, the latter having been a regular contributor to SEFT journals. Vaughan attacks Cameron's assumption that it is possible to discuss a film and be neutral about the attitudes expressed in it. He asks 'How can we agree or disagree with the "attitude" that we ourselves have conferred upon a work in our act of response?' If *Oxford Opinion* and subsequently *Movie* were to be noted for avoiding the taking of a political stance, *Definition* was very much a journal of the Left. Like *Oxford Opinion* it had attacked *Sight and Sound*. Lovell had detected that 'the vitality of *Sequence* is changed into the complacency of the established magazine'.¹⁴⁸ He saw it as reluctant to offer any substantial critique of the British film industry largely because of the BFI's delicate relationship with the film industry. Consequently, the BFI funded journal that had both security of publication and distribution was perceived as merely reflecting 'what is happening without enthusiasm or insight'.¹⁴⁹ Vaughan in his challenge to Cameron was trying to shift him into the ranks of committed critics.

But *Definition 3* rather than *Screen Education* saw three-way battle lines being drawn. Houston had responded to Lovell, and as with her response to *Oxford Opinion* she was essentially patronising, claiming that *Definition* was 'a trifle rocky on its feet'.¹⁵⁰ In the same issue Robin Wood - soon to become one of *Movie*'s regular writers - joined the *Oxford Opinion* position whilst making his own Leavisite leanings very clear.

We urgently need a sharpening of critical instruments, some means of analysing what Dr F R Leavis would call 'local life', some method of practical criticism of mise-en-scène.¹⁵¹

Wood too could not resist patronising Lovell: 'One must be able, Mr Lovell, to analyse and understand these things before one has the right to dismiss Hitchcock as a "second rate director"'.¹⁵² This was the first skirmish in what would later become a major critical debate between Wood and Lovell, under SEFT auspices in *Screen*.¹⁵³

Probably the most significant of the contributions to the debate in this issue of *Definition* was that of Whannel, whose position, according to the Editorial, coincided with that of *Definition*. In fact, Whannel's article attempts to adopt a viewpoint that offers a panorama

across the contemporary critical scene. Having by this stage already identified himself as both a critic from the New Left and a Leavisite, Whannel is least sympathetic to the 'general run of critics who claim a vague liberal position', by which he must mean his BFI colleagues on *Sight and Sound*. They are 'consistently taken in by the big subject, ever ready to judge a film by its plot outline and discuss it or approve it for its subject matter and overt moral position'.¹⁵⁴ However, he appears to align himself with Houston on the matter of *Oxford Opinion*'s French influenced position. He summarises her attack on *Oxford Opinion*.

Not a difficult task, certainly in the English form, where the specific judgements seemed to have been taken over but the theoretical basis left in Paris.¹⁵⁵

Whannel then offers a compromise position.

If we see our problem as teasing out the values embedded in the style of the film I think this undercuts most of the confusions that have cropped up in the argument.¹⁵⁶

But, as a Leavisite, he has to offer a further mechanism for judging the film.

A film is an act of collaboration with the viewer. All the time, we are being asked to respond to hints and suggestions and create a world. In the good film these clues are many, the life portrayed is closely textured. In the bad film the clues are slight, the life portrayed is schematic.¹⁵⁷

If in the matter of criticism it fell to Whannel to try to map out the territory, so after the success of the cinema session at the NUT Conference it was again Whannel, who wrote in *Screen Education* 'Where do we go from here?' 'Here' he defined as having two main obstacles -- the absence of a clearly defined place for film within academic education, and the lack of a serious critical tradition. To take the second point first, Whannel makes no mention of the debates around the various journals with which he was currently then involved. 'The cinema has produced no great critics.' His concern is however more specific. It is less that there is no 'literature of quality' about film, it is that critics are not seeing a relationship between popular education and serious critical writing.¹⁵⁸

The bulk of his article derives from his concern with the place of film in the Academy. It soon becomes clear that for Whannel establishing film in the Academy is simply a starting point. Thus he describes in only the briefest reference the appointment in the previous October of Thorold Dickinson at the Slade School of Art as the first lecturer in film at a British university.¹⁵⁹ What exercises Whannel now is how a place in the Academy would

alter the status not just of film, but also of popular culture, in the school. Whannel's emphasis on the importance of film's acceptance in the university as the means by which film would get proper recognition in schools was always a fundamental part of his thinking.¹⁶⁰ He is forced to look back thirty years for a model - to *Culture and Environment* and *Education and the University*.¹⁶¹ These are not ideal models as he has to concede, since they embody the notion that high culture must be defended against popular culture.¹⁶² He identifies the cinema as particularly important -- sufficiently established and recognized as a popular art form to provide a model for approaching other popular art forms.

That both Cameron and Whannel should chose *Screen Education 7* as the appropriate publication to publish the concluding pieces for their respective involvements in the *Oxford Opinion* debate and the NUT Conference would appear to demonstrate SEFT's position at the centre of events. It would be incorrect to draw this inference. At the time it was the only regular journal in publication that would have had significant numbers of readers with an interest in both debates. Cameron's 'Purely for Kicks' is printed as the second of a sequence of two articles headed confusingly 'University Report'. It follows a descriptive account of a university student film society. There is no context provided to link 'Purely for Kicks' to the previous series of articles published elsewhere that made up this important debate.

The Editorial to *Screen Education 7* fails to respond to any of the issues that Cameron or Whannel raises. Instead, in the double page spread headed 'Concern for Children', Wills takes a view similar to that which had apparently triggered the original NUT conference motion.

The child has seen crook and cop, outlaw and marshall, wife and mistress, all employing the same means to achieve their ends. He has been deluged by the devices of an acquisitive society which appear to offer him extravagant luxury on 'extended and easy terms'. Superficial, trivial and shallow conformity has been put on a pedestal for him to admire.¹⁶³

He is in effect refusing to engage with how Whannel is defining the post-conference position. It would be several years before the Society would address the issue of its journal's idiosyncratic and increasingly marginal rôle.

CHAPTER TWO 1964-1967

LOCATING FILM EDUCATION: THE BACK OF BEYOND

The Crowther Report does establish a better balance of blame than the NUT Resolution. But a more fundamental objection can be made to both statements in the way they define the problem itself. Both passages imply a clear distinction between the two cultures – the culture of the mass media and the traditional culture of sophisticated arts. And both see these as standing in opposition to each other.
Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel, 1964

The Newsom Report provides 'official' support for the introduction of film and television study in schools, specifically in the context of the proposed raising of the school-leaving age. The necessity for providing a liberal studies offer to short-term release students in further education provides another opportunity for screen education at the margins. Publishers become intrigued by the potential this new market offers. But the increased interest from teachers and the number of enquiries consequently received by SEFT puts great pressure on the Society's volunteers. The new Labour Government of 1964 funds the BFI more generously and so its Director and Education Department make SEFT an offer the Society cannot refuse.

During the 1960s the status of film and television study changed considerably and by the end of the decade many more teachers and lecturers were actively involved in a range of developments. BFI and SEFT were both instrumental in these developments and also the beneficiaries of them. There were major events outside the arena of film and television teaching which greatly assisted in the process. The change of government in 1964 was one such defining event. There were others too, affecting in particular the opportunities for screen education in the further and secondary sectors. In the former, colleges became obliged to offer students released for specialist training by employers the additional opportunity to participate in liberal or general studies courses. In secondary schools there was the expectation that the long delayed raising of the school leaving age to sixteen was about to happen and that new areas of interest had to be found for these additional students.

Consequently the biggest potential area for the expansion of film and television study was to be in secondary schools, where the publication of *Half Our Future* in 1963 had made the clearest call to date for the introduction of film and media teaching into schools, albeit for the 'less able' half of the student population.¹ *Half Our Future* very quickly became known as the 'Newsom Report' after its Chairman, J H Newsom, who had been Chief

Education Officer for Hertfordshire in the immediate post-war years. While in post there he had actively encouraged film appreciation and presented reports on a range of related topics to the County Education Committee in 1950.² Given Newsom's earlier promotion of film teaching in an educationally progressive county and at a time when his reports would have coincided with the publication of the Wheare Committee's report, it seems that *Half Our Future* had a very sympathetic author when it came to make its observations on film and television in education.

Immediately following the Report's publication, the BFI Education Department seized on the relevance of what it said and produced a duplicated handout detailing the eight paragraphs from the Report that had the greatest relevance for film and television teaching. The Department did not however add any editorial comment.³ SEFT's response was delayed. This was probably because of the timing of the Newsom Report, which was published in August 1963. Consequently it appeared too late for comment in the September/October issue of *Screen Education* which was ready for distribution at the start of the autumn term, while copy for the *1964 Yearbook* was complete and ready for the printers by early October. In the first *Screen Education* of 1964, there is a brief introduction from Don Waters, then Chairman, but the content of the subsequent article 'Newsom on the Screen Media' was apparently lifted from the BFI's duplicated document, though with the omission of two of the eight paragraphs quoted there.⁴ There appears to be no logic as to the exclusion of these two paragraphs, 378 and 479. The former endorses film-making which would certainly have commanded agreement from SEFT committee members at the time. The latter argues for the value of the creative arts in helping young people 'to come to terms with themselves'. Unlike the BFI's publication of its selection of quotations without further comment, Waters's introduction is unequivocal in its endorsement.

We have had support for screen education in official documents before – the Wheare Committee - the Pilkington Report - but never such powerful advocacy and expressed so much in our own terms as it is in this remarkable document, the report of the Newsom Committee

But, there never was such ammunition for the teacher and the would-be teacher of screen education. It is the duty of every one of us to use it - on every possible occasion and as effectively as we know how.⁵

There is however a curious postscript to the quoted paragraphs: from Alex Richardson, editor of SEFT's *Film and TV News* that had appeared in the preceding autumn.⁶ He was

an important presence on the Committee and was later to become SEFT's first paid officer. The postscript is both a strident and personal. Richardson taught then at Cornwell School in East Ham, the dilapidated buildings of which had been pictured in the Newsom Report where photographs had been selected to juxtapose images of good and bad facilities in secondary schools. It is on this initial peg that he fixes his response but then contrives to enlist SEFT into his diatribe. His concluding paragraphs are printed below. They demonstrate two important features which affected SEFT's organisation in the 1960s: Ray Wills's apparent reluctance to exert editorial control over *Screen Education* even in instances where SEFT as an organisation was inappropriately invoked; Richardson's readiness to use his position within SEFT to give a spurious endorsement to what were his personal views.

I wouldn't mind particularly that Cornwell will not get new buildings for yet another five years (ha! ha!). If I felt that at least Newsom would be backed by money and political enthusiasm. If you could feel that a significant minority really *cared*. But make no mistake about it. I feel badly.

Half Our Future is surely one of the most important Government documents yet prepared - and not just about education. It's about a world which does justice to all its children. They must be taught well. Their real needs must be served first. They must be recognised for what they are: total, vulnerable, powerful human beings. All of them.

When Newsom is finally shelved (by all parties) then it's only the teachers left. In every type of school. We can choose to stay forever with our local children, and teach them, give them everything that can be given with utter honesty and complete concern. Or we can try to become Prime Minister.

You could surrender.

If the quotations printed above from the Report seem like a SEFT manifesto that's how it should be. Teachers *can* effect changes in the greatest conservative system of the twentieth century. SEFT may not win money from people who say screen education is invaluable, but it will still exist when they have built all those universities for the sake of the economy. Because, if nothing else, SEFT represents teachers

Half Our Future cost the nation only £5,550 to prepare. What's the price of a revolution?⁷

The paragraphs that are quoted by both BFI and SEFT provided powerful support for ideas that both organisations had been advocating. Unlike the Wheare Report which made only incidental references to film appreciation within education, the Newsom Report repeatedly stresses the need for teachers to take account of popular culture. The key sentiments of each paragraph are as follows:

87. There is much scope for valuable consumer studies and in examining the influence is extended by newspapers, magazines, comics, advertisement hoardings, films and television. But it would be wrong to leave pupils with the idea that

everything they like is bad, or that all criticism is negative. A sound, positive judgement must start with valuing properly the good things they enjoy.⁸

216. We believe that teachers should reckon with these facts, and that their own training should help them to take account of television as a social force, as well as offering them some preparation for the proper handling of school broadcasts in sound and television.⁹

217. Nevertheless, not only through television, but in a very large field of popular culture -- music, films, theatre, journalism -- pupils can learn, with guidance, to sharpen their perceptions.¹⁰

474. Here we should wish to add a strong claim for the study of film and television in their own rights, as powerful forces in our culture and significant sources of language and ideas.¹¹

475. The culture provided by all the mass media, but particularly by film and television represents the most significant environmental factor that teachers have to take into account.¹²

476. By presenting examples of films selected for the integrity of their treatment of human values, and the craftsmanship with which they were made, alongside others of mixed or poor quality, we can not only build up a way of evaluating but also lead the pupils to an understanding of film as a unique and potentially valuable art form in its own right as capable of communicating depth of experience as any other art form.

While there is a supply, even if inadequate, of specialist and other teachers with some training in literature, music, art and drama, there are very few teachers equipped to deal with the art forms that most closely touch the boys and girls of this Report. We are glad to note that some training colleges have begun to respond to this challenge by offering courses in film both as major and minor elements in a course.¹³

The production of the Report had been triggered by the prospect of the planned raising of the school leaving age to 16, though this was not in the event to be accomplished for a further decade. Such was the extent not only of the generally positive response given to Newsom but also of the concerns about the curriculum development that would precede the raising of the school leaving age (ROSLA) that individual film teachers saw an opportunity to offer their subject as an innovative part of the solution. SEFT followed up the comments in *Screen Education* with a Conference in May 1964, 'After Newsom... Making a Start in Screen Education'.¹⁴ An undoubted effect of *Half Our Future* was to raise the profile of film and television teaching and to initiate questions and controversies where previously in the interests of protecting this embryonic area of study, it had been politic to maintain a consensus. As an initial demonstration of how alliances began to fall apart post Newsom, it is instructive to consider attitudes to the use of the numerous commercially sponsored films available on 16 mm in the 1960s.

Many large industrial and commercial organisations had their own production units and film libraries funded as part of their promotional activities. Annual screenings took place at venues such as the National Film Theatre where the latest releases of sponsored films might be viewed. For some years SEFT was formally associated with these Festivals of Free Loan Films organised by the Federation of Film Societies.¹⁵ The particular appeal to teachers was that these films were almost always available on free loan. Such films were valuable as up-to-date and effective visual aids for science or geography teachers, but increasingly some of the films became of interest to film teachers who could, for example, hire *We are the Lambeth Boys* (Reisz 1957) and *Everyday Except Christmas* (Anderson 1957) from the Ford Film Library, *Terminus* (Schlesinger 1961) from British Transport Films and *The Back of Beyond* (Heyer 1954) from the Petroleum Films Bureau.

To some on the Committee therefore it seemed that an appropriate SEFT project would be to produce a booklet on the 'Best of the Sponsored Films', and indeed a sponsored film supplement was published in *Screen Education* where the impending publication of the booklet was repeatedly trailed.¹⁶ Members' views as to what films should be included were sought by questionnaires in the journal. The plans for this forthcoming publication divided the SEFT Committee in 1965. Jim Kitses, by then BFI Teacher Adviser and sitting on the committee as the Institute's representative, led the argument that this was a retrograde step diverting film education away from its more appropriate interest in mainstream cinema.¹⁷

Undoubtedly there was a benefit to SEFT from the existence of so many free-loan libraries: a significant chunk of its journals' regular advertising income came from the libraries repeated advertisements. This may also have encouraged support for the project among some Committee members. They were however particularly encouraged by learning of the success that a SEFT member, Eric Else, had with an idea that he put to Longmans in 1965.¹⁸ Publishers generally had responded to the huge potential market in secondary schools that the Newsom Report had not only identified but celebrated. Suddenly it seemed appropriate to give textbooks a facelift and perhaps novelty rather than innovation became the driving force. Else's book *The Back of Beyond* is unique. It is essentially a textbook for use in secondary schools, built around the viewing of a single free loan film made in Australia by Shell and distributed in the UK by the Petroleum Films Bureau.¹⁹ The book is now valuable for providing an insight into the confusion of ideas circulating

around film teaching that preceded the date of its eventual publication in 1968 and will therefore be considered here in that context.

The book opens with the acknowledgement of two influences: first of the Newsom Report (with the quotation of paragraphs 474 and 476); and of a SEFT interview with John Heyer, the film's director, by Alex Richardson.²⁰ Else describes the book simply as 'a classroom aid to the study of *The Back of Beyond*'. Its contents include maps, poems, extracts from works of fiction and description, all with linking material by Else. In addition there are thirty pages of very detailed, shot by shot frame analyses of sequences from the film. There is however little indication of the curriculum area that the book is targeting, presumably to enable the publisher to market the book as widely as possible. Only at the end under 'Notes for the Teacher' is there a section 'Appreciation of *The Back of Beyond*'.²¹

The appreciation is a painstakingly detailed chronological account, sequence by sequence, in which Else recalls his responses to the film, with occasional asides to the teacher as to his assessment of the film's effectiveness at particular points. Else's commentary serves to provide any teacher who decides to use the book with a backup of points of cinematic interest, to which s/he might refer in the classroom. In case the teacher might doubt the value of the enterprise, the book concludes with an implicit reference to the British documentary tradition and its revered place in film appreciation.

The Back of Beyond is probably the last of the great romantic documentaries; it is vigorous and life-affirming and has a quality of immediacy that makes it a memorable experience both as a work of film art and as a tribute to the resilience of the human spirit.²²

Of greater interest now are two very specific aspects of the book. Firstly, Else tries to context an appropriate methodology for looking at the film and attempts specifically to reconcile what he identifies as the approaches of Stuart Hall on the one hand, and Ernest Lindgren on the other. To do so, he draws from *Film Teaching* and *The Art of the Cinema*.²³ The former was the first substantial publication from Whannel's Education Department, the latter a recent revision of Lindgren's 1940s original. Secondly, he provides detailed shot by shot analyses - using frame enlargements - of four sequences from the film. These are accompanied by production stills showing the camera crew at work.

At the time Else was writing the auteur approach was becoming established as the dominant critical stance and in quoting Hall he is acknowledging the consequent attitude to style that introduces *Film Teaching*. '...not as something imposed upon the subject already given but as the way in which a director conveys to us his inner meanings'.²⁴ Else's book is unashamedly a celebration of director Heyer as the film's author. Else chooses to quote from Hall in a way that enables him then to link closely to Lindgren.

One has to start at the other end -- with the whole response; and then, by relating the *content* to the *technique* show how the one has modified the other. The language of the cinema has to be approached by way of the film's *meaning*, and the meaning is what the director wants to say or show (his intention), what he has selected (the content), and how he has translated it into sound and images (his language).²⁵

Having established that the 'language of the cinema' is on Hall's agenda, Else is then able to move into the probably more familiar Lindgren territory of film language with an extensive list of the options possible, under such headings as camera setup, camera movement, editing, spoken word, natural sound etc. It is through the constant referencing of these that Else's appreciation is then structured.

The second noteworthy aspect of the book is its display of complete sequences from the film broken down into individual frame enlargements for each shot. Having previously endorsed the authority of film language, inclusion of the author's sequences of frame enlargements is perhaps inevitable, given that he had ready access to a print of the film. But their function in this book seems superfluous. The detail of the breakdown (with information on the content of the various sound tracks accompanying each shot) would be useful for a student tackling an undergraduate film-making course, but understanding the significance of the amount of detailed information that is being revealed here would have been beyond the needs of the 'Newsom' students at whom the book is aimed. Had an enterprising teacher removed these pages and cut the stills into individual shots which the children might then put into order in advance of viewing the film, s/he would have anticipated the photo-play exercises that were to become available in the 1970s.

The controversy in the Committee was such that the pamphlet on sponsored films never reached the printers, though some preliminary work was done on it. The dispute was not in itself the trigger for changes in the Committee, but changes in the composition of its

membership certainly would have diminished support for the project, since some of SEFT's longest serving members were to leave the Committee in the mid-1960s, although the final departure of some was protracted by their retaining notional places on the Committee while working abroad. Don Waters left the UK in 1964 to become Head of Educational Television in Zambia. He was followed by Tony Hodgkinson who went to the USA to become Professor of Film in Boston. Tony Higgins gained a secondary school headship in Nottingham and founder member Paul Alexander finally left in 1967 to continue teaching in the primary sector in London. Their respective post-SEFT situations illustrate the dilemma facing film teachers at that time: whether to concentrate one's energy on developing a career within the established UK educational framework or to risk attempting to make a career out of what had begun as a personal enthusiasm.

Such significant departures did not go unnoticed. Stanley Reed, Director of the BFI from 1964, confided to the then SEFT Chairman R C Vannoey, who was a survivor from the Committee of the 1950s, that the gaps left by these departures made the Society appear less substantial.²⁶ Paddy Whannel however chose to view the situation more positively and anticipating these departures set out to establish better relations with the Society soon after this author took over as Secretary in 1965.²⁷

Whannel, as Head of the BFI Education Department, became the key figure in shaping film education in the 1960s. In *The Popular Arts* both its authors (Whannel and Stuart Hall) propose a 'permanent study laboratory' in which their ideas might develop.²⁸ In the event Hall was soon deputising for Richard Hoggart and consequently able to set about attracting researchers to the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. Whannel in a relatively short period between 1964 and 1970 was to transform his department into the film study equivalent of an 'academy in waiting'. Had they been able to combine the staffing level and facilities that Whannel had achieved for the Education Department with the postgraduate students that Hall was supervising in Birmingham, their ambition for a permanent study laboratory would have become a reality. As Whannel's department strengthened its establishment from the mid 1960s, so SEFT's influence temporarily diminished, although BFI Education continued to promote the existence of SEFT in its literature.

Following its change of name and well publicised presence within the Joint Council for Education through Art and at the NUT Conference, SEFT had started the 1960s with ambitions for growth. There were plans for a range of publishing ventures. Its occasional publications (detailed later in this chapter) proved to be very successful; others proved to be less so and were soon aborted. Among those in this latter category was *Teen Screen*, an attempt to produce an offshoot magazine for teenagers that ran to only two issues in 1962.²⁹ Probably connected with this publishing project was the proposal SEFT put to BFI that the two organizations should co-operate in the presentation of Saturday morning screenings for teenagers at the National Film Theatre as an opportunity for progression with age from the established children's shows in the commercial cinemas. Reed (then BFI Secretary and Controller of the NFT) declined the proposal because of 'pressure of work on the Education Department'.³⁰ *Film and TV News* was another short-lived publication that made it only to a first edition in Autumn 1963.³¹ Another anticipated but aborted project was to be a filmstrip advertised in *Screen Education* as being ready for purchase in October 1962.³² To demonstrate the recognition that SEFT intended to give to television the filmstrip was designed to reveal television production methods at the recently opened BBC Television Centre. Issues of copyright ownership intervened after a series of slides had been made around the production of an edition of 'The Black and White Minstrel Show' and the project was discreetly abandoned.³³

Other new projects were however more successful. Teachers of practical film-making were informed in *Screen Education* 19 of the Committee's decision to make available to SEFT members basic film-making equipment.³⁴ With the assistance of the Rank Organisation, SEFT had acquired three 16 mm cameras which together with tripod and light meter were available for hire. These sets of equipment were housed with committee members in different parts of the country and their availability advertised regularly in *Screen Education*. There was also contact with the Rank Film Distribution Library where SEFT was involved in the selection of some extracts from Rank films.³⁵

In 1962 the first SEFT Summer School was held as a one-week course under the umbrella summer school arrangements of the Educational Development Association.³⁶ By 1963 it had become a two-week course in August offering a programme not that dissimilar from the Summer School offered by the BFI, with screenings, lectures, discussion and an important practical film-making element.³⁷ Based in a training college in Carmarthen this

was an appropriate arrangement for SEFT, as the EDA had established publicity machinery and handled all domestic issues. The autonomous BFI school required a much greater level of staffing, though it tended to recruit larger numbers. The SEFT Summer School continued under similar arrangements as an annual event throughout the 1960s, though its location varied.

If SEFT seemed to be in the ascendant in the early sixties, the Education Department was less confident - at least in public - about its own future. In his 1963 Department Report Whannel identifies the strengths and weaknesses of his situation as he begins to envisage the potential for expansion.³⁸ His fundamental case is that he is under-staffed, with only Peter Harcourt as Staff Lecturer to assist on the professional side. In the 1950s the availability of SFT committee members to step in and be available on occasions to strengthen the department, had perhaps helped to make a reality of the Film Appreciation Department, which otherwise might have been seen publicly as a one person band. By the 1960s this arrangement no longer provided the critical and intellectual focus that Whannel sought to promote. The inputs that SEFT members had made had probably been best exemplified by the contributions made at the NUT conference when Higgins and Waters had provided evidence of the kinds of film teaching were possible. By 1963 Whannel clearly wanted to move beyond this stage. He identifies that a point has been reached

...in which there is a need for fundamental thinking. The teacher of English Literature can fall back on the work of a long line of distinguished scholars and critics. The teacher of Film has to supply his own scholarship as he goes along, relying on a mere handful of books which in themselves represent an increasingly dated approach to the subject.

This is not a problem isolated from teaching within the school. The work in the classroom will also suffer if it is not supported by original studies.³⁹

Typical of Whannel's consistent position is this last sentence. Having been emergency trained as a schoolteacher after the war and having taught in secondary modern schools, he always saw schools as the ultimate beneficiaries of the work he promoted. This was particularly his view when the BFI began to consider financially supporting university lectureships.⁴⁰ Here was a fundamental difference with SEFT which had overseen the growth of film teaching from the classroom grass roots upwards and had promoted expertise in that arena. Whannel now wanted to shift the focus of developments and he spells it out that

...we have in the Education Department at the Institute the people who are engaged in film teaching, who regularly in their lectures are forced to feel the need of a thorough and relevant film scholarship to help them in their work, and so care about the kinds of research projects that need to be done. Immediately what is required is some free time for its lecturing staff so that they may work in what might approximate to academic conditions and the freeing of at least one member of staff to concentrate entirely on research and lecturing.⁴¹

A specific element that he wanted to see introduced was a contribution from teacher training. The ATCDE Report had identified the options that might be available with the extension of basic teacher training to three years. Whannel highlights Bede College where for the first time students from 1964 would be able to take Film and Television Study as a main course.⁴² But he was also aware of the potential of very promising teachers and lecturers already engaged in teaching film and television whose performance would benefit from further enhancement.

The problem is further sharpened by the need that the Department feels to establish a more substantial form of training for teachers and lecturers than at present exists. We believe that a number of lecturers would develop the work in film teaching if such training could be provided. We believe that there is a need now to establish, if only for a limited period, a one-year full-time course, and such a proposal has been put to the Ministry of Education.⁴³

In the event a one-year course did not prove practicable, but one term courses for seconded teachers and lecturers did follow with BFI involvement both at Bede College and at Hornsey College of Art.⁴⁴

In this 1963 Report Whannel identifies the BFI Education Department publications which will be forthcoming - following the significant gap that had occurred after the appearance of the ATCDE Report in January 1960. The gap

... is because the Institute found it impossible to provide an adequate budget. What little money was available was spent on the bulk purchase of the Society for Education in Film and Television's publications. A reasonable sum of money has now been provided for 1963/64.⁴⁵

During that period of the early 1960s, SEFT's pamphlet publication had peaked, possibly encouraged by the income from BFI's bulk purchasing power. So for a period both BFI and SEFT would have been responding to teacher requests with identical materials. The choice of topics for SEFT's occasional publications in the 1960s was a pragmatic one. Each was designed to provide a ready response to the most frequently received queries

from non-members. The material in them was usually reprinted from *Screen Education* or the *Yearbook*. The reprinting was no afterthought: the policy was to set up the material for printing first as articles in one of the Society's two regular publications. This had the double advantage of cost saving and of ensuring that members got access to the information automatically as part of their subscriptions without having to purchase the separate pamphlets.

The first to appear was *Film Making in Schools* in 1960, followed in 1963 by what was to be the most substantial of the series *A Handbook for Screen Education*. Such was the popularity of the former that it was reprinted in 1963 when it appeared under the title of *Young Film Makers*, apparently a deliberate decision to link it to be in the NUT sponsored film making competition. This was followed in 1964 by *Young Film Makers Symposium*. Also in 1964 came *100 Films for Juniors*. The sequence was completed in 1965 with *A Film Society Handbook* for use in schools and colleges.⁴⁶

The implications of the BFI's dependence on SEFT for publications, the rather conventional contents of which Whannel might have questioned, no doubt served to ensure that the Education Department's subsequent pamphlets and duplicated documents would aim to take a stance that was distinct from the apparent SEFT position on any particular topic. SEFT publications of the 1960s were designed to be encouraging, enabling and inclusive, albeit much of the content tended to be drawn from secondary school experience. Produced in the first half of the decade, they combined a positive approach to popular culture with content determined by access to films or ideas from very particular sources. Thus *A Handbook for Screen Education* has a section on 'Basic Films' that combines historical material from the BFI Distribution Library, extracts chosen by the Education Department and sponsored films. No feature films from commercial distributors are included. Although the SEFT stance from its earliest days had been about stirring children's enthusiasm for films at the local cinema, constraints of cost and time seem to have determined that the classroom illustrations here could only come from a specialist and limited repertoire. Availability it seems precluded the reality of the courses that it was promoting from matching the ambition of the Introduction.

The purpose of the course is not to lead children away from films and television in the hope that they will embrace instead the classical cultures of the theatre and literature. No teacher of screen education despises the media of film and television or the concept of a popular culture. Film is the popular art form of the twentieth

century and, while television is a multifarious channel of communication, the development of a new art form within it is inevitable. Children enjoy films and television. By increasing their understanding of the media their enjoyment will be increased and enriched.⁴⁷

A Film Society Handbook, aimed at the after school-hours group, is more catholic in its recommendations, drawn mainly from the commercial 16 mm film libraries. Until the widespread use of VHS video tape recorders in the 1980s, school film societies were popular with children, given that there was a lengthy five-year gap between a film's exhibition in the cinema and its subsequent screening on television.⁴⁸

For, in general, the aim of the society will be the same - to enrich young people's experience by showing them, in a congenial atmosphere, examples of the best that the cinema has to offer. Enjoyment should be the keynote of this experience and films should be chosen, initially at least, which have a popular appeal for the audience for which you cater.⁴⁹

SEFT's film-making publications had much in common with the weeklies of the period: *Amateur Cine World* and *Amateur Movie Maker*, being full of tips and encouragement. As *Young Film Makers* states '...it is not the job of this booklet to argue the case for film-making by young people. Its purpose is essentially practical.'⁵⁰ The assumption was that anyone writing to SEFT for advice on making films with children was already persuaded of the value of the enterprise. It was simply a question of how.

In the section of the 1963 Report headed 'Services' Whannel raises a different issue

The main concern here is, of course, film materials. The Institute, through its Distribution Library, offers a number of extracts of feature films and some special teaching films. This is perhaps the weakest aspect of the provision the Institute makes the teachers and lecturers. The total number of extracts available is still relatively small and the additions have not kept pace with the growth of work. Further, the collection is unbalanced: a great many Ealing comedies, but nothing from contemporary British films; a good collection of silent classics, but virtually nothing illustrating the Western, the Musical or the modern European cinema.⁵¹

Whannel, Reed and the then BFI Director James Quinn had a very particular audience in mind when this document was being prepared. They were approaching the Ministry of Education in the hope that it might provide an additional source of funding, specifically for the Education Department. In the event the timing of their approach was serendipitous. A significant change was about to take place - one which was to affect both BFI Education and SEFT. This was the switch in the funding of the BFI from the Treasury to the

Department of Education and Science which followed the election of a Labour Government in 1964 and the appointment of Jennie Lee as Minister for the Arts. Reed, first as Secretary and then as Director, had been determinedly trying to achieve this switch at least for the Education Department before the change of government, as the internal correspondence of the then Ministry of Education reveals.⁵²

SEFT had its own funding concerns. From 1960-1963 it received £150 annually from the BFI as a grant-in-aid body. This was increased to £500 annually from 1964-1967.⁵³ It was a tiny fraction of the funding of the Education Department and an amount which the Society felt to be inadequate, given the scale of its publications. Indeed, this author recollects that SEFT had been in direct correspondence with Ministry officials at this time about its own funding issues. Unfortunately, none of this SEFT correspondence survives, but its basic argument was to draw attention to the size of its membership in schools and to the frequency and regularity of SEFT's publications and to contrast these with the rather spasmodic appearance of BFI printed materials. There is however, archive evidence that the relative reach of each organisation was acknowledged at senior civil servant level.

Material in the National Archives from Summer 1963 provides an enlightening snapshot of the situation current at the time when the BFI was seeking funding from the Ministry of Education specifically for its Education Department.⁵⁴ This funding would be supplementary to the annual Treasury grant it already received to cover all BFI activities and from which only eight per cent went to the Education Department. The tone of the civil servants' communications would indicate that the BFI got a relatively sympathetic hearing, probably because its approaches were taking place in the immediate post-Newsom publication environment. Reed had submitted evidence to the Newsom Committee⁵⁵ and no doubt he then timed the BFI's approach to the Ministry with the impending publication of the Report in mind.

We discussed the memorandum with the Inspectorate who thought that the Institute, and its associated body The Society for Education in Film and Television, were providing a worth-while service and that in view of the small resources at their disposal they had so far been very successful.⁵⁶

The BFI wanted more than money. It wanted recognition of the value of its work from the Ministry and felt that this would follow the funding. However while the Ministry could

accept the case for giving BFI money, it dithered over how more formal contact might be set up.

We have also agreed that we would institute formal contacts with the Institute although we have not yet decided whether an official or an inspector would be most appropriate.⁵⁷

A revealing if ambivalent endorsement of SEFT's work is to be found as the BFI request proceeds up the senior civil servant hierarchy and the case for the desired amount (£7,500) is analysed.

The Education Department could double its effective strength for £7,000; and the remaining £500 would be passed on to the Society for Education in Film and Television, which assumes the main burden of the work in schools, and, being a largely voluntary body, is also a good bargain.⁵⁸

It would seem from this evidence that SEFT's own attempt at direct contact with the Ministry had backfired. The civil servants had accepted that the Society was important in fostering the work in schools but since it was already operating so effectively on voluntary effort, they saw no reason for SEFT to get more money either from the BFI or directly from the Ministry, this latter option having been somewhat implausibly floated by SEFT.

With the change from Ministry to Department, SEFT tried again with the same arguments and this time succeeded in meeting with officials from the DES in 1965, though with no greater luck. The encounter was reported to members as positively as possible.

A meeting of the Officers with the Department of Education and Science was especially satisfying. The work of the Society was already well known and the Department was most anxious that the Society's contribution to film work in schools should continue through both membership and publications. Although there can be no direct financing of a professional organisation such as SEFT by the Department the Officers were assured of the Department's desire for the maintenance of a strong Society and of their readiness to give whatever further help they could.⁵⁹

The Committee, aware of the continuing contact of the BFI with the new DES as its key funder, clearly felt that it must continue to signal its own presence and its contribution to the same area of educational development.

In the event the Education Department had got the funding from the Ministry to support its 1964/65 budget which included the additional posts of Teacher Adviser and Editor of Materials, to which Jim Kitses and Alan Lovell were appointed.⁶⁰ The additional staffing

of the Education Department inevitably meant that Whannel's regular involvement of/dependence on SEFT Committee members diminished. In the 1950s, successive Film Appreciation Officers had drawn on the services of SEFT to lecture, to advise and address conferences. The further additional funding achieved by the BFI as the DES replaced the Ministry meant that Whannel was able to continue to strengthen the staffing establishment of his department throughout the 1960s. His strategy was in the spirit of his 1963 Report. He aimed to build up the intellectual strength of the Department by recruiting those who – whatever their paid role might be – would be committed to their own research and writing, as if in a university environment.

A further and significant addition to this 'academy-in-waiting' within the Education Department was Peter Wollen who would have been known to Whannel through their mutual involvement with *New Left Review* where Wollen reviewed films under the pseudonym of Lee Russell and Whannel sat on the Editorial Board. When Peter Harcourt left the BFI Wollen replaced him in having responsibility for publications, while Harcourt's administrative duties as Assistant Education Officer passed to Jim Kitses.⁶¹ Wollen's spell with the BFI was relatively brief but in that period he became involved in the more ambitious publishing project shared with *Sight and Sound* of the Cinema One books that were published by Secker & Warburg and Thames & Hudson. These books initially concentrated on making available, primarily but not exclusively, approaches to authorship and subsequently to genre studies.⁶²

First with Alan Lovell in post as Film Materials Officer and then with his successor Colin McArthur more money became available. More extracts were selected to fill some of the gaps that Whannel had identified in the 1963 Report. The collection eventually became sufficiently extensive to form the basis of *The Cinema Book*.⁶³ Access to extracts was hierarchical. Those extracts in the BFI Distribution Library were generally available for hire. Such were the constraints set by distributors over extract availability that there were certain extracts not in the Distribution Library but which were available 'for a strictly educational use and can only be borrowed [from the Central Booking Agency] by teachers and lecturers operating a planned course as part of their formal teaching'.⁶⁴ The most exclusive use was reserved for the extracts in the Department's Lecture Cupboard 'available only to panel lecturers fulfilling Institute engagements'.⁶⁵

When new extracts became available, they were generally welcomed by teachers. The short 10-15 minute extract was usable within the restricted timescale of the lecture or lesson where the feature film was not. Compared to the hire cost of a feature, the extract was a better bet for film teaching budgets. Only with hindsight have questions arisen as to the long-term influence of this selection process. It could be argued that very individual preferences for a certain type of film and the regular deployment of well established relationships with particular distributors inadvertently shaped what was a very particular approach to the teaching of film, so that an unchallenged dominance of American cinema came to underpin courses on film until the advent of VHS and DVD gave flexibility to the classroom practitioner for the first time who might now use material that had previously been publicly broadcast.⁶⁶

As the Education Department became established with more staff and its own base at 70 Old Compton Street, teachers and lecturers had much easier access to advice. The BFI could now offer a service that neither SEFT nor the old Film Appreciation Department had been able to offer: the opportunity for practitioners to have face-to-face encounters with the advisory staff. From these meetings, a benefit to the Education Department soon became apparent. The number of teachers/lecturers on its list of contacts began to rival SEFT's membership. The department was also in a position to ask those whose classroom practice seemed interesting or relevant to write up their experiences, for which they would then be paid. These accounts were typed up, duplicated and made available free on request.

The scale of this intervention may be assessed by comparing the documents produced in the first and second halves of the 1960s. Of the twenty four 'Syllabuses and Descriptive Accounts' listed as available in 1973, sixteen had first appeared between 1966 and 1969.⁶⁷ Only one document dating from before 1966 survived which was 'Newsom on Film', a selection of relevant paragraphs from the Report, reprinted without comment. There had been earlier documents produced in the first half of the 1960s, but most of these originated from work at Kingsway College by Kitses and Ann Mercer which had already been rewritten as *Talking About the Cinema* (see below).

It is clear that Whannel intended that the publications for teachers to come from his Education Department should be more substantial than previous BFI pamphlets, and that

they should also demonstrate greater coherence as a series.. A certain caution in relation to what might have been considered as SEFT territory is detectable: consequently the attention to work in schools is somewhat limited. The first publication *Film Teaching* (1964) concentrates on courses for adults: in a college of science and technology, a teacher training college, local authority adult education classes and university extra-mural classes.⁶⁸ *Talking About the Cinema* (1966) describes work in a further education college.⁶⁹ The companion piece *Talking about Television*, which does describe work in schools, is however written by former SEFT Chairman, Tony Higgins.⁷⁰

The Introduction to *Film Teaching* makes it clear that the Editors, Whannel and Harcourt, are expecting an uphill struggle to establish film as an area for serious study.

Although some progress has been made in film study with young people, it is still rare to meet anyone who, while still at school, has been given any training or guidance, or has even been made to feel that a film could offer a worthwhile experience. In England, even in relatively sophisticated circles, we still make a sharp distinction between art and entertainment, with the cinema falling decisively in the latter category, where - it is believed - the normal standards of judgment do not apply.⁷¹

They seek to demonstrate that the process in which they are engaged has been a lengthy one with attempts to enhance the status of the cinema in Britain having originated in the 1920s. But their approach - and the choice of their contributors - is still a cautious one. The notion of authorship is offered as the prevalent method of analysis, though here it is clear that there are limits.

It is interesting that the younger writers grouped around *Movie* magazine are preoccupied with similar problems and, despite their attempt to treat art as high culture and to give many minor films a weight of psychological meaning we feel they cannot bear, their contributions... have helped to illuminate some of the issues involved.⁷²

Stuart Hall's account of his work within Liberal Studies and of the three different courses he offers becomes most interesting in its concluding paragraphs. Here he discusses one course that examines the relationship between the cinema and popular culture, concentrating on the output from Hollywood.

The aim of the course, then, is to break the false connection between quality and taste, and to develop some critical language by means of which the qualities of the cinema as a *popular* art can be discriminated from the great welter of rubbish.⁷³

Roy Knight writes of the developments at Bede College, Durham where Film and Television Study had just become available to be taken as a Main Course. This is the most substantial chapter in the book and the one that at the time had the potential to be most influential, since the training colleges were seen (and in some cases such as Eastbourne saw themselves) as the places where screen education developments would most likely take place following the increase in length of the teacher training period.⁷⁴

Albert Hunt, an Area Tutor Organiser under Shropshire's unique system for organising adult education had 'the widest possible terms of reference'.⁷⁵ He identifies his starting point as answering the question 'What sort of films are likely to arouse interest and start people talking?' His strategy is one of proceeding by stealth in that he would move from *Twelve Angry Men*, which would stimulate discussion much of it peripheral to film study, and seek eventually to screen *Los Olvidados* where that film's imagery would prevent students simply settling for a discussion of social issues. He has to address a wide brief in his work and when speaking to trades unionists deploys the more obvious issues raised by *I'm All Right Jack* and *The Angry Silence*.

Although Alan Lovell begins his chapter on Extra-Mural work by making a reference to such extension work in Leeds, Oxford, Keele and Cambridge, what he describes is the London University Course which had been run since the 1950s by the British Film Institute on its own premises. This access to the BFI facilities, Lovell acknowledges, gives the course great advantages, particularly in facilitating the screening of films under cinema conditions. Of particular historical interest is his inclusion of the detailed syllabuses of the three-year course then current.⁷⁶

Each of these contributors was in his own unique situation. The readers would have found evidence of what was achievable in different sectors, even if there was little scope for adapting wholesale into the readers' situations the courses as described. One observation that is inescapable is how all courses depend on the relatively small number of extracts available in the period up to 1964 and how therefore the same extract is demonstrated as being used differently in a range of teaching situations.

Talking about Television was seen as following the model set by *Film Teaching* in that it was an account of his work by a practising teacher. Tony Higgins had been a key figure in

the Society of Film Teachers in promoting the extension of its remit to include television. Here he seeks to context, within the prevailing attitudes of the time, his approach to television with less able secondary school students. Different types of transmitted programmes form the basis of classroom discussion, albeit with the problem of very limited availability of material for classroom use. Its concluding chapter takes a fundamentally different approach: thematic.

Parents and children, youth, age, social class, race, politicians, war, policemen, crime, violence, health and disease, housing, fashion, have all entered into lessons held over a period of a few months. Other themes such as work and leisure, falling in love, marriage, animals, scientists, lawyers, teachers etc do not appear in the discussions recorded here, but they are frequently discussed in the television lesson.⁷⁷

This thematic approach was gaining in importance in film study also. The companion publication *Talking about the Cinema* describes work at Kingsway a London further education college. Here teaching is organised thematically.

It is primarily because of this entertainment bias that we have found the theme to be an important organising principle in our teaching. In taking 'Young People', or 'Personal Relationships', or 'War', and bringing in film materials that treat the subject differently, we have wanted to establish that films do have a connection with reality. We have seen this as a first priority in our courses: at the beginning we have planned our lessons so that students are encouraged to find links between the films they see and the life they experience outside.⁷⁸

Further acknowledgement of the encroachment of the use of themes is to be found in Kitses's supplement *Film and General Studies*, published at the same time. The aims of this course are

- (a) to encourage growth, discrimination and expression through the understanding and widening of experience.
- (b) to help students to understand their society, its organisations and pressures, and to help them relate themselves to groups and communities within that society.⁷⁹

The authors Kitses and Mercer are opposed to the introduction of examinations into their courses. In this opposition they are echoing the attitude of Harcourt.⁸⁰ The debate about the role of examinations was to become central to SEFT's arguments in the 1980s.

The final 1966 pamphlet *Film Making in Schools and Colleges* (which grew out of an Education Department conference in 1965) is organised by education sector to include work in Infant, Junior and Secondary schools, but these reports written by the supervising

teachers are somewhat overshadowed by the description of work in the Hornsey College of Art Teaching Training Department.

A word about Hornsey and the place it occupies in this volume. Under the quite exceptional sponsorship of the principal, Mr H. H. Shelton, film-making plays many roles at Hornsey College of Art, in graphic design, general studies and Teacher Training. We decided it would be a needless falsification of Hornsey's multifarious activities to restrict the length of Douglas Lowndes's contribution in an arbitrary way, and so he has taken a lion's share of the book.⁸¹

The reality here was that Douglas Lowndes's approach, using simple cameras and a much higher ratio of equipment to children, challenged the group-made film approach which had been promoted both by SEFT and the BFI under Reed. Whannel's colleague, Peter Harcourt, felt it important to publicise this alternative method for organising practical work.⁸² Lowndes was also provided with further conference opportunities for promoting his work by the British Film Institute.⁸³ A degree of tension was created around this with some SEFT committee members, who felt that interesting as Lowndes's work was there were few schools at that stage which would be able to equip their students to Hornsey standards. It was unrealistic for BFI to promote his approach as a generally usable model since this might well discourage some teachers from venturing into practical work.

Harcourt had already antagonised some in SEFT with his 1964 piece in *Screen Education* 26, a special number devoted to Higher Education.⁸⁴ Harcourt sets out to review the screen education world at the point when *Film Teaching* was published and in so doing is dismissive of the work being done in schools. Whilst few would quarrel with his opening statement, 'Screen education began in schools and youth clubs', his second sentence, 'it also began defensively' was provocative.⁸⁵ When he continues, 'it was generally felt that the greatest need for screen education was amongst the dull', he may have been rather crudely reflecting a reality - in that most of the timetabled work was in the secondary modern school - but the SEFT pioneers bridled at his language. They totally disputed his unqualified claim that 'the basic impulse behind the initial work done in this field sprang from the desire among educationists to protect young people from the possibly corrupting influences of the cinema and then of television'.⁸⁶

Matters were not improved when Harcourt compared the early film teachers unfavourably with those in the Film Society movement. 'Here were no defensive attitudes in relation to the screen: rather there was a real enthusiasm for the cinema', while he sees the film

educationists as 'frequently displaying a limited enthusiasm for a great many films, preferring safe and discussable examples like *The Red Badge of Courage* or *High Noon*, often showing little concern or even awareness of how undistinguished, cinematically, such films often are'.⁸⁷ The reaction of one SEFT pioneer, Paul Alexander, was to write for *Screen Education* his own version of the history of SEFT which was published in five episodes throughout the 1965 issues of the Journal.⁸⁸

Harcourt was using his article to trail what the Education Department saw as its priorities, which he divided into *Fields of Direct Action* and *Services and Materials*. The direct action was to concentrate on the teacher training colleges. In arguing why this approach was the best strategy he takes another swipe at SEFT.

Teachers already in the schools tend to be burdened with their immediate challenges, if not actually set in their ways. Also, we have felt that teachers already in the field who become interested in this work can most profitably be instructed and put in touch with one another through SEFT's information services, publications and summer school, as well as by similar services offered by ourselves. Teaching conditions often impede fresh experiment: whereas in the Training Colleges, when the students are still open to new educational practices, we feel it is easier for them to grapple with the full educational challenge of talking about the screen.⁸⁹

Shifting attitudes to film-making by young people may also be detected in the evolution of the event initially known as the Children's Film Awards. It had begun as a competition organised in the 1950s by the *News Chronicle*. With the demise of that newspaper the sponsorship of the event was taken over by the National Union of Teachers with the detailed organisation being provided first by BFI alone and then by both BFI and SEFT. The first NUT sponsored event was in spring 1961 when it was styled the National Children's Film Awards, with a subheading of 'Film Making - an approach to appreciation'.⁹⁰ The competition entry form made strong links between the mood of the major NUT conference of the previous autumn and the particular value of film-making that some had claimed in that connection.

Few challenges are more serious than that of teaching children to withstand the pressure of the media of mass communication, to discriminate between the good, the bad and the indifferent in the mass of material they see, read and listen to in daily life.

By learning to make their own films under the guidance of their teacher, children begin to gain a real insight into the art of the film and their critical faculties are tremendously stimulated.⁹¹

There was, in the early years, a routine to the arrangements for the competition and the judges usually included representatives from both BFI and SEFT. Frequently a winning entry would come from Cornwell School where SEFT activist Don Waters taught.⁹² The changing attitude toward film-making and practical work that had been instituted by Harcourt was sustained by Jim Kitses, his successor as Assistant Education Officer who organised the event in 1967, now styled as the Young Film Makers Competition. Responding to a review in *The Teacher*⁹³ that had been critical of the judging of the films submitted to the event, Kitses used the opportunity to suggest that some changes in the nature of the event would be appropriate.

The competition in fact began in the days of those polished little story films, traditional group made efforts. But today film-making is penetrating the curriculum in all sorts of ways, ranging from the rough little animated film exercises of an art class, to a Newsom experiment in English, history or geography, to the semi-professional work done in art colleges.⁹⁴

Kites ends by asking 'Is a competition with its roots in the story film idea an anachronism?'

This shift by the BFI was a significant one. In *Film Study Materials*,⁹⁵ a printed pamphlet issued in 1962, the first section (which takes up three of the pamphlet's 16 pages) is headed 'Films Made by Children'. Copies of thirty nine school made films were then available for hire from the BFI. This section, which occupies the same number of pages as the 'Study Extracts: Sound Films' that were also available, is introduced thus:

In recent years, due largely to the efforts of the Society for Education in Film and Television, a number of 16 mm silent short story films have been made by children in school as part of a course in film appreciation. Although in many cases their technique is primitive and content naïve, these films have freshness and charm and have been found particularly valuable both to film teachers and lecturers on film appreciation. By arrangement with the Society, the British Film Institute is making available the films listed below.⁹⁶

BFI, concerned that the range and quality of entries was falling, argued the event should become biennial. Consequently the next event was in 1969 when the name had changed again. It was now 'Young Screen - a Festival and Exhibition of Film Making by Children and Young People'. The following explanation accompanied the entry form:

Recognising the diversity and educational value of so much that is going on the National Union of Teachers seeks to survey and draw greater attention to this work.

We have therefore moved away from the event of a competition with national awards, our past formula which may have placed undue emphasis on the story film, and have embraced the idea of an exhibition. The emphasis is therefore no longer on judging the best film but on selecting and spotlighting representatives of the different approaches and varied uses to which film is lending itself within general education.⁹⁷

Given the changed nature of the event and the need for exhibition space now for three days, 'Young Screen' was held at Hamilton House, the NUT headquarters. The organisation was undertaken by the Teacher Adviser/Secretary of SEFT. Two years later and invitations to 'Young Screen 1971' showed a further distinct shift in the attitude of the three organising bodies

In our viewing of the submitted material we have found two recurrent polarities: between the functional use of film (eg to record a school activity) and the expressive use (eg an adolescent's projection of his persecution fantasies); and between teacher centred films with their emphasis on formal and social order and the altogether more anarchic child-centred films.⁹⁸

An alternative biennial event had also become available. In 1966 SEFT was approached by the London Co-operative Society who wished to sponsor a film-making event in the metropolitan area.⁹⁹ The Co-op ethos ensured that a non-competitive celebration of children's practical work was what the L C S was seeking to promote, while the biennial nature of the NUT Festival meant that a ready-made alternative year slot existed to be filled.

In mid 1966 SEFT was approached by Whannel with a proposal for a joint appointment of Teacher Adviser BFI/Secretary SEFT. Such a joint appointment was not unique. The BFI had already established a joint post with the Federation of Film Societies. But it was significant for SEFT, where the voluntary structure had been under great pressure for some time as the demands made on the Society by the expanding numbers of film teachers increased. It seems that the notion for the joint appointment was put forward initially by Whannel, then rapidly received Director Reed's approval. This author (who was Honorary Secretary of SEFT at the time of the negotiations) remembers the detailed agreement with the BFI, no copy of which survives. Perhaps significantly, when the proposal was put to the BFI Governors, the wording of a supporting note from Director Reed indicates that the Governors were encouraged to think that a new Teacher Adviser was to be appointed who would occasionally handle a few routine SEFT matters for a small honorarium.¹⁰⁰ This

was certainly not how the joint appointment was viewed by the Society. Nor was it how it operated in practice. By 1968 – after a year’s experience of the new post – the BFI was stating in print that SEFT had ‘a full-time General Secretary whose office is located within the Education Department of the British Film Institute’.¹⁰¹

Such had been the antipathy between some members of the Education Department and some Committee members that Whannel in putting his proposal to the Governors felt he had to acknowledge the rift there had been. As the Minutes record:

... while relations between the Institute and the Society had not in recent years been entirely satisfactory, it was felt that nevertheless the Society had been doing excellent work and had produced the very useful journal *Screen Education*, in addition to pamphlets, a Year Book and a list of 16mm film libraries, all of considerable value.¹⁰²

Then to make the case for the actual benefits of the new post to SEFT Whannel argued:

One advantage of this would be that the Society would be relieved of a good deal of the administrative commitments which had so far limited their creativity. Such an arrangement, although it involved the sacrifice by the Institute of a certain amount of the officer’s time, would, nevertheless, be of value to them insofar as it served to extend and improve the Society’s work, which was of real value to the Institute.¹⁰³

The minutes record, perhaps guardedly, that the ‘proposal was generally welcomed’.¹⁰⁴

The reality was that financially this was not a joint appointment. It would be wholly funded by BFI Education, which would house and provide facilities for SEFT. In practice it was a double appointment in that the Teacher Adviser/Secretary would have a full-time secretary working almost exclusively for him. Alex Richardson, who had been on the SEFT Committee since 1960, became the first holder of the joint post on 1 January 1967. With such provision replacing volunteer effort at the core of the Society, there was to be an inevitable shift in the way that SEFT operated. This will be explored in the next chapter.

Also working within the Education Department as a Teacher Adviser was Victor Perkins, one of the Editors of *Movie*. He and Richardson collaborated on aspects of the work. However, the influence of *Movie* on those teaching film at the time was probably a more direct one. In the numerous interviews conducted for this investigation, those who were teaching in the 1960s were very ready to acknowledge the influence that *Movie* had on them during the period 1962 to 1969 when, although its publication soon became both

irregular and infrequent, its reputation guaranteed a loyal and patient readership. But it seems that its influence was less one of inspiring teachers to write articles of *Movie* style textual analysis than to encourage the use of *Movie* methods and preferences in shaping the form and content of their own classroom performance. Not everyone was a *Movie* fan. Roy Knight's view was that

Movie is at pains to demonstrate that good films may be produced in many genres. It argues that the critic's task is to elucidate rather than to evaluate: yet I find in much of *Movie*'s writing not so much elucidation as description.¹⁰⁵

Knight rejected what he considered to be an uncommitted approach and continued to encourage his students to go further and risk a subjective judgment as to the value of the film. There are occasional articles in *Screen Education* where an individual film is described and analysed in greater detail, perhaps in the spirit of *Movie*, but evidence of its more direct influence was to be found in the London University Extra Mural classes where by 1968 Robin Wood had been recruited to teach 'The Director's Cinema' and in the BFI summer schools where *Movie* writers were guest lecturers for several years.¹⁰⁶

When SEFT was approached by BBC Schools Television producer Alan Bell for ideas about a Film Study programme for Sixth formers, Richardson passed the inquiry on to Perkins where the most direct *Movie* style intervention of all was consequently to be found in the resultant programme *Cinema*, screened weekly through the Autumn of 1968.¹⁰⁷ This series uniquely linked the programmes transmitted to schools to feature films that were scheduled as imminently to be screened at evenings and weekends on BBC TV. Its advertised ambition was to 'help to put the cinema as an art form on a level with literature as a subject for serious study in schools where it tends to be ignored'.¹⁰⁸

Shortly after taking up the BFI/SEFT joint appointment, Richardson's book *Screen Education for Schools* was printed by the publishing arm of the National Union of Teachers.¹⁰⁹ The announcement of his new role in the Society is used in the book's promotion. Its style can probably be best described as 'Tips for Teachers' in that the author never hesitates to speak authoritatively and personally from his own classroom experience. This book too is very clearly a product of its time when not only was the 'Director's Cinema' the dominant model but would-be film teachers were compelled to find a variety of ways of introducing film study into their schools. Significantly, therefore, the first chapter deals with the School Film Club, on the grounds that for most children this

was the closest experience they would have of film study while at school. Richardson had however previously taught at Cornwell School in East London, which almost uniquely at that time, had a well established screen education programme throughout the school curriculum.

Coming from the SEFT tradition, Richardson significantly labelled his practice 'screen education', rather than film teaching and consequently he feels he must offer an explanation as to his preference for using the term: because in studying film and television 'there are no clear aesthetic distinctions to be drawn between the two media'.¹¹⁰ Also deriving from his SEFT background, Richardson argues for group film making as an essential part of the screen education experience, and this takes up his third and final chapter. 'I know of nothing else which so swiftly and certainly transforms children's notions of screen art.'¹¹¹

It is this assertion of the value of the individual film as art that underpins Richardson's approach to screen education. In Chapter Two he sees as the two 'crucial advantages' of a timetabled screen education lesson for the teacher:

He can boldly and single-mindedly present films, which, because they are masterpieces, make children more open to new experiences in art.
He can ensure that all film and TV study is shot through with opportunities for associated creative work on the part of the children themselves.¹¹²

This very traditional film appreciation approach is further reinforced by two other approaches, which Richardson identifies but then decides specifically not to endorse. He labels them the *Quasi-sociological* and the *Therapeutic*. The former, which involves an investigation of the organisation of the media industries and of the pressures at work on the construction of various programmes, will he claims 'be disastrous' as a basis for classroom studies.¹¹³ He is more cautious about condemning the therapeutic approach outright, since he has to concede that it is not that different from a thematic approach, which he will subsequently go on to endorse, albeit in a rather restricted mode. But while it is not clear exactly what he is attacking, he cautions that 'Any one teacher (films or no) who chooses to plan a therapeutic course is certainly heading for some big disappointments.'¹¹⁴

It is however authorship that dominates his approach.

It is of the utmost importance that children come to understand, fully and naturally, that films and tv programmes are the work of individual people.¹¹⁵

This is an extraordinary statement in its assertion that authorship is a state about which a child will come to have a 'natural' understanding. Presumably this will happen only if the teacher chooses the appropriate films and television programmes for the course. Coupled with Richardson's rejection of any study of institutions, this is a very distinctive teaching method, which is subsequently further reinforced by his approach to thematic studies, where

Different films, sharing a different theme, reveal differences in treatment; they expose the idea of authorship, of a director choosing images, dialogue, music, effects and so on.¹¹⁶

So here all approaches, even thematic ones, are made to connect to authorship.

A thematic approach of a different kind became installed in the Education Department in 1967 when Jim Hillier was appointed as Film Research Officer for the Humanities Curriculum Project. This Nuffield funded project set out to produce a range of materials that could be used as evidence for themes such as War and Youth that were to be discussed in the secondary school classroom. Film extracts – from mainly feature films - were to be selected to provide 'evidence' additional to that originating in printed sources.¹¹⁷

In retrospect it is now clear that if the institution of the joint appointment was the most important development for SEFT in the 1960s, undoubtedly the second was the decision to publish *Screen* in place of both *Screen Education* and the *Yearbook*. The case for ceasing to publish the *Yearbook* was the easier to establish. It had already reached the ceiling in the income it could make from advertising and to maintain publication would require an increase in both the membership fee and the cover price. Whereas when *The Film Teacher's Handbook* first appeared there were few reference sources for film teachers, by 1969 the supply of books of both reference and criticism was much greater. The niche which the *Yearbook* had filled was closing and its Editor Roger Mains accepted the reality of the situation.¹¹⁸

The case for ending *Screen Education* was an altogether more difficult one. Because it occupied a unique position in relation to film study, those wishing to write about their

work had only *Screen Education* in which to place their articles. Increasingly US writers, often post-graduate students of Professor Tony Hodgkinson, took up a greater share of the pages. Nevertheless it did accommodate the early writings of authors who would become significant players in the development of film teaching: Charles Barr, Jim Cook, Kevin Gough-Yates, Jim Hillier, Colin McArthur, Nicholas Tucker, Robin Wood. Also occasionally featured were writers well-established in other publications: Alan Lovell, Victor Perkins, Paddy Whannel, Peter Wollen.

But it remained essentially separate from SEFT and as the composition of the Committee evolved, questions began to be asked. The fundamental one was about editorship, since whoever controlled *Screen Education* spent the biggest part of the Society's budget and it was by the content of its journal that the Society would inevitably be judged. With new members on the SEFT committee, some recruited by Richardson in his role as Secretary from January 1967, scrutiny of *Screen Education* increased. In 1968 matters came to a head when this author and Kevin Gough-Yates argued the case for a new journal and the motion for change was won by a single vote of the Committee.¹¹⁹

CHAPTER THREE 1968-71

THE UNIVERSITY ON OLD COMPTON STREET

The notion has been put about recently that we (the Society and the Department) have neglected services to the practising teacher... Whatever the source I can tell you nothing has aroused greater anger among my colleagues. If we are to be remembered by anything I think it should be by the quality of the services we provided. Our ideal was never to turn anyone away without giving every assistance possible.

Paddy Whannel, 1971

*With increased funding both BFI Education and SEFT accept that they must now find ways of developing the work, not simply do more of the same. For the Education Department this entails finding ways of deputising for the non-existence of university departments of film in the UK. For SEFT it means concentrating the Society's resources on a new journal **Screen** which will attempt to be less descriptive and more analytical than its predecessor **Screen Education**. Providing the space for would-be academics to practise does not please BFI Governors. They all but demolish the Education Department while almost inadvertently offering SEFT the default franchise for theorising cinema.*

What had appeared in early 1968 to be the beginnings of a smooth transition to a more professionally organised SEFT with a new journal **Screen**, working collaboratively with a substantial BFI Education Department proved to be mistaken. Within three years a series of events meant that an independent (though part BFI funded) SEFT would be at a distance from a demoralised and reduced department re-branded as the Educational Advisory Service.

When SEFT took the decision to cease publication of **Screen Education** and the **Screen Education Yearbook**, its Secretary Alex Richardson was not at the meeting. He had been absent ill from the spring of 1968 and Terry Bolas had taken on the role of Acting Secretary by the time of the AGM in May.¹ Richardson never returned to work for SEFT and finally was replaced officially on 1 January 1969 by Bolas who then became Teacher Adviser BFI/Secretary SEFT.

The long period without a professional officer undoubtedly slowed the momentum of change for SEFT. On a day-to-day basis there was no immediate crisis in that Richardson's secretary, Anna Mathon, continued in post and dealt with routine written enquiries and phone calls. She had two sources of support: the SEFT Committee members

and - more immediately to hand - members of the BFI Education Department within whose offices at 70 Old Compton Street the SEFT Office was then located. Separated from the main BFI base at 81 Dean Street, the Education Department was self-contained with projection and viewing table facilities on site. Thus while the Society benefited from the support that Whannel and his staff offered at this stage, inevitably the clear distinction between the BFI and SEFT as separate organisations became blurred while the Committee waited in the expectation that Richardson would eventually return to work.

SEFT had started the 1960s proposing a wide range of projects that would support its membership. By 1970 with its commitment to *Screen* the Society had to concentrate its energies and modify its activities. The Viewing Panels, where a small group of teachers had once produced reports on films for use by others, had been replaced. In both Leeds and London feature film viewing sessions were held regularly which teachers could attend and decide for themselves on the potential usefulness of the films. The summer schools, still under aegis of the Educational Development Association, had shifted their base to Barry College of Education in Wales which became their regular venue. They were led by SEFT Committee member Kevin Gough-Yates from Hornsey College of Art who facilitated the loan of some of that college's equipment for instruction in the practical sessions.

A determined effort led by Jim Cook was made to develop SEFT activities in the regions. These would only ever be pump-priming ventures and the Society accepted that its success rate would depend on the energy of individual SEFT members in regional centres. Conferences became the responsibility of David Lusted.² In 1969 two recently appointed Education Department recruits were pitted against each other to demonstrate how the same extract material might be used in their respective educational situations. Jim Hillier demonstrated the use of film to provide 'evidence' of social issues within the Humanities Curriculum Project. Colin McArthur spoke on interpreting the film as a text within the scope of authorship or genre study.³ In 1970 the conference was entitled 'The Theory of Film Teaching' where individuals outlined the theory behind their individual classroom practice.⁴

One small scale SEFT/ILEA Project in 1970 became the precursor of a much bigger BFI/ILEA Project later in the decade. Bolas negotiated with Leslie Ryder for the ILEA to

fund a one term film teaching experiment about genres in one of the Education Authority's divisions. Students from the seven participating schools came together to view feature films centrally. Follow-up by their teachers in individual schools was supported by material specially prepared for the project. Most students were in their fourth (and at that time final year) of secondary education.⁵ The later BFI project would be for Sixth Formers.

The task of editing *Screen* was to be shared between Kevin Gough-Yates and Terry Bolas, both being volunteers from the SEFT Committee. Plans for the new journal were made during the latter part of 1968. Whannel was supportive of these changes and there was informal agreement between him and the new editors that appropriate contributions from his department would be welcome in *Screen*.⁶ It was also the case that Whannel indicated that he would like to have a more influential role in that there should be some form of editorial board. The prospective editors resisted this, wanting to establish a distinct SEFT identity. Simultaneously however Whannel was coming under pressure from BFI Governors who were becoming suspicious of the Education Department's emphases.

The two BFI departments that had benefited most from the Institute's changed funding arrangements were the Education Department and the arm of the Distribution Department that was setting up Regional Film Theatres. It was the latter that had by far the greater share of new money and that was expanding rapidly but haphazardly.⁷ However it was Education that became a target, probably because Whannel had clear plans and priorities and was ready to declare these. It was perhaps inevitable that Governors would challenge the educational proposals because they were detailed and demanded supportive decision-making while there was little at stake in giving a blanket welcome to the general reports that the Regional Film Theatres were spreading the BFI's presence nationally. It is unclear what Reed's stance was at this point, though events were to prove that he would become increasingly hostile to the Department that he had so assiduously developed over two decades.

Whannel submitted his detailed paper to BFI Governors in November 1968.⁸ It is a coherent and well argued paper but there is one statement which, though accurate, now stands out to the reader as a hostage to fortune. He states that 'the department operates like a University Department'⁹. Although this statement is clearly contexted in such a way as to

demonstrate its relevance and precision, its apparent ambition might suggest to a governing body dominated by representatives of the film industry that Whannel was taking the BFI into new territory where other agencies might legitimately want to become involved in oversight of the Institute. For Reed, whose original Film Appreciation Department had focused so specifically on schools, this must have signalled an impending radical shift in priorities. Perhaps his first organisational response to the paper was in early 1969 to bring the Education Department (plus SEFT) out of its familiar Old Compton Street establishment into the main BFI premises at 81 Dean Street.

Whannel's hand-picked staff of fifteen included Peter Wollen, responsible for publications. Wollen was the staff member most active in seeking to promote an academic atmosphere. Starting in 1967 he organised a regular series of BFI Education Department seminars held originally in Old Compton Street but later in Dean Street. Attendance at these seminars was by invitation only. Most presentations were given by current or former Department staff but among the outsiders invited were Tom Nairn and Sam Rohdie, then a lecturer in Film at the Sheffield Polytechnic, who led two seminars on 'Totems and Movies' and 'Style, Rhetoric and Genre'.¹⁰

Wollen announced the introduction of these seminars in *Screen Education* where readers were told that the Education Department had 'decided to start an experimental series of film seminars bringing together film critics, film teachers and university teachers and researchers in the established disciplines'.¹¹ As a taster, the first of these seminars by Alan Lovell on the Western was printed in *Screen Education*.¹² Subsequent seminar papers were however to be 'published in bulletin form by the BFI Education Department'.¹³ It is clear that Wollen saw his task as initiating a radically new approach to film study. It is also clear that his focus is specifically film and not any other visual medium. Indicative of his attitude at this point is his assumption that he is entering new territory and may therefore start from scratch. Subsequently members of the 1970s *Screen* Editorial Board were also to consider themselves as prime movers. Wollen begins

The cinema is a new force, a new mode of communication, a new artform. To think, write or speak about the cinema in some sense necessitates a break with old habits of thought and traditional academic approaches and attitudes.

Later he asserts

Our general aim was to see what kind of interconnections could be made between the tradition of film criticism, of analysis of individual films and directors, and work being done in mass media sociology, linguistics and semiology etc.¹⁴

Whether BFI Governors read these comments is doubtful, but the article is indicative of an élitist attitude. Since at that point *Screen Education* was the only journal that circulated to the great majority of potential readers who might have wished to have sight of the seminar papers, it is extraordinary that no arrangement was sought with SEFT as to the regular publication of at least some of the papers. At a subsequent seminar Alan Lovell delivered a paper 'The Aims of Film Education' which - apart from its centrality to the BFI/SEFT enterprise - acknowledges the existence of *Screen Education* in a positive light, yet this paper was made available only as a duplicated document from the BFI.¹⁵

For the next two decades, a recurrent feature of the debates around most aspects of media education was to be the split between on the one hand those who saw themselves as the originators of theoretical developments and on the other the classroom practitioners who found that they had the task of putting theory to the test. It probably had its origins in the ring-fencing of these and subsequent seminars. But Wollen was pressuring Whannel more specifically on ways in which the department might engage with research. In a memo headed 'Film Research' in August 1968 he stresses three demands to be made by the Department.

1. Viewing facilities must be made more easily accessible.
2. We should continue to press for Institute research grants.
3. We should try to set up new ways of encouraging a constant two-way traffic between the critic and theorist, working in comparative depth and often in isolation, and the teacher in the school or college.¹⁶

Wollen follows this up a few days later under the heading 'Research Scholarships' suggesting two possible models:

1. University postgraduates completing a thesis involving the cinema.
2. Teachers seconded to do research.

For the first proposal he envisages a link with the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies; for the second he is much less clear where the secondment might be located, which could suggest that perhaps he had in mind that the Department itself might have been a possibility.¹⁷ When Whannel produced his report to Governors he proposed

the BFI fund Research Fellowships 'which could be operated jointly by the Institute and a University Department'¹⁸.

When Whannel's paper was presented to Governors, it was accompanied by two other papers, one from Martyn Howells, the BFI Regional Education Officer who operated within the Distribution Division, and the other from the British Universities' Film Council, which was another BFI grant-in-aid body. Reed said that 'the papers before the meeting represented the three main aspects of the Institute's educational policy'.¹⁹ SEFT got only the briefest mention in the Whannel paper whereas it might well have merited more substantial recognition. It seems reasonable to infer that since SEFT had been without a professional officer for most of 1968, neither Whannel nor Reed (who only days before had agreed to Bolas replacing Richardson in the post) would have thought it politic to draw attention to the Society at this point

Whannel came under attack from Governors Helen Forman and Edgar Anstey. His paper had argued for his Department's central role in developing a film culture and he had used the scale and scope represented by a literary culture as an analogy for what might be achievable. Forman argued that in the longer term it was film's historical importance that would prove more enduring while Anstey wanted to extend the Department's remit and for it to have a much broader and less aesthetic approach to film. The Governors' minutes provide only the sketchiest account of the debate but it seems clear that although Whannel's arguments were detailed, his opponents refused to engage with the detail. They seem to have registered the carefully argued case as evidence of plotting already at an advanced stage. Paul Adorian however did challenge the proposals specifically - for wanting engagement at university level. He argued that the Department should concentrate on work in schools. Roy Shaw pointed out that the Department could only extend its remit at the expense of activities that it was currently doing.²⁰ Discussion of the item concluded ominously when on the proposition of the Chairman it was agreed

- (i) that an early opportunity be provided of debating further the policy issues raised by Mr Whannel's paper, as these could not be determined in respect of the Education Department alone;
- (ii) that every endeavour should meanwhile be made to build up the educational services of the Institute's own Theatres in the Regions;
- (iii) that subject to the further policy discussion proposed in (i) the Institute should continue to interest itself in the wider uses of film as well as in the film as art.²¹

The uninformed reader might have noted with curiosity the fact that when the BFI Governors had held their meeting in November 1968 and mounted opposition to Whannel's pleas for university involvement in film education, there was at the meeting a representative of the British Universities Film Council. The BUFC like SEFT was a grant in aid body of the BFI and like SEFT it had an officer post funded by BFI. Nowhere in the minutes is it suggested that Whannel's desire for university links might be encroaching on BUFC territory and that there was already a body in place to do the work that he proposed. They did not, simply because the BUFC's priorities were not those of developing film education.

Later when celebrating 25 years of existence in 1973 the BUFC in its journal *University Vision* made clear what it considered it had achieved. It had

...sought to draw our attention to the fact that film and other forms of audio-visual materials can play an important and often indispensable role in university level teaching and research, and that the study of film, and latterly of television, is a worthwhile and legitimate pursuit in universities. That this fact is today generally accepted without question is due in very large measure to the diligence and enthusiasm of the many individuals and organisations who have devoted much time, energy and money to the support of the Council.²²

In the same issue was printed an obituary notice for an Ernest Lindgren, Curator of the National Film Archive, who had been the principal supporter of the BUFC within the BFI. In this it is made clear that Lindgren had promoted a wider university involvement with film than the BUFC had then thought it appropriate to recognise.²³

In October 1968, the month before the BFI Governors met to consider Whannel's paper *University Vision* had published an article by Stuart Hall 'The Impact of Film on the University'. He summarises the situation.

The interest in film in universities seems to be confined - with some notable exceptions - to its technical uses for the purposes of instruction, the reproduction and transmission of information by this new channel.

But anything to match the serious, intense, extended, disciplined study of the cinematic image, of serious film, of the work over years of important directors, of national cinemas styles or of cinematic genres which is the bread and butter of serious intellectual work on the cinema hasn't much of a place.²⁴

Subsequently *University Vision* would print an article relevant to film education but which would unintentionally serve to demonstrate the *Vision's* marginal understanding of

developments. L-A Bawden writing from the perspective of the Slade Film Department uses a report in *Screen* as the starting point for her account of 'Film Studies in the University'.²⁵ The existence of bi-monthly *Screen* then appears to have slipped her memory when she subsequently says there is a "crying need" for a film studies journal, but she thinks its potential readership is too small for it ever to exist, unless it were to be published in more than one language.²⁶

While these internal BFI debates were taking place at the beginning of what was eventually to become a devastating attack by Governors on the Education Department, SEFT was preoccupied with the launch of *Screen*. The Editorial in the first issue divided the journal's intentions into two main areas thus:

The Editors intend *Screen* to provide a forum in which controversial areas relevant to the study of film and television can be examined and argued. It is by no means clear what the nature of Film Study should be.
At the same time *Screen* will contain articles of considered criticism.²⁷

The former intention was distinct from past *Screen Education* practice where accounts of what teachers did in their classrooms had been published usually without comment or context. *Screen* intended to open up debates and within the next two years attempted to do this.²⁸ There were still to be accounts of classroom practice but these were designed to relate any description to the underlying educational/theoretical position of the teacher.

The editing of the journal had been planned as a joint enterprise between Gough-Yates and Bolas. However by replacing Richardson as the Society's professional officer, Bolas's priorities had to change. Thus Gough-Yates assumed the principal role in commissioning articles and seeking new writers; Bolas while doing some of this took on the organisational and production tasks that were best handled centrally and might sit more easily alongside the SEFT Secretary's many other roles, plus the duties of Teacher Adviser BFI.

On a more practical level, the Editors wanted *Screen* to look different from *Screen Education* which had changed layout styles from issue to issue. Its illustrations had frequently been achieved by using printing blocks provided free by distributors wishing to promote their current films. In the new journal illustrations had to relate directly to the articles they accompanied. This point was emphasised from the outset in the article about editing *If* where frames from the film were reproduced within the wide margins that the

new design allowed.²⁹ *Screen* intended that it should look the part of a serious journal about film and how it might be taught.

In its venture into current film criticism, *Screen* was over ambitious. *Screen Education* had never attempted to engage with current film releases. For its readership a practical assumption had been that the journal would only consider writing about a film when it became available on 16 mm. *Screen* abandoned reviewing current films after its third issue. Production difficulties meant that issues four and five had to be combined into a double issue which covered the period from July to October. By the time *Screen* 4/5 would have reached SEFT members any film reviewed would have disappeared from the cinemas long before.

The Editors considered it important to link *Screen* with other SEFT activities. There were obvious ways of doing this: identifying and promoting SEFT events in a more systematic way than had happened previously. Significantly the journal could benefit from work initiated elsewhere in the Society. The articles on Arthur Penn's films printed in the first four issues were written as developments from the previous year's SEFT Summer School where Penn had been studied in the context of the American Cinema.

In an attempt to meet the demands of members for reference information and advisory documentation which had been a feature of the now defunct *Yearbook*, the Society took two different approaches. *Screen* published book listings of a more specialised kind. In doing this it enlisted expert help. The most significant of these contributors was Gillian Hartnoll, the BFI Deputy Head Librarian. She produced a series of lists which - whatever their contemporary usefulness might have been - now have a particular value in providing a snapshot of what was available to the film teacher at the start of the 1970s.³⁰ Of potentially greatest interest is her select list of available works on film theory which includes only thirteen books. The other approach which was less successful was SEFT's production of duplicated materials. Roy Armes was the Committee member responsible for this area. Reporting to the Society in 1970 he had to acknowledge SEFT's limitations.³¹ A questionnaire to members had revealed a great range of potential demands, some of which could already be met by BFI documents, had members been aware of them. SEFT had clearly to design its provision of materials in the context of what BFI had already available.

The Editors of *Screen* wanted the journal to be the locus of debates about film teaching. The most successful of these ventures was that between Alan Lovell and Robin Wood.³² When Andrew McTaggart and Roy Armes³³ addressed Peter Wollen's recently published *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*,³⁴ a reply from Wollen was sought, promised but never received.³⁵ Sadly Wollen failed to participate in precisely the kind of two-way dialogue between educationists and researchers that he had advocated so strongly when in post in the Education Department. There was however a response from Richard Collins to Ed Buscombe's article on genre.³⁶ The important debate for which *Screen* did provide an arena (and that fits into the context of which Whannel was writing) was that between Lovell and Wood. Lovell had held a variety of roles in the Education Department and would subsequently be a significant figure in SEFT and *Screen*. Long associated with, and influential in, the BFI/London University extra-mural classes, he was an independent thinker.³⁷ Wood was firmly committed to a Leavisite position and had become an important critic both through his association with *Movie* and because of his auteur criticism of Hawks and Hitchcock in two groundbreaking books.

In practice the debate commenced with Lovell's seminar paper mentioned above. In it Lovell had identified what he claimed were the three permanent approaches used in film teaching in the late 1960s: 'the Culture and Society position, the Film Language position and the Film and Social Studies position'.³⁸ He points out the limitations of each. The latter two were identifiable in secondary and further education respectively, though it is unclear as to how extensive each was. He is uneasy at the links made within each approach to what was in practice moral teaching. He argues that as a result of these moral emphases, Film Language teaching comes to favour the social documentary style of filmmaking while in the Film and Social Studies work, social studies priorities dominate in terms of how the film is presented and discussed.

His principal dispute is with the Leavisite approach which had been so widely influential in British education that some film teachers, unfamiliar with alternative methods of teaching film, had - especially within English departments - transferred this Leavisite approach to film. It is clear that Lovell is anticipating the development of the study of mass media: the 'mass media are such an important part of the contemporary environment that the educational system must take some account of the phenomenon'.³⁹ Leavis's attitude to the

mass media had been fundamentally hostile, so Lovell argues that there must be a reappraisal of how media teaching should be structured so that the Leavisites were not simply in a position to offer the default approach. He sees the study of cinema as a potential way in to the proper scrutiny of mass media, but acknowledges that it is only one of the options available. In his acceptance of the overarching presence of the media he was in the van of thoughtful opinion of the time.

Given that Lovell saw the Leavisite approach as hostile to the study of mass media, he was an appropriate writer for *Screen* to ask to address the thrust of Robin Wood's criticism which both embodied the Leavisite position and was by dint of Wood's books becoming a model of how film study might be undertaken. These books were also widely available and accessible to the uninitiated reader. Lovell's own seminar paper had had a much more limited circulation as a duplicated document. The substance of the Wood/Lovell debate depends on there being a great deal of intricate quoting and cross-quoting from Wood's books. Consequently although the limitations of Wood's stance were to become clearer, the discussion of alternative ways of approaching film and other media is sidelined, as Lovell has to acknowledge.⁴⁰

The background to Lovell's thinking was firstly his long-established place within the Education Department and its seminars and secondly his years of teaching on the extra-mural certificate. But Wood's arguments were in the public domain. Consequently although Lovell did expose some of the detailed weaknesses of Wood's position, by so doing he lost the opportunity do more than simply list the broad range of ideas that the seminar group were beginning to explore:

ideas derived from structural linguistics and anthropology (structuralism and semiology), from literary criticism and art history (genre and iconography), from sociology (the relationships between art and industry, the nature of movements).⁴¹

Paddy Whannel published very little during his later time as Education Officer. He wrote much, but mainly for internal BFI circulation. With the coming of *Screen* he was able to use its pages to disseminate more widely his thoughts on film education. But by 1971 when he would make his final contribution it was in the extraordinary circumstances that accompanied his resignation. But it is his forecasts in the three earlier reports that he wrote partly with inclusion in *Screen* in mind that were to be quoted in the succeeding decades by those who sought to establish their bearings.⁴² Whannel's statements have importance

not simply because of his accepted status within the film teaching community at that time but also because of their being published in SEFT's journal. The views he expressed were consequently endorsed by SEFT. What Whannel states represented a consensus among the key players at the start of the 1970s. At that point it must have seemed that the movement was well placed to progress. Not only was *Screen* speaking for SEFT as *Screen Education* never had, but there was it seemed again a joint enterprise with BFI.

In his three articles for *Screen* during 1969/70 Whannel is consistent in seeking to establish film study in higher education. Even in his first article where he is dealing with the issues of film availability, he mentions the problems faced by those established teachers wishing to have in-service training.⁴³ Two such one term courses existed at the end of the 1960s - at Bede College Durham and Hornsey College of Art Teacher Training Department. The Bede experiment was short-lived, not because of lack of applicants, but because of the difficulties of their gaining secondment.⁴⁴ The Hornsey Course benefited from its proximity to the Inner London Education Authority which, guided by its Aural and Visual Aids Inspector Leslie Ryder, was more sympathetic to such secondments. Significantly the education authority was funded at a level to facilitate secondments to non-mainstream courses. Whannel mentions the attempts by Douglas Lowndes from Hornsey to develop his work into a one year course at the University of London Institute of Education.⁴⁵ Lowndes has revealed how his application failed.⁴⁶ The Institute rejected the proposed course because he could not demonstrate that there existed the literature and theory to support it. Yet it was precisely because of this need to develop research in order to produce the back-up documentation for serious study that the MA was being proposed. It was being offered as a necessary stage in the evolution of film study. Several of the students from the one term Hornsey Course: Jim Cook, Jim Hillier, Chris Mottershead were to become significant contributors to SEFT and to the development of film and media education. A decade later the Institute would develop an MA under Bob Ferguson who had been a colleague of Lowndes at Hornsey. Had the Institute responded to Lowndes's proposals, the evolution of film and media study in the 1970s might have had very different emphases.

In a significant shift from the anti-examination stance of his two previous deputies, Harcourt and Kitses, Whannel draws attention to the first joint BFI/SEFT publication for almost two decades: *CSE Examinations in Film*. Researched by Roger Watkins (who

would become Chairman of SEFT in 1970), the booklet is cautious in nudging the film education movement towards examinations.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to acquaint the inquiring teacher with information about examinations in Film and to encourage him [*sic*] to think independently about his [*iterum sic*] own situation.⁴⁷

In his next *Screen* article Whannel tackles fundamental areas. He begins by demonstrating the inadequacy of the terminology that defines what is to be studied. His own emphasis on the priority and specificity of film is clear. He rejects 'Screen Education' because it had been created to include television. As the title of SEFT's re-styled journal it had also been rejected, though for a different reason. Whannel was uneasy that 'Screen' might be too inclusive; SEFT had felt that 'Education' might be a limitation. Subsequently *Screen Education* was successfully reintroduced as the title of a second SEFT journal, once *Screen*'s new identity had been established.

The fact that there is no agreed term to describe the subject, no equivalent of the term 'literature', for example, is the most obvious indication of the difficulty. All of us shift uneasily between such descriptions as Film Education, with the danger of confusing the subject with audio-visual aids, and the clumsy Screen Education, implying the uncertain and dubious inclusion of television. At times, for the sake of clarity, we are even driven to return to the old-fashioned term, Film Appreciation, with all its limiting connotations.⁴⁸

Today Film Study has an identity within all levels of education; Media Studies is widely accepted and has a space for film within it. Media education and media literacy are terms that extend the media umbrella even more widely. But in 1970, film as the main object of study was perceived as being under threat. Whannel's previously Leavisite position was being revised as a result; he feels that it is the economics of the situation that threatens film. The costs of film hire are expensive while other media are available more cheaply.

The film will not establish itself as a discipline in its own right, with its own body of knowledge and expertise, if its use in education is confined to being a secondary element within some other course. The danger is illustrated by the number of textbooks on Mass Media Studies now available, which offer a sketchy introduction to the cinema over a handful of pages in the context of chapters on such traditional Leavisite concerns as advertising, newspapers and popular magazines and, in some cases, adding the further confusion of sections on topics like the development of printing and telephonic communication.

We have to argue first of all for the *idea* of the study of film as art and entertainment as a distinct discipline having its own particular problems. Secondly, we need to establish centres at all levels in education, but especially within higher education, where such a study can take place.⁴⁹

His argument says that the case for film study must be starkly made – all the supporting secondary arguments may be deployed but it is crucial to state that

...the cinema is a significant feature of contemporary culture representing the most developed and distinctive form of art produced by technology with the unique feature that its growth, from its most primitive beginnings, is preserved for study on celluloid.⁵⁰

The late 1960s was a time when the term 'educational technology' was being widely adopted. A variety of new machines useful in the classroom was available and affordable. The once rare 16 mm sound projector was well established and had been joined by the 35mm carousel projector and most importantly by the overhead projector. Film study was beginning to be subsumed in this explosion of activity. At Wandsworth Technical College the staff of the Department of Educational Technology included those lecturers responsible for all the Liberal Studies teaching in the college; among them were those who taught film. That department's prime purpose however was to provide training in the use of audio visual aids to all ILEA teachers. Educational technology also then spawned a new kind of educationist: the media resources officer whose areas of responsibility were conceived as being wide and flexible. Whannel interpreted the implications of these developments as paralleling the intellectual stance of the then influential Marshall McLuhan. The educational technologist's role emphasised the 'instrumental capacities of media'. The 'imaginative and expressive qualities' were losing out.⁵¹ For much of the post-war period both SEFT and BFI had striven to dissociate their project from that of the audio visual specialist. By 1970 the status of the latter group was clearly in the ascendant.

He also begins to disown the parallel drawn between film and literature, albeit this was the analogy that he had used to BFI Governors. Perhaps here he was shifting his position, knowing how what had seemed an innocuous and appropriate comparison had so antagonised certain governors.

By and large, the literary culture, with its emphasis on good taste and a refined personal sensibility, *is* narrow. Nothing could be less desirable than to impose such a straitjacket on the cinema which is, after all, not only an art, but also an industry and a form of mass entertainment. The problem is, therefore, to define the content of film study sufficiently rigorously to give it coherence without suffocating it by too narrow a framework.⁵²

He then attempts to define the subject, thereby giving a very clear indication of what his thinking was in 1969. He divides the components of the subject into criticism, theory and contextual studies. His brief summary sentences distil very precisely what many involved teachers thought at the time.

Criticism:

There is a need to develop systematic approaches and to find more objective bases for critical analysis than personal taste and sensibility. At present the various ideas clustered around the notions of author and genre would seem to present the most useful starting points.

Theory:

Much must be derived from other fields such as the work in aesthetics and the more specialised studies like semiology and communications theory.⁵³

Contextual studies:

[Where he assumes the core of the work will be the study of a particular director.] Areas to be covered here include the structure of the industry, the production system, the entertainment forms available and the critical climate. Here again the aid of other subject disciplines, such as sociology and economic history, must be sought.⁵⁴

If Whannel felt able to define the fundamental areas of film study for investigation, he was aware that he wrote at a time when for some these issues were irrelevant. Many teachers, some as a result of the Education Department's own promotional publications, were using film thematically. Indeed by housing and supporting the Humanities Curriculum Project's Film Officer, Whannel had encouraged this development, albeit on the strategic basis that it was better to have the project inside rather than outside the BFI. There was a price to be paid for this, both in terms of the increased workload for his advisory staff and in the dilution of what film study might offer

...the constant insistence on discussion and on the probing of values, the relative absence of a defined body of knowledge and the lack of a systematic critical procedure, all lead to difficulties of their own which can place some strain on both pupil and teacher. If we add to these difficulties the problem of deciding whether it is the theme or the character of the film which should control and define a discussion, we have a situation which can be rather daunting, especially for the teacher coming fresh to film study.⁵⁵

Manoeuvring in this current - where film was being used in a thematic context - presented a problem and one for which he could offer only two suggestions. The Humanities Curriculum Project was due to be formally reviewed and evaluated. Since the basis of its approach had been thematic, the results of this review might be helpful. A second proposal

was that courses might be developed on 'some formal principle drawn from the study of film as art'.⁵⁶ It seems clear that the momentum generated by the increasing use of feature film in the classroom was not readily facilitating an investigation of its proper place in education.

The Education Department under Whannel had regularly been confronted with the problem of determining the place and importance of practical work. The members of the department had not been film-makers; they were skilled users of words. On the other hand SEFT had always maintained some film-makers in its key roles, even if their expertise was that of proficient amateurs. The work that Douglas Lowndes was demonstrating from his position in teacher training appeared to challenge SEFT's support for the group made film. The promotion of Lowndes's work by the Education Department was a means by which the department could be recognised as not ignoring the issue of students and practical work. In defending that position Whannel draws a parallel from art education where he maintains there is an accepted and clear distinction between the scholar and the practitioner.

Whannel ends by returning to the project of his department that had upset the Governors: the development of a film culture. He attempts to put his department's role into context by drawing attention to the other agencies that needed to be involved. These included agencies (as he attempts tactfully to point out) that are within the establishment of the BFI itself, including its publications, the National Film Archive and the National and Regional Film Theatres. What he was not able to say was how separate and indeed hostile to each other these departments then were. To conclude he feels the need to have some proposals as to a way forward. Given that his room for manoeuvre within the BFI was limited, he ends by finding safety in the same project that he had so vigorously championed in the late 1950s with the Joint Council for Education through Art.

The idea of agency is more dynamic than a concept like museum. The idea of film culture is wider than the notion of film art. The point, therefore, in using the term Agencies of Film Culture is to imply an alliance of artist, critic and teacher in an activist programme.⁵⁷

A decade earlier there had been much broader involvement around this alliance both from within the BFI and beyond it.

A year later Whannel projects a more confident outlook. Indeed much of what he then expected to happen, did. What he did not foresee - or at least did not feel able to commit to paper - was how vulnerable was his own position within that future. In 1969 he had limited his suggestions as to future developments to stating that the coming of videotape would transform the possibilities for studying film.⁵⁸ Here he felt able to be more generally positive.

In the seventies it will move decisively out of its pioneering phase into a period when the outlines of its discipline will emerge more clearly and the study of film, once dependent upon the individual's private enthusiasm, will receive more public and institutional support.

Most of our definitions and formulations are made in the heat of the battle and are therefore provisional.⁵⁹

Where in 1969 he had seemed prepared to acknowledge that the term 'Film Appreciation' still had a value as a point of reference, now he welcomes the extending, if rather indeterminate, scope of film study and identifies as a measure of this achievement the abandonment of the earlier term.

This was symbolised some years ago by the decision to drop the term 'film appreciation', with all its narrow connotations, from the title of the Department.⁶⁰

The strands making up the identity of the emerging subject have changed somewhat. Theory and criticism remain, but Contextual Studies is replaced by 'the debate about popular culture'. Here also Whannel appears to be shifting away from the moral and Leavisite tone that had been detectable in *The Popular Arts* to allow for a more inclusive and objective approach to popular culture.

It will be broader and more flexible, more dependent on knowledge than on 'good taste' and calling for more diverse lines of attack than the individual critical insight. In this sense once the enormous opportunities for its study have been fully realised it could provide an important challenge and stimulus to the study of art and society in general.⁶¹

But when he considers the basic territory, he has to repeat the questions of the previous year.

What is the subject Film Study? What are its appropriate teaching methods? How will it become more firmly established as a recognised discipline?⁶²

Therefore whilst depicting a greater use of film at all levels of education, he emphasises that the fundamental issues as to the nature and methodology of film teaching remain

largely unexplored. He takes some satisfaction from the fact that his Department's seminars are setting out specifically to investigate these. The nature of the debate around practical work has changed too. Jennie Lee had used her visit to open the Young Screen Exhibition in the previous summer to announce the setting up of the National Film School. Its recently appointed principal Colin Young had become an occasional visitor to the Education Department.⁶³ Young's commitment to, and preference for, practice rather than theory would perhaps lead to a redefining of what Whannel might expect from the universities.

Whannel consequently has to acknowledge the specifically British situation around the study of film. Its acceptance in higher education was the final stage of its fitting into the educational hierarchy. Unlike the USA where film study had percolated down into the schools, in Britain it had worked its way up from the schools. He explains this origin by uncharacteristically demonising the process by which the schools had become involved.

Presumably this is because of the paternalistic and moralising approach to the media characteristic of the English (at their best and worst) which sustained the belief that the mass audience needed to be protected from the false values of the movies by being trained in awareness, but that the educated few were saved by having natural good taste.⁶⁴

There were, as has been shown, some vociferous proponents of this view, but it was not the case that this view predominated. For SEFT activists in the two preceding decades, it was their own enthusiasm for film that motivated them.

His article is about servicing the film teacher. Whannel clearly believed that the long term solution was to reverse the 'bottom up' engine that had propelled the study of film during the post-war period. The establishment of film study within higher education was not to be an end in itself. It would be the means by which the many issues and questions that Whannel had identified as impinging on the identity of the subject might be resolved.

Even given our limited knowledge it seems crucial at this stage to make every effort to establish film study as a distinct discipline at key points within the university. This is important first of all as a strategy. Further advances at other levels are probably conditional on achieving such a status. Secondly, developments in research and scholarship are necessary to sustain the work at the school, further education, adult education and college level. It would seem that a number of problems facing the teacher can only be solved by advances elsewhere.⁶⁵

Where he may be seen as especially prescient - in the light of the developments that took place within SEFT and *Screen* in succeeding years - were in his expectations of the potential that might be detected in the post-1968 generation of young graduates. It is also clear what part he envisages for the BFI in response.

It is a distinctive feature of this new generation that they are interested in a wide range of film topics, including theoretical questions, but it remains true that formal education provides little opportunity for them to pursue the study of film in a sustained or systematic way.

...the Film Institute has an important role to play in this development, especially in the transitional period before fully financed and well-equipped film departments flourish. Already a great many university ventures are sustained by lectures and documentation from the Department and the Institute is now making more money available to support the viewings essential for research purposes.⁶⁶

Clearly aware of the teacher readership of *Screen* he ends his report by reiterating the persistent practical problems that he had identified in previous years. There are certain specifics where he is assertive:

For some time now we've had requests for definitive film textbooks. These requests have been resisted on the grounds of not wanting to create an orthodoxy and instead we have concentrated on accounts of teaching experiences.⁶⁷

In practice he had begun to provide more substantial film literature through the Department's involvement in the *Cinema One* series. But ever the clear-sighted administrator, Whannel understands that for many teachers it is the costliness of beginning the film teaching enterprise that thwarts them. So he finally concludes by acknowledging how so much of what is or is not possible lies with those who control film distribution.

On the other hand if the needs of film teachers were more clearly understood, if the idea of using a feature for study by a small group were properly distinguished from its showing to the whole school as a holiday treat, and if the idea of creating a population with a film culture was seen in its broad relevance to the changing audience for cinema and the changing exhibition pattern, then we might be able to work towards a more regularised system of discounts related to use.⁶⁸

When Bolas decided to return to school teaching in autumn 1970, the post he had held as Teacher Adviser BFI/Secretary SEFT was redesigned as Secretary SEFT/Editor *Screen*.⁶⁹ The redesignation appealed to both BFI and SEFT, but for different reasons. It had become clear that the BFI and SEFT parts of the job did not sit easily together. If the post holder were to be the sole professional officer of the Society s/he had to negotiate on behalf of SEFT with an organisation for which s/he had also the duties of an employee. It

was also the case that as Bolas had also been Editor of *Screen*, not a situation envisaged when the original joint appointment was made, the workload of the post had been great. Whannel had been supportive in reducing the BFI advisory element of this workload.⁷⁰

For SEFT therefore it was a much more workable arrangement that the post should be almost wholly concerned with SEFT matters and that the paid professional officer should have editorship of *Screen* which was by far the Society's principal financial commitment.⁷¹ Whannel on the other hand was aware that when the post came to be advertised the Editorship of *Screen* element of the post would attract a much more substantial field of applicants than would the Secretarial role. He saw the opportunity to strengthen the 'academy in waiting' through which both Perkins and Wollen had already passed. Although this would be a SEFT post, the appointment would remain a joint one by BFI/SEFT.⁷² Furthermore, Whannel had got SEFT's agreement that the new Editor would be answerable to a joint editorial board.⁷³

Sam Rohdie was appointed Editor of *Screen* and General Secretary SEFT in August 1970 and took up the post in January 1971.⁷⁴ During the three years that he held the post, the status of SEFT, the project of *Screen* and the scope of BFI Education changed fundamentally. In practice SEFT would be the beneficiary of the BFI Governors' determination to curb Whannel's Education Department.

The situation that Rohdie inherited at SEFT was one of an organisation in flux. There had been an accelerating process of committee change. Vannoey and Wills, the last of the 1950s' Committee, had left. Watkins, himself a relative newcomer, took over as Chairman for most of 1970 but then, having taken a job in Leeds, he was unable to continue. When Rohdie joined SEFT the replacement Acting Chairman was Jim Cook and the Acting Treasurer, was Edward Buscombe, who also took over from a departing long-term committee member Chris Bott.⁷⁵ By the time of the 1972 AGM only John Bennett, Buscombe and David Lusted remained of those committee members who had reported to the 1970 AGM.⁷⁶

A consequence both of his workplace location within 81 Dean Street and of the SEFT substitutions among its voluntary officers, Rohdie probably depended more on the support of staff in the Education Department.⁷⁷ It seems however that he was a naturally

independent operator who found himself in a situation where he was able to operate independently. His first issue of *Screen* proclaims difference. It has a new and distinctive design by Gerald Cinamon⁷⁸ and is now published quarterly. Its Editorial is signed by The Editorial Board and states unequivocally that the 'emphasis in *Screen* on theory is crucial'.⁷⁹ As if to place *Screen's* new venture into context the Editorial implies that the journal will not be influenced by what had been written about film in most of the twentieth century. In this Rohdie echoes Wollen's earlier adherence to the novelty of film.

Above all film must be studied as a new medium, a product of this century and of the machine, and which as a new medium and a new mode of expression challenges traditional notions of art and criticism and the system of education which still in part is tied to these notions.⁸⁰

This statement written in 1971 has clear echoes of what had been written half a century earlier. Subsequently *Screen* did pay great attention to what had been written about the cinema in the early years of the Soviet Union.⁸¹ It must have been interpreted by *Screen's* readers as a rather arrogant anachronism in a journal that already had a twenty year history of promoting the serious study of a medium already seventy five years old.

The trope of the new *Screen* identity may be inferred from its contents. Its principal article is a reprint in translation from *Cahiers du Cinema*. While reviewing a book by US academics, Ben Brewster produces an article on 'Structuralism in Film Criticism'. Claire Johnston, who like Brewster would be an influential and long-term member of the SEFT Committee, surveys film journals in Britain and France.⁸² At the back of the issue are to be found 'Education Notes', compiled by Diana Matias, the Editorial Assistant. This section

...has been introduced to provide a more direct link between the Society and its services on the one hand, and the teacher and the classroom on the other.⁸³

Ominously a distinction is being made here between SEFT (which existed because of the teachers who subscribed to become its members) and the needs of those same teachers which are apparently to be addressed as an afterthought. Reassurance might be sought in the article which Rohdie himself contributed to the issue.⁸⁴ It is certainly possible to find something that reads like reassurance even if it is in a paragraph that plainly contradicts what the *Screen* Editorial Board had asserted about theory, only a few pages earlier.

The practical work of *Screen* is education. It is not primarily a journal for professional intellectuals, film critics, cinephiles, but for practising teachers. For it

to be intellectualist would not only be sterile in itself, but it would not serve its supposed educational practice.⁸⁵

But in the light of what would subsequently happen in *Screen*, Rohdie was perhaps protesting too much.

By appointing Sam Rohdie as its Secretary, SEFT was breaking with established practice. Previously those who had held SEFT's professional officer post had already served a lengthy voluntary apprenticeship on the Committee. Indeed in its early years gaining a position on the SEFT Committee itself had been regarded as a useful stepping stone. Rohdie was unusual too in that he came from higher education where he had taught film. SEFT's previous links with higher education had been substantial but always with teacher training. Only one of its previous officers, Don Waters, had experience of being employed in a specifically film teaching capacity. Consequently Rohdie was probably more at ease with the BFI Education Department than with the SEFT Committee. This is a view supported by Christopher Williams, BFI Education's Editor of Publications and Jim Cook who chaired SEFT in 1971 – 72.⁸⁶

But closeness to the Education Department had its dangers. The Department had been under scrutiny for some years and when the BFI Governors began a policy review of the Institute, the Education Department was first in their sights.⁸⁷ Asa Briggs, Vice Chancellor of Sussex University, joined the Board in the February 1970 and was rapidly asked to chair a Governors' Sub-Committee to investigate the Education Department as part of the Governors' Policy Review Committee.⁸⁸ This committee consisted of Paul Adorian and Helen Forman whose criticisms of Whannel had first been recorded in 1968. No copy of the Briggs Committee Report appears to have survived. Its concerns have to be inferred from the responses that it elicited, of which the most significant were the resignations of Whannel, Lovell and four other members of the department in August 1971.⁸⁹ The thrust of the Briggs Report seems to have been that the Department was developing a research/theoretical bias when it should have been supporting grassroots work in schools.⁹⁰ It is impossible to know whether the Report acknowledged that it was the previous 25 years of grassroots work in schools that had provided the platform for the theoretical work to begin.

The investigation of the Department's work was cursory. SEFT's appointment of Rohdie and his changed emphases in *Screen* were apparently included in the charges against the Department. Cook, then Chair of SEFT, remembers that he, Rohdie and Whannel attended a meeting, held before the BFI Governors' April meeting, with Briggs and Helen Forman on the 'neutral' territory of Granada's London headquarters.⁹¹ Also present at that meeting was Denis Forman. His presence would suggest that he was already in the process of replacing William Coldstream as Chairman of BFI Governors. This meeting probably took place on 6 April 1971 between the first circulation of the report to Governors and the point at which the Governors acted upon it.⁹² The Governors' Minutes record that the Report was first circulated at the February meeting with the intention that it be discussed in March.⁹³ However at that subsequent meeting so many governors left early that discussion was deferred until April.⁹⁴ At the April Governors' meeting there was a substantial item on the report. There was also consideration of SEFT and *Screen*.⁹⁵

The Briggs group was initially styled as the Education Sub Committee. Then its title was subsequently - and significantly - adjusted to become the Committee on Educational Services. Its report finally appeared as 'Report of the Review Committee on Educational Services', presumably to fit in alongside the other subsequent Governors' policy review papers. According to Briggs, his committee had produced 'a brief and practical report that purposely avoided involving itself at this stage in a detailed study of the work of individual members of staff'.⁹⁶ It was certainly easier for a committee to pass judgment if they exempted themselves from the necessity of examining detailed evidence but the Chairman remained confident that they had 'all the facts necessary to form a judgment'.⁹⁷

Consequently Briggs told the Governors that his committee's aim was 'to see a more streamlined Department, playing a less independent role than hitherto.' The Governors' reaction was one of 'warm support'.⁹⁸ It is pertinent to remember that at this time the Institute's Governors were themselves under attack from the Members' Action Group which had been particularly effective in calling Governors to account at the previous December's Annual Meeting.⁹⁹ Two members of that group Victor Perkins and Peter Wollen had previously been employees in the Education Department and perhaps this helped to direct Governors' attention towards this department, some of whose members were known for their left wing political affinities and against whom Governors' hostilities had been simmering for years.¹⁰⁰

The Minutes record Whannel as vigorously defending the department.¹⁰¹ Where the Governors had made incorrect assumptions, he was able to challenge them. His main problem was that, whereas he had a very clear idea about the need to establish that there existed a film culture which was as appropriate for study as a literary culture, his opponents only wanted to engage with film in a more nebulous educational context. Not only was the Institute's educational agenda to be broadened, but its implementation was not to be confined to the Education Department.

The Committee were opposed to the concept that the educational function of the Institute should be solely conducted through the Education Department as it now existed.¹⁰²

It would seem from the specific defence that Whannel had to give to his department's involvement in the *Cinema One* book series, that this aspect was one that particularly attracted criticism.¹⁰³ In 1969 two of the books published in the series were attributed to the Education Department. These had been written by two then current Education Department employees, Jim Kitses and Peter Wollen.¹⁰⁴ Both however had left the Department before the Briggs Committee was set up. The implication was that they had spent BFI work time writing these books and that this was an inappropriate use of public money. Having not talked with individual members of the department, the Sub-Committee was possibly not aware that three then current employees, Lovell, Hillier and McArthur were producing *Cinema One* books duly published in 1972.¹⁰⁵ Certainly Whannel is recorded in the Minutes as having denied 'that members of the Department spent much time in lecturing and said that they did no sophisticated research themselves but made available the researches of others'.¹⁰⁶

The Governors supported the Report in full and its assertion that 'if the Education Department continued as it was now doing, the servicing aspect, which they regarded as important, would suffer'. Whannel was given a month in which to satisfy the Director 'as to the manner in which the recommendations contained in paragraph 8 of the Report would be implemented'.¹⁰⁷

Under a later item of the same agenda SEFT came under separate scrutiny, initially as a result of reports from the Editorial Committee which had been considering *Screen*.¹⁰⁸ This Committee was recommending that the grant for *Screen* should be £500 per annum to

bring it into line with other film journals. This was in fact the amount that SEFT had received as a grant from the BFI in 1966, before the joint appointment had first been mooted. As this Editorial Committee meeting was held in mid April, it would seem likely that the only Rohdie edited issue of the journal that the Editorial Committee might have inspected was the Spring 1971 issue. However Briggs intervened in this discussion of *Screen* and raised the wider issue of SEFT. His committee, following the meeting of 6 April, would recommend that 'the organisation should be gradually dissociated from the Education Department and become an independent body'.¹⁰⁹

It is relevant at this point to consider what role Director Reed might have had in these developments. SEFT had for twenty years been an independent body but perhaps Rohdie's involvement with the Education Department had blurred the distinction between the two and Reed did not wish to disabuse the Governors of this. Those who resigned from the Education Department writing subsequently about these events alleged that Reed had stated publicly that Rohdie was not appropriate for the SEFT post, yet Reed had been on the joint SEFT/BFI appointing committee.¹¹⁰ However, as Alan Lovell also on the committee recalls, Reed left the appointing meeting after all the interviews were completed but before the candidates were considered.¹¹¹ Reed had however concurred with the re-designation of the post so that both the SEFT element was increased and the Editorship of *Screen* was the key to a successful appointment. It is clear that at this point Reed was not voicing support for either Whannel or SEFT. Consequently that Governors' Meeting ended with SEFT being expected to operate independently with only a £500 grant from BFI from April 1972.¹¹²

Whannel did not in the event attempt to satisfy the Director but, along with other colleagues, he resigned with effect from mid August.¹¹³ Reed had found contact with the Education Department difficult in the face of hostility and had handed the task of dealing with the surviving rump of the department to his deputy Ernest Lindgren.¹¹⁴ Reed then fell ill. In these circumstances SEFT decided that its best strategy for survival lay in direct contact with the new BFI chairman Denis Forman. History was to SEFT's advantage in that Forman, when he had been BFI Director two decades earlier, had publicly supported the newly formed Society of Film Teachers.¹¹⁵ There was however a more fundamental card for SEFT to play. If the BFI wanted its educational staff to deal mainly with direct

teacher enquiries, it would be more publicly acceptable for them to do so, if other more research/theoretical areas could be seen as being addressed elsewhere.

Jim Cook as Chairman of SEFT, wrote to Forman in very strong terms.¹¹⁶ There were two strands to the letter. The Governors' action meant that both Rohdie and Matias were implicitly being sacked from March 1972 since SEFT had no means of replacing the BFI funding. Yet in contractual terms both were BFI employees. This was a nicety that had eluded the Briggs Committee. Much of Cook's letter is highly critical of Reed who is accused of having declared publicly that Rohdie was unsuitable for the post and of telling a representative of the National Union of Teachers that SEFT would soon cease to exist. As evidence of Reed's hostility to SEFT, Cook cites Reed's provision of 'free films and services' to the Barry Summer School which was no longer a SEFT event.¹¹⁷ Cook also claims that the newly founded National Association for Film Education (NAFE) is an anti-SEFT, anti-BFI Education Department organisation which is expecting a BFI grant. The letter hints that for these reasons NAFE may get a sympathetic response from the BFI. Finally Cook wants Forman to state where the BFI stands on this matter.

In his immediate reply Forman was able to avoid dealing with the issues concerning Reed, since the latter was still absent ill. Significantly Forman claimed that the area of the Institute educational policy where there had been disagreement 'is a small area; the Governors endorse the great majority of the work that has been done'.¹¹⁸ The final paragraphs of Forman's letter are quoted in full below.

The Governors and management do not regard it as the function of the Institute to "shape a film culture". This does not mean they are "anti-intellectual". On the contrary, they wish to promote theoretical and practical research into film appreciation and film education. But they wish to stimulate research through grant in aid bodies such as your own, in university departments and in other appropriate places.

What they do not want to do is to support and perpetuate any single doctrine or dogma within the Institute about film to the exclusion of other schools of thought. They believe in a plurality of educational theories and methods. They consider that as in the fields of textbooks, music and the arts, so in the area of film and television education it is the job of the central body to provide guidance, to stimulate educationalists, and to provide them with the tools for the job.

The notion of a 'film culture' appears to be the sticking point. This was the term that Whannel had long promoted and his repeated references to it seem to have been conflated

in Governors' minds with what his department was up to - of which they were perpetually suspicious. It seems clear that in these two paragraphs Forman was trying to find room to manoeuvre.

In Cook's immediate reply he is able to identify the contradiction in the Governors' position.¹¹⁹

On the one hand the Institute expresses concern at any charge against it of anti-intellectualism yet by an administrative formula defining the proper place for the generation of ideas it is in effect cutting off the two major areas where ideas on film education have been generated -- namely SEFT and its own Education Department.

The Education Department and SEFT have done precisely what you yourself ask for - 'promote theoretical and practical research into film appreciation and film education' - and yet the Governors sub-committee condemned them for doing just that.

He was also able to point to the problems that the BFI had created in another area of its responsibility by failing to provide any coherent context for its work:

Perhaps the paradigms in your mind for what seems to SEFT a contradiction is the NFT and Regional Theatres which provide films but no context for their understanding or appreciation, a serious lack which in part may account for the financial distress in which these theatres now find themselves?

Forman took a slight pause before replying. When he did he proposed that, rather than continuing the correspondence, SEFT should meet with him in mid-September after he had returned from holiday.¹²⁰ A meeting was arranged for 21 September between Forman and Cook.¹²¹

In the interim Rohdie and Lindgren were in regular contact. Rohdie was preparing a case to be made at the October BFI Governors' meeting for SEFT to be properly supported. Lindgren was advising him to play down the significance of *Screen* and its demands on Rohdie's time and to 'establish that SEFT has other activities of a more practical nature'.¹²² Consequently in a letter to Forman, Rohdie outlined a series of proposals and made a point of emphasising that it was only the uncertainty over SEFT's future that had prevented their earlier inception.¹²³

The two main proposals were the development of a SEFT regional policy and the introduction of *Screen Education Notes*. The first innovation would be the organisation of

a 'series of one-day schools in the regions as well as weekend conferences and seminars'. The *Notes* was to be a new SEFT quarterly journal of 'practical film education'. Such were the changes of personnel on the SEFT Committee that the re-use of the recently discarded title *Screen Education* did not apparently cause concern. The implied trivialisation of the educational input by reference to it as *Notes* did cause some disquiet.¹²⁴ These particular moves clearly had a timely tactical value in that, given the previous attitude of the Governors, these proposals were unlikely to be opposed.

Screen does get mentioned and Rohdie is clearly determined not to diminish the importance of this particular SEFT project, the appeal of which was what had brought him to the Society. He does not mention *Screen's* content but concentrates on its sales, pointing out that 'revenue now meets direct expenditure', presumably meaning printing and distribution. He claims that his first two issues have caused sales and subscriptions to rise by 150 per cent so that 2000 copies of both numbers 1 and 2 of Volume 12 have sold out.¹²⁵ Rohdie was probably being optimistic at this point.¹²⁶

In a paragraph to reassure the Governors Rohdie states:

In the future the Society will be devoting most of its efforts to the organisation of SEFT - the generation of a constituency of film teachers as a pre-condition for the acceptance and generation of ideas about film teaching.

Inevitably and understandably he makes the case for an end to the uncertainty surrounding his and Matias's employment situations. Lindgren was sympathetic and in a memo early in September is clearly seeing that SEFT's best bet is to go initially for a stay of execution and to get Governors to agree a full year's funding for SEFT for 1972/73 so that both Rohdie and Matias are secure for a further year at least.¹²⁷ At their September meeting the Governors agreed to this but wanted a detailed SEFT budget before their October meeting.¹²⁸ But the main deal was being worked out between Forman and Rohdie who alone had taken up the invitation for the meeting on 20 September. This seems to have been a particularly successful occasion. Cook had detected at the earlier meeting at Granada that Forman was not as hostile to SEFT as the Briggs Committee was.¹²⁹ Rohdie has described Forman's role in the proceedings as that of a 'gentleman'.¹³⁰

In the event the outcome for SEFT was remarkable. It had in 1967 achieved a joint appointment where its Secretary would for half the time be a Teacher Adviser in the

Education Department. By autumn 1971 it was being offered a grant to cover the salaries of two full-time SEFT employees. It had also been found premises in Old Compton Street which had been equipped and furnished at the BFI's expense. This additional generosity was not without advantages to the BFI who had sub-leased the Old Compton Street premises to a tenant who, while owing BFI money, was about to assign further his sub-lease.¹³¹ The BFI felt justified in cancelling his debt and in paying him £400 for the furniture and fittings, which included four desks, four chairs, a large settee, carpets, curtains, light fittings, an electric heater and a safe. These were to be available to SEFT from 18 October. This advantageous outcome then came almost to a disastrous conclusion.

Rohdie clearly had alternative strategies in place should the more conventional negotiations with the BFI fail. The first was to devote a considerable part of the Autumn issue of *Screen* to the events around the resignations from the Education Department. The second was to organise a SEFT all-day conference at the National Film Theatre called 'Crisis in Film Education' with speakers including Roy Knight, Alan Lovell, Peter Wollen and Colin Young.¹³² The timing of events was such that *Screen* was published on 11 October, the Governors met to consider the detailed SEFT budget on 19 October and the Crisis Conference was on 23 October.

Rohdie had to act quickly. On publication day he sent a copy of *Screen* to Forman with a covering letter in which he had to explain why, when he had already achieved the best possible outcome for SEFT, he was devoting 42 pages of *Screen* to criticisms of the BFI. These were then followed by a seven page advertisement for the BFI Members' Action Committee.

The issue was planned some time ago when both the Society and the Department felt their existence threatened; the Society's Executive and the SCREEN Editorial Board decided that we had no other choice but to print such an edition of SCREEN.

Some six weeks ago I informed the Deputy Director that such an issue was at the printers but that we would be more than happy not to print it if the Institute could give us some positive guarantee about the future, but it could not.

It was not until well after page proof stage that such a guarantee was forthcoming and hence the appearance of this crisis SCREEN.¹³³

He then had to present the forthcoming conference as having a changed agenda 'now directed towards debating and defining policies for film education and strategies for their realisation'. He extends an invitation to Governors and Management to be present.¹³⁴

Forman's response was to propose a meeting for 26 October - after the conference - with Rohdie and Cook.¹³⁵ Lindgren felt betrayed and wrote to Forman that 'personally I should like to see SEFT's grant cut immediately and *in toto*'.¹³⁶ Asa Briggs at the October Governors' Meeting stated that the *Screen* material might be defamatory.¹³⁷ Consequently Forman took legal advice and was told that

Prima facie, I think that the articles and letters taken as a whole are defamatory of the Governors and Director of the Institute.¹³⁸

This opinion does however hint at the considerable scale of any legal case that might be mounted:

...it would be necessary to consider the various changes in the composition of the Governing body which would have taken place over the years, since the criticism is not restricted to any particular period of time or to any one event.

In the event Forman took the matter no further.

Rohdie saw that the interest the Crisis Conference had generated might be used to SEFT's advantage. He wrote to Reed indicating that if the BFI were shifting from the agreement that he had come to with Forman, he would have to inform the conference of this. Alternatively he held out the prospect of the conference providing 'a favourable opportunity for SEFT to both settle the disagreements of the past and the anxiety it has caused SEFT and the film movement clearly and publicly'.¹³⁹ Reed was not prepared to do more than state that Forman 'wants to continue discussion of the future relationship between our two bodies'.¹⁴⁰

Reporting on the conference, Tom Ryall concedes that 'the discussion proceeded in a random fashion'.¹⁴¹ It began with Rohdie presenting his official Report as Secretary. He blamed his predecessors in SEFT for 'the absence of a clearly defined constituency of film teachers' and for failing to organize such teachers into 'a coherent movement'.¹⁴² Some antagonism was expressed from the floor toward SEFT as being focused on higher education. There was a call by some for a separate teachers' organization. David Lusted

then on the SEFT Committee recalls that some teachers who attended were surprised to learn that there was a crisis.¹⁴³ Reed received reports from Thorold Dickinson and Gough Yates.¹⁴⁴ Both had attended and were very critical of the proceedings. Rohdie tried to present the occasion to Reed as having been important in that over 200 people had attended.¹⁴⁵ But there had apparently been little agreement, which Rohdie had to concede. He chose to present the conference's disunity as inevitable, reflecting the fragmentation of the film education movement.¹⁴⁶

Governors at their October meeting had noted that *Screen* 'contained numerous allegations and inaccuracies' but they were prepared to accept that the matter would be best dealt with by the Chairman meeting again with the Chairman and Secretary of SEFT.¹⁴⁷ At the November meeting Forman reported that a formal apology had been asked for and that a statement to this effect should appear in the next issue of *Screen*.¹⁴⁸ In a memo to Reed, Rohdie stated that he had written a letter of apology to Forman at the end of October.¹⁴⁹

It would appear that neither SEFT nor BFI wanted to risk losing what each regarded for separate reasons as an appropriate resolution. SEFT got total independence underwritten by substantial public funds (£9,994 for 1972-1973).¹⁵⁰ BFI was able to re-designate the Education Department as its Educational Advisory Service and hope thereby to demonstrate that theory and research were legitimately no longer part of its educational brief. Whannel was replaced by Douglas Lowndes, widely respected as an innovatory practitioner in both secondary schools and teacher training.¹⁵¹ But the constraints imposed by Governors were to restrict the potential of EAS for a decade while SEFT was about to commence upon a period when the Society would become both prestigious and widely influential.

CHAPTER FOUR 1972-1975

THE FELT INTERVENTION OF *SCREEN*

The first two 1971 issues of the British journal *Screen* published a translation of essays by Comolli and Narboni, Leblanc and Fargier. Their impact was immediate. They at once initiated an open battle, which led *Screen* to play a major role for several years both as a participant in the debate and as a battlefield.

Francesco Casseti, 1999

While Screen embarks upon a trajectory of pursuing theory, from its back pages emerges Screen Education Notes. This modest quarterly publication not only chronicles the quickening pace of educational developments around film but begins to develop its own stable of writers. Then in 1974 it metamorphoses into the second SEFT journal bearing the title of Screen Education. The BFI Summer Schools are re-structured to provide a key transmission route for Screen's theories. Film teachers in favoured areas have access to substantial self help projects and even an O level in film. Meanwhile Screen recruits from the intelligentsia.

The changes that came about in SEFT in the 1970s were extraordinary. What had been a marginal grouping of teachers rapidly had at its core an intellectual cell. Film study which had persistently found itself able only to worm its way into gaps in the curriculum of schools and colleges, became the intellectual standard behind which a whole cadre of young graduates were marshalled. What had been perceived as appropriate fodder for the less able or for those on courses with spare time to be filled, became the territory for displays of intellectual experiment around the translation and transmission of European thought.

If the nucleus of this activity was to be *Screen*, its partner journal, the revamped *Screen Education*, would turn its focus on to the educational implications in its title. The original *Screen Education* had been so titled in order to allow SFT to become SEFT, the term 'screen' enabling the accommodation of television into the Society's remit. The emphasis in the shift then had been on 'screen'. 'Education' was merely the appropriate afterthought. The writers of the new *Screen Education* saw that if they were to consider those elements of the visual culture implied by 'screen' then the educational context for that consideration was the key determinant.

For two decades SFT then SEFT had in turn presented themselves as the professional subject association for film and television teachers. But these were unlike other subject associations. None of the members had been trained to teach about film or television; and even a tinier fraction of them had been employed specifically as teachers of film and television. Most SFT/SEFT members were likely to belong to other subject associations that represented their interest in the subject that they spent most of their time teaching. Thus in 1966, at the stage when SEFT was to make its first joint appointment with the BFI, its Chairman taught Chemistry, its Secretary taught Geography and its Treasurer, History.¹

A consequence of this loose alliance of teachers who were enthusiastic about film was to diminish controversy. For many the involvement with this aspect of their teaching was subsidiary and film/television teaching was only an enjoyable phase on a career path that had to lead elsewhere. For two decades SFT/SEFT had encouraged those who wanted to develop 'screen education' to do whatever was possible in each individual situation. From the experience of those who had been around longer, an accumulation of information was made available. If a beginner wanted to share her/his first attempts with others, both *Screen Education* and to a lesser extent BFI Education Department would facilitate the dissemination. Nobody was to be deterred. Everybody was compromised.

Thus when SEFT found itself staffed, housed and independent while the remnants of the BFI Education Department had instructions principally to service teachers' queries, a unique situation had been created that reversed the roles that each had traditionally played. The voluntary body had a secure flow of public money on a far larger scale than before.² The thinking that Whannel had fostered in his Education Department was no longer acceptable within the BFI. The thinking had to go somewhere. And there were certainly thinkers about to enter territory where there had not been much intellectual investigation. It was undiscovered territory and that was to be its greatest attraction.

When Rohdie became Secretary of SEFT, he inherited the constituency of established SEFT members, though he did not perceive them as forming a coherent group.³ But he brought with him another constituency - one that might best be summarised as New Left. The potency of this constituency was first demonstrated at the Crisis Conference that Rohdie called in October 1971 when 170 people attended and from among whom Rohdie was to recruit several new Committee members, some of whom were also new to SEFT.⁴

Those teachers who were pre-existing SEFT members were probably those whom Lusted remembers as being surprised to find themselves in a crisis. Cook's view is that perhaps Rohdie's determination to go ahead with the conference, despite having settled SEFT's future with Forman, was fuelled by the need to recognise and respond to the significance of this new constituency.⁵

There is no doubt that following SEFT's move to 63 Old Compton Street, the Society set in motion a number of ventures which would reassure BFI Governors that SEFT was indeed more than simply the body that published *Screen*. This chapter will in the main consider these non-*Screen* ventures in the period up to the end of 1975. *Screen*'s history will feature in the next chapter, though as will be shown *Screen* was influential in a range of related SEFT and BFI activities during this period. The most important of these non-*Screen* ventures was *Screen Education Notes*, of which there were nine quarterly issues between Winter 1971 and Winter 1973/74. The 'Notes' had begun as a section at the back of *Screen* in 1971 called 'Educational Notes'.⁶ The first issue was typed and duplicated; subsequent issues were offset litho printed at generally around 40 pages per issue. Additionally there was a one-off *International Edition* that followed the October 1972 Ludwigshaven/Mannheim Conference. This conference on aspects of screen education was an annual event which had featured in the previous year's first issue of *Screen Education Notes*. The international edition was 'only a gesture on the part of SEFT, and does not have any official backing'.⁷ The published accounts of various European perspectives on screen education revealed - as had always been the case with previous SEFT international publishing ventures - a great variety of different approaches, some of which would have not been considered appropriate for any United Kingdom specific publication, hence the need for the disclaimer about official backing. Since the UK had been represented by Jim Hillier from the Educational Advisory Service of the BFI, rather than by SEFT, publication may have been a goodwill gesture to EAS on the Society's part.

Throughout its two-year existence the *Notes* was edited by Edward Buscombe and also for most of the period by Tom Ryall. They were supported by an active Editorial Board whose members regularly contributed items to the journal. Three members, Richard Collins, Jim Hillier and Chris Mottershead remained on the Board throughout. The change-over of other members was gradual and the continuity of approach was maintained. But the greatest significance as viewed from today's perspective is the subsequent

durability within the film teaching movement of those involved with *Screen Education Notes*. Previous generations of SEFT activists had served their time and then found career progress outside film and television teaching. Here and now was the first cohort who would develop long-term careers within screen education. Those involved with *Screen* might subsequently attract more attention and rise more visibly into the posts that would become available in higher education. But it was the group that produced *Screen Education Notes* that would be more influential and for longer in determining the evolution of media education.⁸

The SEFT Committee may have considered that, given the turmoil which surrounded the setting-up of SEFT's new found independence, there was a need conspicuously to address the established teacher audience within SEFT, since this was the grouping that some claimed had been disenfranchised by the 'New Left takeover'. Indeed an alternative body, the National Association for Film Education (NAFE), had been created which sought to replace SEFT as the institutional home for those teachers. SEFT's response was to shift 'Screen Education Notes' from its location at the back of *Screen* and to make it a separate publication. Ultimately the *Notes* would become *Screen Education* in 1974 and that journal would then establish its own distinctive identity. But for the period that the *Notes* existed it addressed a teacher audience and performed a crucial task. Events of the early 1970s in the arena of film and television education were occurring at a much faster rate than ever before and were beginning to demonstrate a shape and structure that would definitively replace what had gone before. *Screen Education Notes* took on the tasks both of detailing what was happening and of providing a commentary on its significance. The journal was able to fill its pages, to be current and yet repeatedly focus on developments that would prove to have long-term implications. There were sufficient of these for each issue of the *Notes* after Number 1 to focus on a discrete area.

The second issue dealt with students' film-making. It is clear that such was the controversy created at the October 1971 Crisis Conference around the separation of theory and practice that it was felt that if *Screen* was about to devote its first post Conference issue to Soviet Film in the 1920s, *Screen Education Notes* was the appropriate publication to redress the balance.⁹ Buscombe's editorial makes clear that, given how widely views on film making ranged, 'this journal can do no more than hope to open up the area of discussion'.¹⁰ He is equally clear that any previously assumed connection between the

experience of student film making and the same students' abilities in studying film must be open to question. The debate about this relationship has persisted ever since and has on occasions assumed fundamental importance in the construction of many courses at all levels. The shape of the debate has constantly been remodelled as the facilities offered by advancing technology have been absorbed by each generation of students at a younger age.

Thereafter the *Notes* managed to monitor contemporary developments. Its television issue in Summer 1972 coincided with the publication of veteran screen educationist Groombridge's book, the influential Penguin *Television and the People*.¹¹ Issue 4 was able to demonstrate how current substantial courses in higher education - in Art and Design and teacher training - were anticipating the introduction of 'a fully fledged degree level course in film'.¹² Issue 5 on film courses outside higher education gave space to the introduction of two initiatives that would have enormous influence in secondary schools: the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) Film Study Course for Sixth Formers and the proposals for a GCE Mode III O level in Film Study.¹³ These were complemented by a student's review of the long established but evolving Certificate in Film Study under the auspices of the University of London Extra Mural Department. Issue 6 faced the reality that other curriculum areas were using film as part of the delivery mechanism for their subjects and, following a cautionary editorial questioning how far this might restrict the development of film study itself, *Notes* features film in modern languages courses. It is ironic that film would eventually come to subvert some of the language departments that were ready to embrace it. When certain language departments could no longer recruit postgraduate students to enrol for MA language courses, they switched and offered Masters degrees in film.¹⁴

But Issue 6 addressed a more pressing reality: the raising of the school leaving age to 16 which was to follow later in 1973. Len Masterman, having moved from teacher training to in-service teacher education and having chosen as part of this move to teach a group of secondary school students who were in that first generation to stay until 16, writes a polemical piece.¹⁵

The problem thus created by the raising of the school leaving age, will, I believe, give substance to the view that for many children film ought to become the principal medium for the transmission of cultural values within school.¹⁶

The significance of Masterman's timely article is that he challenges the educational context in which the leaving age is being raised. This challenge would be one that the successor to *Notes, Screen Education*, would see as central to its mission. Here Masterman echoes the familiar attack on training in 'discrimination and taste' that had gathered momentum in the late 1960s.¹⁷ But he goes beyond this to argue for the displacement of literature from the curriculum of those students most affected by the raising of the school leaving age.

This kind of approach will almost certainly cut no ice with lower stream pupils. Perhaps the most potent reason why literature is able to say so little to them is that it is filtered down to them via middle-class sensibilities. The experience of watching film however is a lateral rather than hierarchical process. A filmic tradition has been experienced directly without the interference of an intermediary; it has been absorbed without being taught, transmitted without any moral overtones.¹⁸

The references in his text are to educationists and thinkers beyond the small comfortable world of film study: Freire, Postman, Weingartner, Illich and Reimer.

Issue 7 focused on the manner in which film was gaining acceptance in a particular facet of higher education: American Studies. It also had an article by Richard Dyer on 'Stars', the significance of this being that it was work that he had done at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, an institution that would parallel in its investigations issues that SEFT would also subsequently explore in each of its journals. The final two issues of *Notes* looked closely at the detail of film courses. Issue 8 attempted an evaluation of the now established ILEA course for Sixth Formers. Its assumptions were investigated by some of those teachers who had participated. This critiquing was extended to two very well established screen education events: the Young Screen Conference and the BFI Summer School. Alvarado questioned the whole basis of the Young Screen event, with its showing of school made films on the big screen for the benefit of a child audience. He advocated a replacement teacher only event with the focus being the educational case for film-making in schools. Bazalgette was equally radical in her assessment of the 1973 Summer School, which had been attended by 121 students coming with a very wide range of levels of knowledge about the cinema. Like Alvarado, she identifies an unwieldy event, trying to be as welcoming and inclusive as possible, with the consequence that the potential in each case for exploring fundamental issues was awkwardly evaded.

The last *Screen Education Notes* marked another significant start-up: the Diploma in Film Study at the Polytechnic of Central London (which would ultimately be converted to a Masters degree). It was however put into a very precise context in *Notes*: dissatisfaction with the London University Extra Mural Certificate and Diploma. *Notes* published two accounts: the revised scheme for the Extra Mural Course and an introduction to the Polytechnic's proposal by Richard Collins who saw the new diploma as a considered response to the 'unsatisfactoriness of the scheme of study and structure of the University certificate classes'.¹⁹ More recently Collins has claimed that the Diploma came out of the SEFT problematic.²⁰

Rohdie had promised Forman that in addition to *Screen Education Notes* SEFT would work both at developing regional groups and at extending the screen education message beyond the metropolitan area. In 1972 energy did go into these projects with SEFT-run courses at among other places: Ormskirk, York, Sheffield, St Austell, Exeter, Birmingham, Leicester, Bristol and Grimsby.²¹ The venues were self-selecting in that each had an institution or an individual with SEFT connections. This was a demanding schedule and Rohdie complained to the SEFT Committee of the additional workload this imposed.²² Perhaps it was unsurprising that by the end of 1972, the direct responsibility passed to the Educational Advisory Services with the setting up of a BFI/SEFT Regional Committee to oversee the process.²³

Delivering a one-day course in the regions was a straightforward, if time-consuming operation; establishing a permanent regional group was a task of a different order. In the Summer 1972 issue of *Notes* ten potential regional groups are listed, most in places where a SEFT course had taken place.²⁴ The named contacts were usually individuals in colleges or local education authorities, but the distribution across England was irregular and uneven. There was a plea to SEFT members to come forward and to participate in these embryonic groups or to start up their own groups. In the event none of these groups persisted. Only later would a small number of SEFT regional groups take shape.

The SEFT Summer School modified its ambition and from 1972 to 1974 took place annually in London, first at Stockwell College of Education and then at the Polytechnic of Central London. After this, as key SEFT members' involvement with the BFI Summer School increased, the SEFT summer school - which had always been scheduled to run at a

similar time during the school summer holiday period - ceased. It was however to be replaced by quarterly SEFT weekend schools, starting in spring 1975 and by the Easter residential schools for teachers starting in 1974.²⁵

If there is a moment in the brief history of *Screen Education Notes* that marks the separation of the film education movement of the 1970s from what had gone before, it is to be found in the two reviews it published of *Film in English Teaching*. This had been edited by Roy Knight for the newly re-branded BFI Educational Advisory Service and published elsewhere, though this may have been in order to secure wider distribution rather than at the insistence of Governors.²⁶ The book had been commissioned by the Education Department when it was still able to operate as an independent publishing section. The book's long period of gestation and the changing fortunes of the Education Department meant that it was not published until late 1972. These delays had served to ensure that the book, the ideas of which were embedded in the 1960s, would not match the needs of the 1970s.

If a book receives two simultaneous reviews in the same publication, it is usually an indication that it is controversial and therefore it becomes appropriate for it to receive one hostile and one sympathetic review. *Film in English Teaching* however came under sustained attack from both Len Masterman and Jim Cook.²⁷

Helpful as *Film in English Teaching* is in chronicling the movements of the past decade, it could well hinder the teacher who wishes to catch a whiff of the future.²⁸

If *Film in English Teaching* attracts newcomers to the idea of using film in their work and provides them with some basic information - well and good; if its ideological assertions are left unchallenged and become assimilated into an orthodoxy - less good.²⁹

The problem for both reviewers is that they recognise that the publication of this material in book form will serve only to reinforce precisely the kind of unreflective personal experience that the old-style *Screen Education* had regularly promulgated. For Masterman in particular it is no longer appropriate to make a facile link between the study of English and the study of film as equal elements in a shared culture.

Film in English Teaching represents an attempt to assimilate film into a cultural heritage which has itself been called into question by Freire, Marcuse and others who have shown us the ways in which it has become an instrument for domination in both school and society.³⁰

While it is possible to claim that Cook and Masterman have in effect jointly written an obituary for the work of their predecessors, it is relevant to indicate that the momentum that the screen education movement had gained by 1973 had only been possible because of what had gone before. The book's editor Roy Knight was well-placed to acknowledge this in his dedication.

...and finally to the various editors of *Screen Education* and *Screen*, and to the officers and members of the Society for Education in Film and Television over two decades - to their persistence and devotion to the causes of film and teaching this book is gratefully dedicated.³¹

If *Film in English Teaching* was out of date before it was published, there were soon indications that the BFI was finally prepared to give proper recognition to the importance of television in its educational brief. Although EAS was no longer permitted to be involved in publishing Cinema One books, it retained a member of staff responsible for directly educational publications, Christopher Williams (until 1973) and then Ed Buscombe. Williams began a series of monographs on television by different authors. The series of thirteen ran until 1981. Williams was aware that the only previous publication about television to emerge from within the BFI's education remit had been *Talking about Television* a decade earlier. This had done little beyond demonstrate that children might be encouraged to transfer to their discussions about television programmes the approaches already familiar to them when they discussed feature films. The first four monographs were published in the period 1973-75 and these, as Paterson observed, were disproportionately focused on television's current affairs output.³²

The SEFT that Knight had acknowledged in that dedication no longer existed, as he must have known since he had addressed the 1971 Crisis Meeting as SEFT's President, a role that had no constitutional input into the Society. However as a consequence of his success in the dispute with the BFI over SEFT, Rohdie had become a powerful and independent figure in the Society, the Committee of which had become seriously depleted in membership. Collins who joined the Committee in 1972 describes Rohdie as having 'energy, charisma, authority' while having to relate to 'a rump of people with stronger roots in schools and further education'.³³ Rohdie took it upon himself to find recruits both for the SEFT Committee and for the *Screen* Editorial Board. Rohdie's methods were *ad hoc*. Alvarado recalls being recruited to the Committee as a result of a chance encounter

with Rohdie at a screening.³⁴ If the SEFT committee still maintained a regime of regular meetings it seems that the *Screen* Editorial Board was a much more casual arrangement with little formality as Willemen recalls.³⁵ Lovell identifies Rohdie's readiness to recruit to the Board without seeking its approval as an early cause of the SEFT Committee's dissatisfaction with its Secretary/Editor.³⁶ The Associate Editors seem never to have met together. Neither Perkins nor Barr who were listed as such editors can recall any formal meeting. Their contact with *Screen* was always via its editor.³⁷

In recruiting to the Editorial Board Rohdie used his London contacts and quickly involved Brewster and Willemen. But he extended his searches when, following the publication of *Signs of the Times*, Stephen Heath and Colin MacCabe were contacted in Cambridge. MacCabe recalls how he learned from Heath that 'some people' in London were interested in contacting them.³⁸ This led to a Soho lunch with Rohdie and Wollen in 1973 and invitations to join the *Screen* Board followed. MacCabe who had found it impossible to get funding for *Signs of the Times*³⁹ and had paid to publish it himself, found the enticements of the *Screen* set-up irresistible, like an invitation to the best ever party. He could see how the staffing and funding that SEFT had achieved would provide a unique opportunity to promote the theories that he had found so attractive when researching in Paris. What is particularly significant about MacCabe's involvement was that he claims to have had no special interest in the cinema at that point. What he perceived was the scope to take theories that were already well developed in the abstract and to test them out in a territory where little previous serious thinking had taken place. Indeed Rohdie's strength as an editor seems to have been his readiness to act as a facilitator for the expression of other people's priority ideas. He wrote little himself for *Screen*. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith believes that Rohdie modelled his editorship on that of Perry Anderson, Editor of *New Left Review*.⁴⁰

It had been the Education Department seminars in the late 1960s that first provided a regular focus for the discussion of theoretical ideas. Given the prohibition from its governors, the BFI was not in a position to revive these. They were however reintroduced but with the label SEFT/BFI seminars on the unexceptional organisational rationale that SEFT would provide the intellectual leadership and the BFI the seminar spaces. The first tranche of the seminars in the spring of 1973 was designed to be 'a preparing ground for the 1973 Institute Summer School, "Concepts in Film Criticism"'.⁴¹ They followed the

pattern of the previous seminars where papers were circulated in advance and then presented at each seminar.

The next series of seminars were to be much more heavy duty:

It is suggested that each session a different member of the group summarise the content of the reading for that session; however, every member should prepare for the session in such a way that he could introduce the session himself if called upon to do so. Hence it is essential that every participant commit himself to carry out the reading for every session. The readings for each session are relatively short, amounting to less than 100 pages per session...⁴²

A further refinement was that the one large seminar group was now split into three groups, each with its own leader: Ben Brewster, Colin MacCabe and Kari Hanet. The seminars were to be 'more formalised and pedagogic, presenting a basic introduction to the concept of semiology or semiotics'.⁴³ It seems that for those able to attend and put in the work these seminars were welcome and productive events, as Douglas Lowndes, then the newly appointed Head of the Educational Advisory Services, recalls.⁴⁴ If those involved with *Screen* felt the need to set up these preliminary briefing sessions for their immediate contacts, there can be little doubt as to their assessment of the scale of the intellectual heave they were about to attempt in the pages of *Screen*.

Rohdie was a tough if idiosyncratic editor. A succession of controversial editorial decisions began with the Autumn 1972 issue when Rohdie published an article on English Hitchcock by John M Smith but pre-empted the reader's response by using his introductory editorial to undermine Smith's article by labelling him as someone who 'relates to an older and I think incorrect aesthetic position, but one nevertheless in the mainstream of British Film Criticism'.⁴⁵ It seems that part of the decision to print Smith's article was to set it against the collective text of the Editors of *Cahiers du Cinema* on *Young Mr Lincoln*, translated in the same issue. Smith's contribution was apparently an example of how not to do it. Then Rohdie quotes from V F Perkins's *Film as Film* as evidence of what constitutes this 'species of Romantic aesthetics'.⁴⁶ In fact Rohdie was preparing for his next attack when in the following *Screen* he printed a savage review of *Film as Film*. Perkins recalls that he was unprepared for the onslaught of Rohdie's review, having previously had amicable meetings when he had offered to help Rohdie. It seems that Rohdie's only concession to Perkins was to let him see the review in advance so that Perkins had his right of reply published immediately after Rohdie's hostile review.⁴⁷

Most of Rohdie's offending review is taken up with an attack on the recently published *Movie Reader* where he makes an attempt to locate its writing as a feature of the 1960s which had now been superseded, presumably by *Screen*.⁴⁸ Rohdie then sets out to discredit *Film as Film* by association. Rohdie claims that Perkins's book 'only makes sense in the context of the *Movie* tradition'.⁴⁹ Rohdie however begins his review by conceding that in *Film as Film* Perkins presents 'a rigorous, coherent explication and rationale of his own critical position'.⁵⁰ Given that Rohdie so assaults Perkins's position, this praise may be inferred as being extremely patronising to an author who allegedly offers a theory which relates 'only to a handful of directors'.⁵¹

Perkins's reply is eloquent and thoughtful but it elicited no further response from Rohdie.⁵² Indeed the editorial to this issue of *Screen* written by Alan Lovell, while making no direct reference to the book reviews, writes in a context that is more sympathetic to Perkins.⁵³ Lovell reminds readers how in its first Editorial (*Screen* Vol 12 No 1) Rohdie had stated

Auteurs are out of time. The theory which makes them sacred makes no inroads on vulgar history ... The primary act of auteur criticism is one of dissociation – the auteur out of time and history and society is also freed from any productive process...⁵⁴

In this *Screen* auteurs are put back into history with a substantial article on 'The Cinema of the Popular Front in France', as Lovell acknowledges. However what Lovell has to face up to, given Rohdie's previous claims for *Screen* to be a theoretical journal, is the obvious absence of theory from the issue which he is introducing.

We can only say in our defence that the production of theory is not as easy as we first thought, not so much a matter of pulling rabbits out of hats as, perhaps, we have made it seem. We have also become increasingly conscious that knowledge is needed as well as theory.⁵⁵

Knowing their material well was a quality that *Movie*'s editors and writers had always manifested.

In January 1973 Rohdie planned to publish later that year (as Volume 14 Number 2) an issue of *Screen* containing a series of articles on experimental cinema. Film-maker Malcolm Le Grice was hired to be in charge of this section and he set about commissioning articles from others with expertise in this area. Copy was expected by 1st April and was

delivered by that deadline.⁵⁶ At the beginning of June Le Grice got a letter from Rohdie which rejected the material.⁵⁷

Each member of the Editorial Board read all of the copies submitted and we all felt as a group that the material did not fulfil the function for which it was commissioned and we have therefore decided not to publish it.⁵⁸

By way of explanation Rohdie continued:

We felt that much of the copy submitted constituted propaganda and advertisement; that aesthetic problems were raised in only a vague way; that a fetish of technology, of alternative, was endlessly invoked, rather than analysed and constituted therefore more aesthetic ideology than aesthetic understanding.⁵⁹

An acrimonious exchange of correspondence followed.⁶⁰ Christopher Williams who had joined the Editorial Board in late 1971 and had had the task of representing the Board in discussions with Le Grice during the early spring of 1973, confirms that it was a decision by the whole Editorial Board.⁶¹ The acrimony arose not simply from the Board's rejection of the work but also from the fact that, having paid the contributors a fee for their work, Rohdie then claimed copyright of the material, despite not considering it fit for publication. A consequent editorial decision was made to compensate SEFT members for the missing issue by producing a double issue of *Screen*. This was achieved by increasing the amount of content in the 'Metz' issue to cover for the missing experimental cinemas issue.⁶²

There were other delegated projects that proved to be more successful. Rosalind Delmar recalls that Rohdie took the initiative in facilitating a women's cinema group that met to view and discuss films.⁶³ Claire Johnston who was associated with the group then wrote *Notes on Women's Cinema* which drew on the debates that had taken place within the group.⁶⁴ This was published as a *Screen* Pamphlet and sold out very quickly. Earlier Ed Buscombe's *Films on TV* had started the series.⁶⁵ However these specifically *Screen* publishing ventures were to cease after Rohdie's departure.

Rohdie appears to have related more effectively to his Editorial Board than to the SEFT Committee. Perhaps for this reason he involved the Editorial Board, but not the SEFT Committee in an expensive decision which led to a further controversy. Paul Willemen who joined the Editorial Board in autumn 1972 and Claire Johnston, who would later join the SEFT Committee, were principal figures in the organisation of the 1973 Edinburgh Film Festival which focused on the films of Frank Tashlin. It was the Festival's practice to

publish a small paperback book to support its screenings. Previously such books had been published in association with outside bodies who contributed financial assistance. On this occasion a book was published 'in association with *Screen*'.⁶⁶ This was a decision apparently taken by Rohdie who then chose to inform only the Editorial Board. Quite how expensive this venture finally became may only be approximately detected by comparing the total publication cost of 1972 (£7,086) with that of the following year when *Frank Tashlin* was published (£9,029).⁶⁷ An official SEFT link with the Festival was subsequently made in 1975 for what became known as the Brecht Event, transcribed in *Screen* a few months later.⁶⁸ Lynda Myles became Director of the Festival in 1974 and Laura Mulvey identifies Myles as the key figure in establishing this link.⁶⁹

There was increasing dissatisfaction with Rohdie which led to the Committee in late 1973 seeking legal advice as to its position, given that it had been Rohdie's employer since April 1972. The detailed letters sent to Rohdie setting out the causes of the Committee's dissatisfaction no longer survive in any archive. What do exist are two documents apparently prepared by Rohdie in response to those letters that had detailed the Committee's dissatisfaction.⁷⁰ What emerges from these documents is that there were issues which arose around Rohdie's personal style – a style that had enabled him first to stand up to the BFI and then effectively and confidently to recruit his own Committee and produce a transformed version of SEFT in just over two years. Nevertheless, having recruited to the Committee people who had responded to his crisis call two years earlier, Rohdie was now confronted by these same people who were taking their responsibilities very seriously, recognising that as members of the Executive Committee of SEFT they were answerable for substantial amounts of public money.

When the 1973 AGM took place in November of that year, some Committee members were well prepared and, having read the report that Rohdie had written for that occasion, they raised a motion from the floor which proposed that 'the Annual Report be rejected on the grounds that it did not represent a real reflection of the work, policy and position of the Society over the last 12 months'.⁷¹ The motion was eventually passed after much discussion, as was another motion that a Special General Meeting be called before 31 May 1974. The pressure increased on Rohdie who resigned on 28 February. As part of the deal worked out with the Committee his name stayed on *Screen* as editor for the Spring and Summer and the Autumn 1974 issues. Most of the editorial work for these issues fell

to Brewster and MacCabe who took on the task with relish and enthusiasm, although they were not in favour of Rohdie's departure.⁷²

Following Rohdie's departure, the SEFT Committee was able to complete its thorough review of the Society's work and organisational priorities. It had to hold a Special General Meeting in the summer of 1974 as it had promised at the abandoned AGM in November 1973 and it needed to have substantial proposals for that meeting. Changes were already under way even before the meeting. What SEFT members would have noticed first were the changes to *Screen Education Notes*. Its Contents page for the Spring/Summer 1974 double issue still appeared under the banner of 'Screen Education Notes' but its cover had a different emphasis. The new cover design like its predecessor had been borrowed from *Screen* but it now resembled the other journal even more closely. But on the new cover the name was now *Screen Education*. The 'Introduction' stated

The board feel that the term *Notes*, carried over in the title of the journal is no longer appropriate to the publication which has developed, so from this issue the journal will be called simply *Screen Education*.⁷³

Screen Education would now have different editors for each issue. This first issue had Cook, Hillier and Mottershead as editors, a consequence of the collaboration of both SEFT and the BFI Educational Advisory Service for this particular issue which was on CSE courses. SEFT's grant from the BFI was channelled through the EAS and Douglas Lowndes, who was very supportive of SEFT, found additional money specifically to finance *Screen Education*.⁷⁴

Further developments were manifested in the document produced for the Special General Meeting which eventually took place on 6 July 1974.⁷⁵ No longer were the tasks of General Secretary SEFT and Editor *Screen* to be combined. Editing *Screen* was now to be a paid half-time post. A new full-time post was to combine the Editorship of *Screen Education* with the new role of SEFT's Education Officer. In practice this post was much closer to what the SEFT Committee of 1970 had envisaged when it combined the Editorship of *Screen* with the role of General Secretary SEFT, in that under the new arrangements SEFT would have its own full-time professional officer overseeing a regular educational publication. But after the three years of Rohdie's involvement SEFT had not only gained its 1970 ambition but also now had its independence and additionally was the publisher of an influential intellectual journal that was avidly exploring new territory.

What the document recognises is the need for SEFT to identify its position in the rapidly evolving world of 1970s film and television education. What is also implicit in the following quotation (which makes no specific mention of *Screen*) is the Society's caution about what its involvement with *Screen*'s promotion of European theory might be likely to entail. There are separate references in three of the four proposed aims to SEFT's engagement with British culture.

The Executive Committee proposes to utilise the reformed structure of the Society and deployment of staff outlined in order to put into practice the following basic aims:

- to promote the study of film and TV and the identification of their disciplines within the context of British culture;
- to work towards the growth of a British film and television culture;
- to encourage the development of film and television education within the context of the British cultural and educational scene;
- to ensure the closest links between the prosecution of these three interrelated areas, in particular by re-dressing the present imbalance through putting more staff and financial resources into the journal *Screen Education* and related education work.⁷⁶

The Committee, having got the agreement of the Special Meeting, was then in a position to make appointments to each of these posts. They selected two individuals who had demonstrated proven qualities: Alvarado, an established member of both the SEFT Committee and the *Screen Education* Board, became Education Officer/Editor *Screen Education* from 1 January 1975. Brewster could now be properly recognised from 1 December 1974 as Editor of *Screen*, a task he had already been discharging on a voluntary basis for nearly a year.⁷⁷ There were two further posts which were already in place: a part-time Business Manager (Ann Sachs) and a full-time Editorial/Administrative Officer (Elizabeth Cowie).

Screen Education Notes had kept a record of developments beyond SEFT. For many teachers in the early and mid 1970s these would be of more direct consequence than the institutional changes within SEFT. The BFI/ILEA Sixth Form Film Study Course which originated in 1972 was unlike any previous project in screen education for several reasons.⁷⁸ It was on a large scale; it evolved over many years; its materials were produced as part of a collective enterprise focused around the BFI Educational Advisory Services; an advisory teacher was appointed by the ILEA specifically to support the teaching and the participating teachers were to be continuously involved in its evaluation.⁷⁹ There were to be further benefits which would extend beyond ILEA: the supporting documentation was

publicly available and could be used by teachers not participating in the course while through their involvement in the course, numerous London teachers began the process of becoming film and media teachers.

The origins of the course were modest. Michael Simons, a teacher at Wandsworth School, who also ran a local ILEA centre for Teachers of English had in 1970 arranged to hire the National Film Theatre for the screening of three versions of Hamlet to A Level students studying English. Seeing how successful the screening of films to students under such ideal conditions had been, Simons contacted the Inspectorate to see if there was support for a film study course.⁸⁰ Leslie Ryder, the Aural and Visual Aids Inspector, who had supported the earlier SEFT experiment in one ILEA division and now presided over an expanding Learning Resources community in the authority, supported the proposal. He set up a preliminary investigative course in autumn 1971 for teachers in secondary and further education who might be interested in teaching film.⁸¹ Ryder's subsequent commitment extended to the appointment of Chris Mottershead as Advisory Teacher to support the work from January 1973. In the following year Mottershead would become Chairman of SEFT. The authors of the materials in the early years of the project were Jim Cook, Cary Bazalgette, Christine Gledhill, Michael Simons and Jane Clark.⁸² Jim Hillier who committed much of his time at EAS to the ILEA Project felt that in doing this he was in practice involved in a much more substantial project of designing a particular approach to film teaching. He had a particular involvement in the production of slides which he felt was introducing a new focus of study: the detail of *mise-en-scène*.⁸³

The project was expensive but very successful, with 500 students from 37 London schools participating in the first year.⁸⁴ Such was the enthusiasm of schools that the original single screening in NFT 1 was supplemented by a second in NFT 2 on a different afternoon.⁸⁵ The course was offered as a contribution to sixth form General Studies.⁸⁶ There was no particular expectation of written work from the students and no examination at the end. However over time the course was to change. It ran for some thirteen years and eventually a smaller group of some a dozen schools was attending when the course was geared specifically to the requirements of the CEE (Certificate of Extended Education) Examination, as the composition of ILEA sixth form groups changed.⁸⁷

Whatever benefits individual students may have received from the course, probably its most lasting importance would be in the scale of on-the-job training it offered to would-be film and media teachers. There were specially prepared materials for students, but more significantly substantial Teachers' Notes were produced simultaneously. The screenings were fortnightly and in each alternate week the teachers had the task of using the materials in the classroom. When a major review of the course was undertaken in 1976, teachers were supplied with a version of the students' material into which the notes for the teacher had been incorporated.⁸⁸ Previously the teacher had had to juggle two booklets. However the extracts from texts to which the students were referred were no longer in a single student booklet but were now produced separately, so each student had two booklets: Study Notes and a Study Guide. At this stage of the development, documentation was the work of Cook and Hillier from the BFI together with Mottershead.⁸⁹ A substantial part of the course now focused on the use of specially chosen slides made specifically for the course from frame enlargements.⁹⁰

Like the long-term support by the BFI for the London University Extra Mural Course, this was another metropolitan venture where the location of BFI facilities determined that the population of the capital would be the beneficiaries. There was a previous history of such ventures in that the National Film Theatre had been the venue for BFI Film Appreciation Department/London County Council joint lectures for students since the 1950s. But on this occasion there were additional favourable factors. The BFI Governors wanted to see their educational staff directly servicing teachers and that desire justified large scale BFI involvement in the course. The ILEA had introduced in 1968 training for the first holders of the posts of Media Resources Officers. These MROs wanted to have responsibilities around media which clearly defined them as being more than AVA technicians. Supporting film study fitted into the desired category of additional expertise.⁹¹

What linked the ILEA course to almost all previous developments in screen education was its grass roots origin. It had started from the initiative of a single teacher who saw an opportunity to replicate in a larger arena what individual teachers had done for years in their own school or college situations. Simultaneously another teacher led initiative was to have long-term consequences. David Lusted, then a lecturer in further education who had developed a CSE syllabus, decided to approach all the GCE O level boards with a proposal for an examination in film at that level.⁹² Only the Associated Examining Board

responded positively, albeit saying in effect 'very interesting but not yet'. However when one of their examiners subsequently had a letter published in the *Times Educational Supplement* calling for the media to be studied in schools, Lusted seized the opportunity and got the Board to call a meeting of interested parties. Subsequent progress was rapid with Lusted appointed convener and then moderator when the first group of about a dozen schools in the London and South East area submitted candidates for the examination in 1972. The film O level (or more accurately OA level) went national in its third year.

The ILEA project and the O level were similarly constructed to contain in their syllabuses the emphases of film study that were then current: authorship, genre and an understanding of the film industry. The teachers who were pioneering these developments had a problem. They saw that these projects offered opportunities to be seized by teachers in order to secure a firmer place for film study within educational institutions. However they were also aware of the momentum that was building around the development of film study. In designating specific elements for inclusion in the structure of syllabuses, they were indicating a degree of certainty as to the nature of these elements, whereas the reality was that they were giving authenticity to areas that should more appropriately have been labelled as work in progress.

By the autumn of 1975, with Alvarado now established as Editor of *Screen Education*, the journal signalled recognition of the tentative nature of the concepts that it was addressing.

Thus the present situation is one in which members of the editorial board see the need for a continuing re-examination of how the field of film, television, media might be conceptualised and for a reconsideration of how the 'subject' ought to be presented.⁹³

In a series of articles around teaching about the Film Industry, the scale of the shift in thinking that might be required of film teachers is made much clearer. In the leading article Cook looks critically at the way that teaching about the industry had been justified in the Teachers' Introduction to the original Industry Unit on the ILEA course.⁹⁴

The industrial context, therefore, is presented as one of organisation - obtaining and financing personnel and plant; conceiving of an audience and appealing to them by particular forms of presentation; while the work itself is justified to the teacher on the assumption of some sort of relationship between it and 'the wider critical issues and problems involved in studying film', and to the student on the assumption that it will enable him/her 'to become more aware of film as a specific medium which requires understanding and might therefore be worth studying'.

As with the metaphorical descriptions referred to in Nos 10/11 of *Screen Education*, at the time such a generalised justification was sufficient to get the work established, and given the fact that so few coherent models for work on the industry existed prior to this course, it is perhaps inevitable anyway that it should be justified in these terms. Now however with such work more firmly established, there is a need to try and refine the description of what it might set out to do, and to examine more rigorously justifications for it - bearing in mind that this is not an attempt to put a brake on such work but rather to attempt to assess more precisely what, if anything, the nature and outcome of such work might be.⁹⁵

The scale of the potential task of *Screen Education* becomes clearer as Cook develops his thinking. He identifies the gap that exists between the level of theory being advanced by *Screen* in the work of writers such as Althusser, Benjamin and Williams and the more detailed investigations also published in *Screen* from Barr, Ellis and Buscombe. The writings of the first group of writers, he suggests, did not provide a clear theoretical perspective that was applicable to the study of the industry while the latter's researches are too specific to allow for meaningful generalisations about the industry to be inferred.⁹⁶

Cook then has to accept that the level of concern that he is recording has different implications for different student groups. The rather simplistic recognition of the functional role of the film industry in the production of texts that the original ILEA course had accommodated clearly needs to be challenged. But he can offer little by way of how to develop it. He has to acknowledge that

...at the secondary and further level it is probably enough to endorse the general concern of broadening the perspectives in which film is considered and we should work towards devising material which generally (and perhaps intuitively) seem to help achieve this...⁹⁷

But it is at the higher education level that the changes are imperative where

...one ought to embark on the production of more substantive research analogous to Barr's and Ellis's and more generally to subject existing substantive material on the industry ...to an ideological scrutiny of the extent to which they do or do not recognise some determining role for the industry.⁹⁸

This instance has more general applicability. Until the 1970s it was the case that the impetus for film and television study came from the grass-roots. Whannel, in his determination to get film study established in higher education, realised that there were limits as to how far the grass-roots might continue to be the engine driving the movement. He therefore consistently called for developments to be set up in higher education. Now

that *Screen* existed to push ahead with theoretical developments and *Screen Education* had the distinctive role of connecting the emerging area of theoretical film study with its delivery in classrooms, it was evident that there was a problem. The subject specific expertise that most teachers acquired in higher education before being required to perform in the classroom had not been there for film teachers. Provision of more resources of intellectual stimulation for would-be film teachers was now on the agenda. This would be met in a number of ways.

While the BFI collaborated with ILEA to deliver the film study course for sixth formers, another long-term player in the development of film study, the National Union of Teachers, collaborated with SEFT to provide week-long Easter schools in 1974 and 1975.⁹⁹ These were targeted specifically at teachers and allowed wider scope for the investigation of the ideas that were being explored in *Screen Education*. In 1975 Philip Simpson, a lecturer at Alnwick College of Education, attended with some of his students and as a group they reported on the experience.¹⁰⁰ Unlike the substantial recruitment for the BFI summer schools, attendance here was much smaller (24 students). Most of those who came were familiar with the concepts involved. Alvarado, having taken over the organisation of the event when he became Education Officer three months earlier, reported back to the Executive that the attendance had been disappointing. Thirty students had attended in 1974 and more had been expected. Among his reasons for the low turnout was the fact that NAFE had run 'a much cheaper, shorter course at exactly the same time'.¹⁰¹ The significance of the Alnwick report lies in its questioning of the centrality of film study. During the week students had spent time both looking at carefully selected images - such as those proposed in the work of Golay and Gauthier - and also had participated in photoplay exercises.¹⁰² These activities had given rise to questions about the wider relevance of image study. Simpson and his students felt that the question 'Why teach film?' which had opened the first session of the week (and had been resurrected unanswered at the end of the course) avoided wider issues.¹⁰³

But the raising of this question in a final seminar showed how arguments stemming from film as 'popular culture' or from the need for developing understanding of the way images, with or without sound, work make at least as much sense in the context of media studies generally and are by no means specific to Film Study.¹⁰⁴

Perhaps the most influential of the mechanisms by which potential film teachers outside the ILEA were to be trained was the annual BFI Summer School.¹⁰⁵ Lusted considers that

there was a definite progression route for teachers, who would transfer from the Easter Schools to the Summer Schools.¹⁰⁶ In the 1960s these schools had followed a pattern common to much of the wider summer school movement. They provided the opportunity for a learning holiday, with formal sessions usually occupying only a part of each day. In the 1970s BFI Summer Schools changed to become events that in the descriptions of many who attended them were both exhilarating and exhausting.¹⁰⁷ The intensity of the events was in part a result of the Educational Advisory Service having been restricted in what it might do. Philip Simpson is clear that the Summer Schools were the way in which the EAS was able to define itself at a time when its contribution in other areas had been restricted.¹⁰⁸ Planning for each subsequent summer school would begin in the autumn and the use of the two weeks would be constructed with great care since the school now represented the main opportunity for BFI's educational staff to address teachers and lecturers.¹⁰⁹ But alongside this circumstance was the existence of SEFT and in particular of *Screen*.

The organisers of the BFI Summer School saw an important part of its function as being the interface between the theorists of Old Compton Street and the teacher in the classroom. The rapidity with which the summer school's organisation was changed is reflected in how events were recalled in the booklet *BFI Summer Schools '71-'79* published after the Education Department was given back its old status in the 1980s.¹¹⁰

However, in general terms it is worth signalling the moves from a 1971 school which was in effect constructed before the new *Screen* began publishing (Spring 1971) through to those of 1972 - 1976 where in varying ways attempts are made to describe and understand formal semiotic approaches to cinema and particularly to assess the ways in which they developed and/or displaced more traditional critical notions such as authorship, genre, mise-en-scène.¹¹¹

The pace of change may be detected in a number of ways. In 1971 the Summer School was held at Eastbourne College of Education. 16 mm film-making was still a feature of the course with obligatory end-of-course screenings for the student made films. The reading list and checklist of texts supplied to the students in advance of the fortnight occupied only a single sheet of A4.¹¹² By 1975 film-making had disappeared, its demise preceded in the intervening years by a shift first to 8 mm and then to video. The 1975 reading and checklists now amounted to nine sides of A4.¹¹³ The school found a more congenial and permanent home from 1972, being based in Scotland at the University of Stirling, a location that had the added advantage of being backed by financial support from

the Scottish Film Council. In its advance publicity prospective students were advised that 'priority is given to applicants such as film teachers'.¹¹⁴

The 1971 school, 'Realism: Theory and Practice' had been built around the British Documentary Movement, Italian Neo-realism and the writings of Bazin. In doing so it was not that different from summer schools of the 1960s when a title like 'The Western' was a draw for students and sufficient justification for staff.¹¹⁵ By 1972 the title was 'Technique/Style/Meaning' and *Screen* articles made up half of the checklist of texts. Both Rohdie and Perkins featured on the list of staff.¹¹⁶ The latter recalled how out of place he felt at the event, where it appeared that semiotics and Marxism were to be presented as the new critical normality. By default he found himself to be 'the voice of the opposition'. He recalls that when he challenged the apparently unquestioned acceptance of Marxism, he felt he was being identified as part of the enemy.¹¹⁷ It seems that the charge of 'intellectual terrorism' that was subsequently to be levelled at *Screen* started in Stirling. For different reasons neither Rohdie nor Perkins would be on the summer school staff again.

Of the 120 students present in 1972, 45 were from overseas, the largest single contingent being from the USA. The great majority were working or studying in educational establishments.¹¹⁸ From the list of all the students it is possible to identify numerous participants who would become very influential in the subsequent development of film and media teaching.¹¹⁹ If the 1972 list functions as a snapshot because it is available, nevertheless the pattern would persist in subsequent years, as successive cohorts arriving at the BFI Summer School would routinely contain a core of dedicated enthusiasts who would subsequently be involved with film and media teaching in the long-term.

In 1973 'Concepts in Film Criticism' were on the agenda. Perhaps the experience of disjuncture that Perkins had experienced led to the school being introduced thus:

The course assumes that film criticism and film theory are at a crucial juncture which demands that questions which have been raised and debated, particularly over the last ten to fifteen years in magazines like *Cahiers du Cinéma*, *Sight and Sound*, *Movie*, *Screen*, etc, be reviewed and re-examined.

The course will concern itself both with general attitudes to the cinema and to film criticism and theory, and more particularly with some of the concepts which have been used in critical and theoretical writing, for example concepts of mise-en-

scène, authorship, genre. The course will also take account of the way semiology and ideology have been discussed in relation to the cinema and examine attempts to approach cinema more scientifically on the basis of these concepts.¹²⁰

By the following year 1974 'Critical Theory and Film Analysis' has a reading list not dissimilar to that of 1973. However the design of the event had changed with the first week 'a concentrated introductory study of certain areas developed in criticism and critical theory over the last decade'. Given the disparity in student backgrounds that Bazalgette had noted in her review of the 1973 course, the planners had recognised that there needed to be some preliminary preparation before week two with its 'intensive analyses of particular films'.¹²¹ Roy Stafford, a summer school regular, considers this to have been the first '*Screen* theory' Summer School.¹²²

In 1975 the school subject was 'Genre: Problems and Approaches' where the films under scrutiny would be American film noir. But the context had changed from that in which the Western had been considered in the 1960s. Now it was the concept of genre itself that was under investigation.

Despite widespread use of the concept, particularly in discussions of film as popular art, genre has remained uncertain in definition and problematic in application. The school will aim to assess the nature and usefulness of the concept of genre in the development of film study and criticism, looking at areas such as generic approaches in other arts, relations between art and society, conventions of narrative, style and subject matter, the intersection of genre with other critical approaches such as authorship.¹²³

Demonstrative of the intensity of this inquiry was the re-scheduling of the students' day. As practical work had disappeared the free time available to students in the afternoon had been curtailed.

The authors of *BFI Summer Schools 71 – 79* consider the 1976 Summer School (Film: Image and Analysis) to be the last in the sequence of those that were heavily indebted to *Screen*. Important in its content were the days devoted to 'Psychoanalysis and the Cinema'.¹²⁴ These sessions would have been planned in late 1975 when four members of the *Screen* Editorial Board had written a statement questioning the significance that *Screen* was giving to psychoanalysis.¹²⁵ By the summer 1976 issue of *Screen* and the timing of the summer school, all four had resigned. Thereafter the delivery of BFI Summer Schools would be less influenced by the theories coming out of Old Compton Street.¹²⁶

SEFT's weekend schools were designed for a more specialist audience than the BFI summer schools. The weekends were advertised in such a way that they were likely to attract those who read *Screen* and/or *Screen Education*. If the summer schools were facilitated by the BFI and if as a consequence the BFI's staff were to form the transmission mechanism for certain of *Screen's* theories, the weekend schools provided a more direct address from SEFT rather than from *Screen* to its membership and to others during 1975 and 1976. The sequence of schools was: Narrative and the Cinema; Mise-en-scène; Women and Film; Television Fiction: the Series; *The Searchers*; Pleasure, Entertainment and the Popular Culture Debate; Realism and the Cinema; British Independent Cinema/Avant-Garde.¹²⁷ Christine Geraghty who joined the SEFT Executive in 1975 believes that the significance and strength of these events derived from their being seminar driven, without the formality of lectures.¹²⁸

The regularity of the weekend schools was a direct result of SEFT now having its own Education Officer, part of whose remit was to develop these events. Costings for the four 1975 schools exist and show that two schools made a profit. The total deficit for the year was £27. The full fee per student was £4.32 which divided into the figures for receipts would suggest that attendance for each event was in the range of 50 to 80 students.¹²⁹ These were intensive weekends, running from Friday evening to late Sunday afternoon, with students receiving in advance substantial documentation.¹³⁰ At this time, weekend events were usually held at the London International Film School. Unlike the series of seminars that preceded them, these were open to all.

One major development was totally within the remit of the BFI. Whannel had always argued for film in higher education and had indeed been directly approached by Warwick University in the late 1960s about the possibilities of the funding of a film teaching post there being provided by the BFI.¹³¹ After the re-organisation of the Education Department, the BFI Governors established an Advisory Committee on Grants to Higher Education and in 1972 began to offer funding for which universities might apply.¹³² This was one of the last decisions to be made by Reed who retired from the BFI in June 1972. Williams and McArthur believe that Reed's decision to proceed with this proposal was a direct consequence of the upheavals in the Education Department.¹³³ Reed, it is suggested, felt the need to demonstrate recognition of those calls from within the BFI for film to have a

place in higher education and, by giving money to selected universities, he might ensure that these developments could be definitively outsourced.

The task of approaching the universities fell first to Williams and then to Buscombe as part of the publication officer's brief. The project was designed to be enticing. The BFI would fund a full-time post for three years, after which the intention was that the university would take over the funding. Each year starting in 1973 a new post would be created at a different university, so that by 1975 and thereafter BFI would be funding a total of three such lectureships annually. The Governors under Forman accepted these arrangements, but were reluctant still to shift their basic position and went on record as having schools as their priority.¹³⁴

The BFI offer was specific to universities, not polytechnics. Consequently whereas there were developments in some polytechnics into which such lectureships might have been suitably fitted, with the universities there were no automatic connections to be made. The task for BFI therefore was threefold: first to find an appropriate niche in a sympathetic university, then to define the job to be done there and finally to appoint someone to fit the post. Finding a niche in the system where film study might flourish had some similarities with what had been happening in schools during the three post-war decades. In different institutions film would find a different home but the underlying justification would be that, for whatever reason, student numbers were increasing and meeting the needs of a greater number of students simply by offering more of the same was becoming less and less sustainable.

The first lectureship went to Warwick which had campaigned longest. But a solitary lecturer can only provide a modest offer to students. To maximise recruitment, Warwick offered a single option open to students in all departments of the university. The post itself was attached administratively to the Theatre Studies Department. The postholder was Robin Wood who saw his long-term task as developing a full Single Honours Degree in Film Studies.¹³⁵ In succeeding years post were established at Keele (Richard Dyer, 1974) and Essex (Peter Wollen, 1975).¹³⁶ At Keele the post was divided between the undergraduate American Studies Department and the university's adult extra mural work where film had had an established position since film study there had first been encouraged by Roy Shaw in the 1950s. At Essex Wollen was in the Department of Language and

Linguistics where his classes formed no part of any degree scheme and as he observed 'my work is somewhat marginal to the concerns of the University'.¹³⁷ He did however establish a class in Semiotics within his 'home' department.

From the contemporary observations of these pioneer post holders, it is clear that, even with BFI funding, the early years of the pump-priming operation did not initiate a period when film study took a firm hold within the host universities. Again there were echoes of what had happened in schools where, when courses began, only a small number of students benefited but found themselves to be learning in the context of the improving expertise and knowledge of their teacher/lecturer. When *Screen Education* published accounts from each of these early lecturers it is clear that each was able to use the scope of his post to develop his own particular research and teaching interest. As for the students, their interests were partly determined by what reference material was available for them, when so few texts had been published. There was however scope for initiative. At Warwick two students in Wood's first intake started the journal *Framework*; for Keele students there was the option of participating in a successful local SEFT group; while at Essex Wollen in his first year offered the Semiotics specialism drawing heavily on *Screen* material.¹³⁸

In the Educational Advisory Service Douglas Lowndes did not attempt to reproduce the charismatic leadership that Whannel had given. He gave his staff scope to develop their own work within the reduced remit now given to EAS. But he was at heart a practitioner rather than an administrator or a manager. He needed to find an outlet for his expertise. Lowndes had established a reputation as an innovator when involved in teacher training at Hornsey College of Art in the 1960s. There his work had challenged long established ideas about children's film making as a group exercise, albeit he had done this from a situation where he was able to experiment with children's creativity outside the constraints of the school curriculum. Subsequently while at the BFI, Lowndes collaborated with Thames Television Schools Department and produced in Autumn 1975 a series of television programmes called *Viewpoint*, targeted at students aged 14 and above. The ten programmes and their associated notes for teachers provided 'a 10 week course on mass communications which could be used by teachers of English, Art and History either within their separate disciplines or as an interdisciplinary study'.¹³⁹

The programmes combined observations made direct to camera, by the presenter, Lowndes, with illustrated visual material from advertisements, films and television. Commentary on both this material and on the assertions of the presenter was provided by specially written music and lyrics, performed to camera by actors. A Monty Python-esque quality was inserted into some of the graphics. Each episode usually ended either with a small number of students from a selection of schools commenting on the issues raised in the preceding programme or with students participating in a further experiment to test out *Viewpoint's* hypotheses. At the conclusion of each programme Lowndes cautioned the audience with the proviso that the views they had seen and heard were those of the presenter; the challenge was for them to continue the debate in the classroom when the programme was over.¹⁴⁰

There were clear parallels between the work that Lowndes had done at Hornsey and was then attempting in collaboration with Thames Television. Although always involving school students in the experimental situation, in neither place was Lowndes working within the constraints of a given school's curriculum or organisation. This had the advantage of foregrounding in the experiment what might be possible when circumstances changed within schools. Thus his 8 mm film work in the 1960s, which celebrated the individual student's creativity, did become a model for work in schools in the 1970s when simple portable equipment became cheaper and more plentiful. *Viewpoint* proved to be more controversial.

The problem for *Viewpoint* was not that the teachers using the programme complained about it. They simply did not organise to support it, because it had no dedicated audience.¹⁴¹ Had *Viewpoint* been received by teachers of Media Studies, if they had existed at that time, then its innovative use of television to inquire into the mechanisms of the media would have been recognised and commended. What did happen was that the Independent Broadcasting Authority intervened to prevent any repeat broadcasting of the series in the following school year.¹⁴² The grounds for the intervention were bizarre and followed objections by the Board and Management of Southern Television.

The company have informally advised IBA staff that they do not wish to transmit the repeat of the series in autumn 1976, since the programmes could cause offence to the general audience in the home.¹⁴³

The Head of Education Programmes at the IBA who found himself at the centre of events in 1976 was Brian Groombridge. Groombridge, who only fifteen years earlier had represented the radical edge of screen education thinking, now found himself in opposition to one of the next generation of radical screen educators. This situation would become not untypical of the upheavals within the movement generally that would follow in 1976. Much had been achieved in the half decade that followed the BFI Governors' decision to behead their own Education Department. But if it seemed that the programme of events and publications seen in 1975 would represent a new normality, 1976 was to demonstrate otherwise.

CHAPTER FIVE 1976-1977

SCREEN SAVIOURS

The SEFT Committee, concerned about how far *Screen* was being understood, organised a regular series of events (one-day conferences, week-end schools) which aimed to explicate and explore the kinds of issues dealt within *Screen* and *Screen Education*. The majority of the *Screen* board were noticeable for their absence from these events and have been censured for this by the committee.

Edward Buscombe, Christine Gledhill, Alan Lovell and Christopher Williams, 1976

On a wintry campus in early 1976 film teachers meet to take stock and start to expand their remit into the study of media. The intellectuals producing Screen propose psychoanalysis as the theory to complement its Althusserian structuralism and for some SEFT stalwarts this becomes a resigning matter. The first Screen Reader will appear in 1977. Screen Education is less troubled by factionalism and is increasingly confident in its pursuit of a theoretical understanding of both education and media. It will achieve 96 pages by 1978. The Society's membership divides at its 1976 Annual General Meeting where, despite some decisive voting, it seems that nobody will win in the long term.

1976 started for some screen educationists with their attendance at a unique event. Early in January a conference was held at York University entitled 'Film and TV Studies in Secondary Education'. The joint organizers, the SEFT and BFI/EAS Regional Committee, had determined to invite as many practitioners as possible. If they were limited in the success of their targeted recruitment, the overall attendance was impressive. 'Of the eighty six delegates listed for the conference only thirty four were actually teaching at secondary level, and the remainder included inspectors, advisers, film officers and lecturers in tertiary education.'¹ Once assembled they had none of the consolations usually provided at such events by screenings, apart from *Invasion of the Bodysnatchers* which was shown on the Saturday evening. They had to stay focused on the issues for some six days. That such a lengthy and specific event was possible in 1976, which would have been unthinkable five years earlier, is a measure of the pace of development that film study had undergone in the preceding five years. 1976 and subsequent years would prove to be significant in the history of screen education for a number of reasons.

Later in 1976 Prime Minister James Callaghan would start his 'Great Debate' around educational issues which was designed to curtail educational experimentation and thereby begin to counter the influence that the left was assumed to be gaining within education. For the general public, the intensive press coverage of such proceedings as the ILEA

inquiry into the events at the William Tyndall Junior and Infant Schools had provided a dramatisation of such claims. The inquiry had reported in July 1976. In higher education individuals would be targeted in the following year when Julius Gould produced his report on Radical and Marxist Penetration.² George Foster recalls that SEFT was implicated in its findings.³

Victor Perkins had found himself out of step at the 1972 BFI summer school when he observed that Marxism seemed to be the orthodoxy of belief for the new generation of screen educationists. In preparing participants for the York conference Jim Cook and Jim Hillier had produced an introductory paper detailing the growth of film and television studies. Its bibliography was very selective containing only four works, all demonstrating Marxist thinking and influence. When the paper was reprinted a year later the list had been extended to include *Screen Education 22*, the 'Popular Culture' issue, published in Spring 1977. By the mid 1970s the consensus of interviewees is that most screen education activists, whether in SEFT or BFI, were positioned politically on the Left. In early 1977 Robin Wood's move leftwards is revealed in an account of his work at Warwick University.

The question of ideology - the urgent necessity for examining and evaluating all our acquired and inherited assumptions at a time when bourgeois capitalism, and civilisation as we know it, may be entering its final phase of disintegration - has become increasingly prominent on all my courses, as in my published criticism.⁴

SEFT had two journals; both were part of what may be considered a New Left project. Interviews with the participants in the project have demonstrated that SEFT was a very broad church and that even for the most politically active, its publications were not the preferred location for their activism. What all those who wrote for *Screen* and *Screen Education* did share was a sense of being in pioneer thinking territory. Previous generations of SFT and SEFT activists had succeeded in demonstrating that a wide range of film and television activity was possible with students of all ages. Whilst having reservations about what others might be doing under the heading of screen education, there was little criticism between those in the movement, probably because they were all accustomed to being on the receiving end of antipathy from those outside it. Again a feature of the interviews for this investigation has been how, at all levels of education, many of those who had ventured into screen education even during the 1970s and 1980s reported encountering persistent institutional opposition to their work. The presence of

two substantial SEFT journals was to be a decisive factor in changing this situation, not by displacing the opposition but by developing solidarity among screen educationists.

External hostility lost its capacity to unify screen educationists once there was scope for proper debate within the screen education arena. What each of the SEFT journals did was not only to legitimise controversy within screen education but also to demonstrate that it might be very productive. They did this in completely different ways. For *Screen* the task was the more straightforward. It wanted to apply theory where previously theory had been largely absent: to investigate the nature of film and its reception. For *Screen Education* it was a more complex task. Manuel Alvarado has defined it as a tripartite enterprise. 'This was to try and link: (a) film theory (b) educational theory and (c) educational practice/pedagogy.'⁵

If the 1970s was a time when film theory was evolving rapidly, it was also a time when educational theory was controversial. Thus the educational perspectives underlying the articles in *Screen Education* are probably more variable than the film theory with which they engaged. The particular problem for *Screen Education* was to find a body of educational theoretical work which would provide an analysis compatible with the stance that the Editorial Board wished to take.⁶ There was however an explicit recognition of the significance of these debates within SEFT by winter 1976 when the first eighty eight page issue of *Screen Education* could now be perceived to be an equal partner to *Screen*.

Evidence of a new found readiness on the part of SEFT to take risks was demonstrated in Summer 1976. Chapter Seven ended with the refusal of the IBA to sanction the repeat screenings of *Viewpoint*. Background documentation about the refusal had been leaked to *Screen Education* from inside the Independent Broadcasting Authority. The Editors decided to publish it.⁷ The justification for the IBA's refusal was a curious one: they argued they had a duty to protect the adult daytime television viewer. This was the basis of the case put forward to the IBA by Southern Television, apparently the prime mover in opposing the repeats. Southern argued that the IBA risked being in breach of Section 4 (1) (f) of the relevant Broadcasting Act. The thrust of their argument appears to have been that in the classroom the teacher was present to take up the issues raised by the programme and deal with them immediately. The home viewer, however, might be left floundering, confronted by 'matters of political and industrial controversy' without the guaranteed

safety mechanism available in the classroom. If the programme had this potential to disturb the adult viewer, we must assume that the IBA felt confident that the teacher would be both willing and able to neutralise Lowndes's critiques. One can only infer that the television company in objecting to Programme 8 was resisting what appeared to be a view of society from a left perspective and one that consistently referred to the non transparency of television broadcasting. The *Viewpoint* series in a revised form was eventually transmitted again in 1977.

An unexplored aspect of the *Viewpoint* events is the context in which the programme came to be produced. The creative energy for the series came from Douglas Lowndes, who happened to be the head of BFI/EAS at a time. Lowndes's involvement with film and media had begun in the 1960s when he had been working in initial and in-service teacher training at Hornsey College of Art. He had found in that situation ways of working directly with school students and had experimented with a range of creative film, photography and recording techniques. These practitioner instincts were still there when he was at the BFI, where he was able to use a comparable freedom to that he had enjoyed at Hornsey to involve groups of students in the work he would then show on *Viewpoint*. He recognised that if you could demonstrate to students and their teachers that the ideas within the programme might be translated into effective classroom practice, this would make the strongest case to doubtful teachers for looking critically at the media.

Lowndes was not the only 'independent' practitioner to become strongly influential in the development of media education. The IBA did not allow a repeat of Lowndes's *Viewpoint* in 1976, but they did that year give an IBA Fellowship to another experienced teacher trainer, Len Masterman, who was responsible at the University of Nottingham Education Department for in-service teacher training over an extensive area covering most of the East Midlands. Masterman voluntarily took on a regular secondary school teaching commitment after taking up the Nottingham post in 1971. He rapidly revised the views that he had earlier espoused in *Screen Education Notes* about the importance of film as the language of communication for school students. He discovered that his students in a mining village almost never went to the cinema. He switched to television study and in another school from 1972 - with the prospect of the raising of the school leaving age in 1973 - designed and taught a CSE TV Studies Mode III syllabus.⁸

With his subsequent year's Fellowship Masterman was able to consider what TV studies might look like as a disciplined area of study. From these deliberations he produced in succession, a report for the IBA, a thesis for a PhD and finally *Teaching About Television* for which he eventually found a publisher, after many rejections, in 1980. It was, Masterman believes, 'a book of its time'. The first print run of 3000 copies sold out within three months. Fourteen impressions were to follow with some 60,000 copies sold in all.⁹ Until the widespread take-up of Media Studies examinations for GCSE and A-level caused textbook sales to soar, no screen education publication had approached the success and widespread dissemination of *Teaching About Television*.

Masterman's book takes as its starting point the 1976 York conference where the four commissions into which participants divided for the duration of the conference were: Television, Film CSE, Film O-level, Images. The trajectory of their deliberations led toward a recognition that what was beginning to emerge was 'media studies'. This was the conclusion of Philip Simpson, attending as a training college lecturer, who subsequently wrote up the event for *Screen Education*.¹⁰ It was however resisted by another conference member, Keith Lucas, then Director of the BFI. Jim Hillier recalls that an important consequence of the event was that Lucas had been confronted by the momentum of this move toward media studies.¹¹ To argue in response, as Lucas did, that the BFI's remit did not include such media as advertising, the press and radio, seems now to have been a serious misreading of the situation, as much subsequent work initiated by the educationists within the BFI was to demonstrate.

However in 1976 the case for media education was not proven. Masterman while clearly sympathetic to the issues raised about considering the media draws attention to 'the epistemological fuzziness surrounding media studies' and decides that he can more convincingly argue that 'the medium of television itself can offer to the teacher a framework for disciplined study'.¹² The four year interval before his book's publication would have an unplanned benefit for its author. By 1980 schools were beginning to consider video recorders to be standard equipment.

In the mid 1970s it was undoubtedly the two SEFT journals, *Screen* and *Screen Education*, which made the greatest contribution to the evolving disciplines of film theory and screen education. Other developments were inevitably shaped by what these journals

did. It has been noted how BFI Summer Schools responded to *Screen* by adapting their programme structure to its current thinking. Events organised by SEFT at Weekend Schools or in regional groups became the means of transmitting these new ideas.

A recurrent observation from interviewees who were one-time SEFT activists has been how very young they were at the time. This has been said both by those in their fifties who were the 1970s activists and by those in their forties who were involved with SEFT in the 1980s. But it is essential to distinguish between the two cohorts in a fundamental way. By the 1980s SEFT activists had usually come to the Society via some academic pathway which had involved them in a formal encounter with film or media. Those of the 1970s were different in that they had almost all had involvement with the academy, but film and media had been excluded from their formal university experience.

One of the outcomes of having so many young graduate activists involved in the 1970s was that they were prepared and able to devote a great deal of time to the SEFT enterprise. The essential way in which commitment was expressed was in attendance at meetings of the SEFT Committee and Editorial Boards. The boards of the two journals had separate memberships with almost no overlap of personnel. Those who served on the *Screen* Board have recollections of a less harmonious enterprise than those who met to plan *Screen Education* where Richard Collins recalls a constructive, collaborative atmosphere.¹³ While both journals did demand the same level of involvement from Board members, Roy Stafford identifies a particular characteristic of the *Screen Education* Board that facilitated its coherence: everyone on it had at that time a London teaching connection.¹⁴

For the purposes of this chapter, the period under examination ends in 1978 when there was a change in the editorships of both journals. *Screen* had been edited by Ben Brewster until the end of 1976 when he was replaced by Geoffrey Nowell-Smith who was in post until the end of 1977. Nowell-Smith's successor was Mark Nash who started in 1978 at approximately the same time that James Donald replaced Alvarado at *Screen Education*. These new editors approached their tasks differently from their predecessors and their work will be explored in the next chapter.

Following Sam Rohdie's departure and SEFT's setting up of a new structure, the *Screen* Editorial Board had become a much more formal body with clear rules about eligibility and

attendance. It met in a three-weekly cycle, with the SEFT Executive and *Screen Education* Board following a similar cycle in the intervening weeks. *Screen* Board members were involved in reading everything in advance of publication, usually in a troika arrangement.¹⁵ Sometimes during Nowell-Smith's editorship, the Editorial Board readers would have not only the article in manuscript but also an initial report on it by the Editor.¹⁶

The Editorial Board - frequently at odds over many issues - was however united in seeing *Screen* as something very different from an academic journal.¹⁷ On one level this soubriquet of 'academic' could be denied on very simple grounds: there was in the UK no academy for film study to be grounded in, so no British journal could properly be styled 'academic'. But much more fundamental was the way in which the people involved in *Screen* regarded themselves. Nowell-Smith points out that the *Screen* agenda had very deliberately to do with cultural politics in Britain.¹⁸ *Screen* offered a home to non-academic intellectuality according to Nowell-Smith where engagement with popular culture became a mechanism for challenging academic traditions and for 'blowing up the Humanities'.¹⁹ Laura Mulvey is also clear about the status of those involved with *Screen*: 'we didn't think of ourselves as being academic - much more being an intellectual and a cinephile - certainly not an academic'.²⁰ Peter Wollen summarises it thus: 'The first generation were freelance intellectuals who were interested in laying the foundations of film study'.²¹ John Ellis is more specific. People arrived at *Screen* perceiving it as 'a surrogate for wider political activity, feeling in the post 1968 world that the realm of ideas was important but that there was no place for intellectuals in the Left political process at that time'.²² Alvarado's view complements this. He saw the *Screen* experience as a 'coming-together of a group of deliberately independent people who had no power or influence'.²³

The role of *Screen* in the mid-1970s was hugely important in demonstrating that film study could become a disciplined area for investigation. Such was its impact that a succession of *Screen Readers* was published and many of the original *Screen* articles were reprinted in the *Readers*.²⁴ The same articles were also to be included in successive generations of film theory editions. The 1970s' readership of *Screen* was founded particularly on the buying power of universities in the United States of America. *Screen* became influential in the USA because there were many departments of film within American universities, a situation not to be found in the UK for some two decades. David Rodowick, a post-

graduate student in the US at this time, remembers the considerable influence that *Screen* was to have there. Indeed he believes that the American understanding of what French writers were thinking about the cinema was simply what was 'filtered' through *Screen*. The journal's 'Marxist approach' was very controversial at first. He instances his own *Screen* influenced thesis which attracted marks from different examiners that ranged from the top to the bottom of the marking scale.²⁵

Although *Screen* was created by intellectuals outside the academy, its survival and success depended on it being valued in higher education. Indeed it would eventually become an academic journal with a readership in UK universities. Though important in this role *Screen*, with its emphasis on film, became less significant in the development of screen/media education at other levels in the UK education system. *Screen Education* however had a wider brief and would interact more readily with its educational constituency. Both journals were produced in the same SEFT office and this interconnection where each editor understood what his colleague was attempting to achieve undoubtedly provided an inbuilt monitoring mechanism to the benefit of each journal during the period up to 1978. Ellis recalls 'the strong personal dynamic of two editors in a small office'.²⁶

The *Screen Education* of the 1970s unlike *Screen* did demonstrate continuity with work in screen and media education from earlier decades. Several of its authors had been active screen educationists in the 1960s. *Screen* however, while dipping very selectively into the past, was creating a legacy rather than responding to one. It was the pace of its perceived dedication to creating a new critical and theoretical forum that triggered the split within its Editorial Board and which subsequently led to four members resigning. Two distinctive aspects of *Screen* need some examination here: *Screen* language and '*Screen* theory'. There was also the associated charge of 'intellectual terrorism' that was subsequently to be levelled at *Screen* at the end of the decade.²⁷ Each of these descriptions originated as a response to the level of difficulty that for many became associated with reading the journal. If *Screen Education* would see its task as one of engaging with its readers, *Screen* sought to challenge its readership.

There was a different attitude to translation evident during Brewster's editorship which reinforced notions of there being a '*Screen* theory'. The earlier translation from the

original French of 'Cinema/Ideology/Criticism' by Comolli and Narboni in spring 1971²⁸ had been done at Rohdie's request by Susan Bennett who worked as a translator within the BFI Education Department.²⁹ Her strategy as a translator was to find an English formulation which was as close as possible to what had been expressed by the French. Her aim was to make the translation comprehensible, given the novel nature of what was being introduced. Bennett was however aware that the translation mode of the period was to use the French word or a neologism based on it. She recalled that her approach was well received by the Editorial Board at the time, though the reaction of *Cahiers du Cinéma* was perhaps ambivalent, saying that her work was in accord with the *esprit anglais*.³⁰

Bennett's approach was very different from that of Heath and Brewster three years later. Alvarado maintains that theirs was a strategy of trying to create a language for theory. Brewster believed that the translation should retain in the English formulation the complexities of the original language, so his translation of Althusser maintains an essentially French structure. Heath's style similarly avoided 'neat, easy' prose. His non-transparent style is designed deliberately to make the reader think.³¹ *Screen* readers were not immediately faced with the contrast between the Bennett and Brewster styles, in that other translators, especially Diana Matias, were involved during the interim. Nevertheless the Brewster/Heath style was very distinctive and in its foregrounding of stylistic complexity gave additional credence to the notion that there was a '*Screen* theory'. Ellis also confirmed that, during his involvement on the Editorial Board, there was a structured policy toward translation in support of the Brewster/Heath agenda.³²

Paul Willemen argues that the adoption of an 'experimental' language for all the articles in *Screen* was essential to the project.

There was a feeling that if you were to write in the kind of language that the BFI would find agreeable, it was impossibly restrictive. You could not think of different ways of understanding film in that language which was so heavily, heavily invested with other meanings. One had to find a language and that other language was going to be almost by definition at the time unacceptable to the advocates of good journalistic English. It didn't bother us that it wasn't good journalistic English. It couldn't be any way. It had to be one that reflected the fact we were still searching for a way of understanding.³³

'*Screen* theory' is a term referred to by numerous writers looking back at the period of the 1970s when *Screen* was at its most productive in developing theory. Though much used, there is considerable confusion as to what it might mean. Both Easthope³⁴ and Bergstrom³⁵

state that there never was a '*Screen* theory'. Others refer to what *Screen* presented in a way that suggests there was some unity around its theoretical pronouncements, but then do not feel it appropriate to use that particular term. In 1990 Kaplan writes of 'a set of approaches'³⁶ where earlier Lapsley and Westlake had talked of '*Screen*'s project'.³⁷ More recently Tredell would go no further than to see *Screen* as having provided 'a major forum'.³⁸ The term '*Screen* theory' was apparently first used by Hall in 1980 when he specifically identified it as a 'convenience term' to cover the variety of theoretical approaches that the journal had promoted.³⁹ Although the term has tended to be avoided by scholars when going into print, on less formal occasions the term has undoubtedly enjoyed a currency. In their introduction to the most recent of the four *Screen Readers*, Kuhn and Stacey acknowledge that '*Screen* theory' has in effect become common shorthand.⁴⁰

While some of those interviewed have very different understandings of what the term might imply, Christine Geraghty observes that 'it wasn't a label anyone would want to dispute'.⁴¹ Alvarado, who was probably more involved than anyone with SEFT, with *Screen* and with *Screen Education* as distinct institutions in the mid 1970s, is adamant that any notion of there having been '*Screen* theory' is misleading.⁴² The commitment of both SEFT journals to the prime importance of theory in their respective projects was what distinguished them. Laura Mulvey, on the other hand, whose involvement with SEFT and *Screen* was very much more limited, takes a different view. For her '*Screen* theory' is specific to the period of Brewster's editorship when the ideas of Althusser, Freud and Lacan were introduced. She sees the intellectual overlap with the journal *New Left Review* (with which Brewster had previously been involved) as marking his editorship of *Screen* out from the others.⁴³ Willemen looking back now detects a 'filter of selection through a *New Left Review* political agenda'.⁴⁴

Whereas use of the term might be problematic, there is general consensus as to the identity of *Screen*'s key theoreticians: Colin MacCabe (on realism), Stephen Heath (on narrative space) and Mulvey (on visual pleasure). These may be a directly nominated - as by Easthope in 1988⁴⁵ - or their stature may be deduced by the inclusion of their work in edited collections - as by Rosen in 1986.⁴⁶ These three may be the most anthologised but interviewees have acknowledged the importance of Willemen writing on ideology and particularly of Brewster as a constructively interventionist editor, working closely with authors on the shaping of their work. Mark Nash however considers Brewster to have

applied 'heavy filtering to the articles he intended to print'.⁴⁷ Despite drawing heavily on *Screen* for articles in *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology* Rosen gives no currency to the notion of '*Screen* theory' by saying that 'what requires repetition and emphasis is that it would be a distortion to hypostasise this discursive network into an easily unifiable theoretical entity'.⁴⁸

For some members of the *Screen* Board these elements in *Screen*'s content were becoming disturbing. They felt that there was an important and significant section of the readership, notably teachers, which *Screen* was in danger of alienating. The particular issue which triggered a more organised opposition from the group was the journal's decision to explore a psychoanalytical dimension to the theories with which film was to be examined. There are three key statements published in *Screen* around these issues that led to the resignations of Ed Buscombe, Christine Gledhill, Alan Lovell and Christopher Williams from the Editorial Board⁴⁹. It is clear from references within these pieces that there were many documented discussions within SEFT and the *Screen* Editorial Board over some three years. Geraghty recalls that the arguments over the language of *Screen* were taken up quite separately from the dispute over psychoanalysis.⁵⁰ The articles published in *Screen* provide evidence but they do not represent the whole picture⁵¹ of which readers would first have become aware from the editorial in Spring 1975 when Brewster trails the journal's impending involvement with psychoanalysis.⁵² The strategic importance of psychoanalysis was that it might fit the perceived lack in Marxism of any theory of subjectivity or individual agency.

Several of those interviewed made it clear that the resignation issue around psychoanalysis affected not only the *Screen* Editorial Board but also the SEFT Executive Committee. There was some overlap of personnel between the two, but significantly by 1975, there were influential members of the Board who had almost no connection with SEFT and who have subsequently betrayed their ignorance of the parent organization in retrospective writings where confident references to SEFT as a part of the BFI from its inception are simply inaccurate.⁵³ It was perhaps therefore significant therefore that those who were resigning were those who had been active not only in *Screen* but also in the SEFT Committee since 1971.⁵⁴ Buscombe is clear that the leader of the quartet was Lovell.⁵⁵

The original statement on psychoanalysis and film in *Screen* Winter 1975/76 concluded by offering itself as a way of opening up a discussion.⁵⁶ Although it must be noted that this offer was not taken up - a brief mention in the editorial notwithstanding - it did offer *Screen* readers who might otherwise have been struggling to follow some of the arguments a concise analysis of some of the issues. The invitation to discussion was however taken up by the journal *Framework*. Stephen Crofts, whose byline makes it clear that he is writing in *Framework* as a member of the SEFT Executive (to which he had recently been elected), led the debate.⁵⁷ His stance was very clear. He attacked the four who had produced the statement by arguing that they were still attached to 1960s' notions of popular culture and were not prepared to shift their position, whereas Crofts saw only progress:

In the final analysis, the statement amounts to a refusal of psychoanalysis and a retrenchment in the popular culture position logically displaced later in the 1960s by classical semiotics, which in turn has been logically displaced in the mid 1970s by a semiotics recast within terms of psychoanalysis.⁵⁸

Alvarado recalls how divided the various bodies were at this point.⁵⁹ While the resignations apparently offered a resolution to one issue, there was a legacy of factionalism in the board so that by the time of Nowell-Smith's editorship, there were frequent disagreements which were often highly personalized.⁶⁰

Although addressing the manner in which *Screen* was becoming involved in the detail of debates around psychoanalysis and film, the statement by the dissenting four begins by identifying the two distinct areas of concern. Firstly they claim that there is a lack of critical distance, so that controversial intellectual choices are made to appear unproblematic. The ideas of Althusser and Lacan are evidenced as being controversial. Secondly there is the issue of intelligibility: 'we do not think that obscurity is a guarantee of profundity'.⁶¹ The obscurity is demonstrated by quotations to show how this may result both from the compressing of complicated ideas and from the adoption of precise terms from other disciplines, combined with an interest in the play of language.

It is clear that, given their SEFT credentials, the writers are concerned about the reception that *Screen* is having among SEFT members. Not only are the members' subscriptions fundamental to *Screen*'s survival but it is the work these members are undertaking in educational institutions that underpins the reasons for SEFT's existence. A rival organisation to SEFT was in existence in the 1970s - the National Association for Film

Education (NAFE). This Association was in practice relatively short-lived but it drew its legitimacy from teacher dissatisfaction with SEFT's changing priorities.⁶² It had been founded with the change in direction of *Screen*. Alvarado recounts how the SEFT Executive felt it appropriate to maintain contact with this potentially rival organization,⁶³ but at this stage he acknowledges that SEFT was no longer seeking to be identified as a teachers' professional organisation.⁶⁴ In practice NAFE concentrated its attack on the BFI where Director Keith Lucas came under constant pressure from it, as Hillier recalls.⁶⁵ When David Lusted joined EAS, he was instructed by Lucas to try to set up a joint BFI/NAFE project in order to improve relations.⁶⁶

The more specific concerns that the authors have about psychoanalysis still seem today to have been worth addressing. There is the questionable acceptability of seeing the film as a patient under analysis. In relation to Heath's analysis of *Touch of Evil*⁶⁷ attention is drawn to the over-emphasis on drawing conclusions from insignificant detail.

It seems that in this analysis one of the worst 'popular' effects of psychoanalysis is at work, the encouragement it is taken to give to ingenious interpretation where the ingenuity is thought to guarantee the interest of the exercise.⁶⁸

Questions are then asked about the relationship between spectatorship and film. The writers show how in different articles Heath, Metz and Mulvey take the same Freudian concept of the fetish and yet use it, each in a different way. Similarly they compare how Metz and Mulvey differ in the use they make of the ideas around the Lacanian 'mirror image'. These are such obvious discrepancies that the Editorial Board does acknowledge them eventually when responding to the authors' final resignation statement by stating that they emanate from a 'process of understanding'.⁶⁹

The other key point that they raised follows Mulvey's argument about the construction of classic narrative films specifically for a male spectator. How then do women relate to films?⁷⁰ The Editorial Board did not respond to this. Rather there were clearly different political agendas at work and it was these that divided the Board. Specifically, the authors of the statement argue that psychoanalysis is being used to maintain a high bourgeois position and this provides a problem for educationalists working with working-class children.

The subsequent resignation letter in summer 1976 invokes more deliberately the audience that *Screen* is addressing when it draws attention to the 'serious' film/television study that

is now in place and that there is a 'serious' audience for *Screen*. Plentiful examples are cited. Additionally attention is drawn to the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham and to other groups now becoming involved in film study and associated areas. The four allege that the 'positive contribution that *Screen* had made initially is now being counter-balanced by other factors'. *Screen* it seems may now be doing more harm than good. The charges against *Screen* are now more specific:⁷¹

1. *Screen* by its obscurity and inaccessibility handicaps SEFT's efforts to develop film study and make contacts with other groups.
2. By taking a high bourgeois position *Screen* advocates the *avant-garde* against the popular cinema with which education also has to engage.
3. The Editorial Board has no interest in educational matters and does not attend any SEFT events.

In responding the Board predictably deals most severely with the second of these. Someone had clearly researched past issues of *Screen*, so that the authors of the resignation statement might have their own words quoted back at them. The details of the parrying of the attack are not relevant here. What is clear is that this is where the issues become most personal. On the charge of obscurity and lack of interest in educational matters, there is much less said. It is those political differences that separated these four from the rest of the Board and which would be played out at the SEFT AGM in the following November.

The 'Introduction' to *The Screen Education Reader: Cinema, Television, Culture*, published in 1993, puts into context the work of the journal which had ceased publication ten years earlier. It is a useful retrospective, though curiously does not distinguish between the two very different editorships of Alvarado and Donald and the shift toward a cultural studies emphasis under the latter's regime. What cannot emerge so clearly from it however is the sequential manner in which *Screen Education* addressed its readership, particularly in the early years as the new identity of screen education/media studies emerged as a specific area of the curriculum. The importance of considering the issues in sequence is that through this procedure it is possible to demonstrate both the level of activism and intellectual commitment surrounding each publication and the sense that the participants shared of being engaged in a progressive trajectory.

The editorials in *Screen Education* functioned in several ways. Until 1977 all SEFT members and institutional subscribers received both its journals. Only in 1977 did it become possible to subscribe to either or both journals, though in practice most readers kept receiving both. *Screen Education* had emerged from *Screen* and needed to establish with its inherited readership what it stood for. It clearly needed to be perceived as fundamentally different from the predecessor *Screen Education* published in the 1960s. The practice of identifying which Board members had edited each issue acted as a signal to readers that the contents, even if individually authored, had undergone group scrutiny.

SEFT membership had always been composed mostly of teachers in secondary schools and lecturers in further education. So it would probably be *Screen Education* rather than *Screen* that they would on first inspection find most immediately useful. *Screen* with its single but multi-faceted task of developing theory was less constrained by the expectations of its readership. In practice it would acquire an additional readership widely distributed in higher education as academics in established disciplines realised that the applications of *Screen*'s theories went beyond the confines of film study. But it was vital to *Screen Education* that it was not perceived as a teacher's version of *Screen*, where difficult ideas were simplified. In practice *Screen Education* had the more complex task: to find a means of simultaneously addressing film theory, educational theory and pedagogy. The Editorials regularly re-assured the readership that the journal had a definite sense of direction. During the period when Brewster edited *Screen* and Alvarado *Screen Education* the two journals did succeed in projecting a unity of purpose for SEFT by complementing each other. In effect the presence of each validated the existence of both. Geraghty's view is that *Screen* at this time would have more closely represented *New Left Review* had *Screen Education* not existed.⁷² Collins believes that the distinctive character of each journal might not have evolved without the other.⁷³

Where *Screen Education* sought to become radical was in its engagement with educational theory. It was not promoting a particular theory necessarily, but as a first step it needed to identify that some theory was implicit in all practice. It did however resist the more extreme child-centred theories of the 1970s, since the very nature of the enterprise in which SEFT was engaged demonstrated the impracticability of child-centredness. Here was a group of educated committed adults seeking to shape an area of the curriculum which might at that time have variously been defined as screen education or media studies.

If this dedicated group was struggling with the process, but was nevertheless convinced this was an area of such importance that school students should engage with it, it was clearly a territory where the students even more than their teachers were going to be in need of guidance. Neither teacher nor student could discover and interpret it successfully alone. It was of necessity a subject-centred rather than child-centred enterprise.

If members of the *Screen* Board were influenced by Gramsci into perceiving themselves as organic intellectuals rather than academics, for *Screen Education* it was another aspect of Gramsci's thinking which supported their stance. To support working-class students effectively, teachers should not be tempering their methodology nor finding ways of making learning more palatable. Only by teaching such students with rigour were teachers providing them with the necessary knowledge and skills to operate in the students' own best interests, or rather, as it would more predictably have been justified then, in the interests of the working class.

Soon after Alvarado became the paid Editor, the editorials began to detail the parameters of the journal's various quests which lacked the apparent investigative precision that *Screen's* concentration on film theory seemingly ensured for that publication.

We will give particular attention to education, to the way in which a subject area is defined; to the way in which study, teaching and learning are performed and the resultant social relations that this generates. This activity of thinking of media education as part of a social totality and the call that makes for us to investigate that totality in order to define the shape and purpose of media education is an emphasis very different to the one that has distinguished the development of film studies in Britain. In that field there has been a pronounced (and understandable) tendency to insist on the subject area's authenticity and to construct and defend strict parameters for the young body of knowledge.⁷⁴

Surprisingly this same issue on 'Media Studies, Methods and Approaches' then includes an example of the sort of personal account of practice that had been so familiar and that had so limited the usefulness of the 1960s' *Screen Education*. Written under the pseudonym John Pearce its inclusion is justified in the Editorial as an article which 'provocatively suggests ways of studying mass communications and of restructuring the classroom relations that other, traditional teaching procedures enforce'⁷⁵. Pearce, it turns out, is in his first term of teaching and the article, based on a diary record that he kept, is explicitly critical of his teaching colleagues. Puzzled readers, some of whom had written to SEFT to protest, had to wait for the Editorial in the next *Screen Education* for the explanation of

its publication and even then the rationale is a curious one. The Editors criticise Pearce on several grounds, all of which are essentially for making the sort of mistakes that experienced teachers would expect a beginner to make.⁷⁶ Even if the readers were to accept the argument that Pearce's inexperience was specially revealing of the problems faced when putting classroom practice under scrutiny (because the potential in those circumstances for making mistakes was compounded), the situation in which a beginner was so exposed was never justified. A more substantial considered and thoughtful collaboration piece is printed as part of the issue focusing on 'The System and Classroom Practice'.⁷⁷

The Autumn 1975 issue 'Teaching the Film Industry' needs fewer explanations in the Editorial but there is underlying that Editorial - as with all the Editorials at this time - a determination to find an appropriate intellectual format into which articles of each issue might be fitted. The Editorial Board met once every three weeks and, given that *Screen Education* appeared only quarterly, there is a sense when reading the Editorials that they emerged from lengthy and controversial debates, the implications of which the reader can only infer from the contents of each issue and the format that the relevant Editorial proposes to erect around it.⁷⁸

There is no mistake as to the journal's political stance. 'The Education Cuts' sets out to rally teacher support via their unions, on the grounds not only of the impact of the cuts on education generally but more particularly of the vulnerability of this emerging area of film and media studies with its need for specialised hardware. It concludes by attempting to define more precisely the position from which its authors are coming.⁷⁹

Yet this process of reflection, of theorising and developing new educational practices is subject to more than its own internal dynamics. *Screen Education's* project is also governed by the determination of consciousness by being: as Marx formulated it, 'Universal consciousness is only the theoretical form of that whose living form is the real community, society...' (Economic Philosophical Manuscript 1844). Our project of understanding and formulating a programme of educational activity in film and media studies takes place within a social context which decisively influences the shape and possibilities of that project.⁸⁰

The next four issues are presented to the readership as having a specific unity underpinning each one: *The Searchers*, Media Education in Europe; a reflection on work established by SEFT/BFI and *The Sweeney*. Unfortunately no records survive of the Editorial Board

meetings of this period. There was a troika approach to the consideration of each article, which paralleled that of *Screen*, so that the implications of publishing each article were thoroughly debated and as suggested above there were legacies of these debates to be detected in the Editorials. In Summer 1976 it is possible to detect an effect that this was having on the Board members' perspective on the readership. Each Board member had to defend her/his position not just about the relevance of the article under consideration, but about her/his stance generally. Consequently there was a perceived need to caution the readers who would be tackling the articles without the benefit of group mediation.

The need for a theoretical investigation of our work as teachers becomes clear when we begin to confront the problems of *what* the teachers are going to teach and, having decided that, determining *how* to communicate that knowledge. We are aware that to respond pragmatically to educational problems and to support a position that suggests each individual teacher knows best how to deal with teaching situations through empirical observation is to encourage a form of experimentation that is positively dangerous if we are really concerned with the *needs* of the people we teach. That is why we argue for the importance of developing a better theoretical understanding of the processes of education as well as constructing a theorised body of knowledge about film and media.⁸¹

Screen Education 18 in spring 1976 was timely in its content. Susan Bennett had been employed as a researcher by UNESCO to survey 'the situation and aims of media studies in Europe'⁸². The project had developed from the Ludwigsheim/Mannheim conference in 1972 following which *Screen Education Notes* had produced its special edition.⁸³ Bennett's survey in abbreviated form, with an additional summary of the British situation, forms the bulk of *Screen Education* 18. Her introductory article is useful in that it positions the British experience within European wide trends.⁸⁴ A legacy of 1968 is still to be detected in the countries surveyed, where educational reform has worked to make curricula less rigid. As a result there has been a limited recognition of the necessity for media education in secondary schools.⁸⁵ But the provision of training for the teachers is always informal and usually only available in the teachers' own time as with the BFI and SEFT provision in the UK.

At the same time, as was already noted with reference to the UK, the spread of educational technology often worked to obscure developments in media education. Bennett points out how such innovations actually work against the introduction of media education.

Technology in order to justify its existence, is supposed to 'do' something. The only material that technology can 'do' something to is the student. But this conception does not readily accord with that inherent in media education that the

student picks apart what is presented *via* the technology (and not *by* the technology).⁸⁶

When media educationists were able to intervene in these situations and subvert at an institutional level, there would be scope for media to begin to be studied and the assumed neutral status of media apparatus might then be contested. *Screen Education* 21 has an interesting account of the beginnings of such an intervention at the University of London Institute of Education following the appointment there of Bob Ferguson who had worked with Douglas Lowndes at Hornsey College of Art.⁸⁷

Bennett's conclusion is that the major problem faced by media education is the opposition presented to it 'by the social context within which it is contained'.⁸⁸ Certainly the treatment of *Viewpoint* by the IBA provided a convincing example of her claim. What is also clear from her survey as presented in *Screen Education* is that nowhere was educational theory underpinning the introduction of media education. She does however identify certain 'marginal' institutions within European countries where such thinking was beginning. One of these was the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.

The Editorial of *Screen Education* 22 is important in tracing the journal's development. It is explicit in defining what needs to happen if there is to be an agreed theoretical position among the *Screen Education* Editorial Board that goes beyond the shared recognition of the need to connect film/television with education/pedagogy. Such an agreed position it is argued is both desirable and essential. The previous absence of such an agreed position had been because

...we have not so far really opened up for examination many of the covert assumptions which, though rarely expressed, determine our own various practices and critical/theoretical evaluation of them. This issue therefore attempts to correct this error by considering less aspects of the conjuncture 'screen + education' directly – broadly *Screen Education*'s practice to date – and more some of the underlying assumptions/ value judgments which have been associated with our formal concerns – film and television – ever since their inception: namely that they are *mass* media and *popular* forms.⁸⁹

Like the NUT Conference some decade and a half earlier 'Popular Culture' is the area that is seen as providing a productive locus for investigation. But that is as far as the similarity may be pushed. In 1960 the expectation had been that by bringing together the producers of popular culture with the teachers and the critics before an *ad hoc* but concerned

audience some beneficial interaction would emerge, if everyone were to respond responsibly. The debates of the 1970s were not being played out before an *ad hoc* audience but were directed specifically at the readership that was assumed to share a commitment to the *Screen Education* project.

Perhaps because of the charge of difficulty and inaccessibility that had been levelled at *Screen's* articles, the Editorial here repeatedly seeks to justify an issue that may be perceived as 'potentially difficult and contentious'. Clearly for the Editorial Board this was a defining moment in their enterprise. The case for this move toward theory had been under discussion for some time. In a statement from the *Screen Education* Editorial Board to the SEFT Executive Committee in March 1976 the following was high-lighted:

Screen Education cannot afford to not engage in theoretical work and inquiry, particularly in the area of education and mass communications but also, when necessary, even in the area of film theory.⁹⁰

When the *Screen Education* policy statement was subsequently promulgated by SEFT in May it was expressed more emphatically:

Screen Education must engage in theoretical work and inquiry, particularly in the area of education, mass communications and film theory.⁹¹

Where *Screen Education* 22 differed from previous ones was in the four articles identified as specially commissioned for it. Two authors Grealy and Collins were members of the Editorial Board, the third Nowell-Smith was the recently appointed Editor of *Screen* and the fourth Colin Sparks was a lecturer in media studies from the Polytechnic of Central London.

The introductory article by Grealy, called 'Notes on Popular Culture', is actually very closely focused on film teaching.⁹² This focus was probably a decision made in order to connect more directly with the experience of the majority of the readership. Provided that the film teacher he addresses is ready to align her/himself with the identity of 'socialist teacher', Grealy's position is straightforward.

Here I am not arguing that teachers must 'politicise' education but that they recognise the ideological roles that the school plays in society, and that their teaching explicitly confronts the problems which arise when this ideological functioning of the educational apparatuses is recognised. School plays a crucial part in the production and diffusion of 'popular culture'. The function of socialist teachers is to work at the contradictions which arise in the culture at the educational level.⁹³

Nowell-Smith's article on Gramsci is essentially introductory, given that Gramsci's writings were only then becoming available in translation.⁹⁴ He uses the model of Gramsci's investigation into 19th-century Italian Culture to suggest the nature of the questions that need to be asked in relation to British popular culture. He identifies the limitations of current writing on popular culture as having no perspective 'other than that which is supposed to emanate from the forms themselves and the attitude taken by the writer towards them'.⁹⁵

Sparks writes of the evolution of cultural studies, a term which was only at this time acquiring common currency, most often within references to the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham. It is some of the work of the Centre that Sparks describes in his article.⁹⁶ But the greatest importance of the article lies in its attempt to explain how Marxism in a variety of manifestations had, via *New Left Review*, come to influence the thinking of a generation of intellectuals. The distinguishing features of this generation were their increased access to Marxist influenced thinking, the greater proportion of university graduates among their number and their connections with the events of 1968 and its aftermath. He then indicates where that cohort might currently be found, some ten years later and what influence they might be having. Though Sparks does not specify it, among that cohort would be included the activists within the SEFT Committee and the Editorial Boards and a significant number of the journals' readers.

Collins in the final piece of the four revalues the contribution of Leavis.⁹⁷ As has been shown the legacy of Leavis in film study had been considerable both directly in the work of Robin Wood and *Movie* and more indirectly as a consequence of the transfer of a Leavisite methodology from the study of literature to the study of film by the great many English teachers who had been trained to follow Leavis's approach. It was of course these teachers who had been attracted to the teaching of popular culture by the arguments advanced by Hall and Whannel who had demonstrated that it was possible to discriminate between the good and the bad within popular culture. 'Revaluation' for Collins means abandonment of the Leavisite model completely.

The absence in Leavis' model of a notion of the reciprocal determination of base by superstructure left none of the space for action, and we need rather an analytical model that is adequate to the totality of social relations in which culture, its primary object for study, is located; one that, to put it modestly, attends to the

absence of free play in culture, that recognises the dominance of ruling-class ideology in mass communications, and the function of mass communications in propagating and naturalising the world view of the ruling class.⁹⁸

An aim of *Screen Education* was to stimulate debate beyond those who constituted its Editorial Board. This began to happen in 1975 with the formation of first a North Staffordshire SEFT Group and then a North Eastern Group. By the end 1976 SEFT began to approach the task more systematically by making available a list of its members, organised regionally, to anyone who wanted to take the initiative and form such a group.⁹⁹ There was an irony in these arrangements in that though it was in *Screen Education* that reports of these groups' activities were carried, it was a pre-occupation with *Screen* that usually shaped these groups' activities. In January 1977 the SEFT Glasgow group was set up, though as its first report makes clear, it was essentially a *Screen* reading group.¹⁰⁰ At about the same time a Manchester group was formed from members of the North by North West Film Society and specifically from subscribers to *Screen*.¹⁰¹ Such was the influence of *Screen* on this group that its journal, *North by North West*, rapidly became a mechanism for the transmission of *Screen* theories. This regional expansion was made more substantial later in 1977 when the first SEFT Weekend School outside London was held in Glasgow in June.¹⁰² This was followed by the SEFT Potteries Group holding their first Weekend School in Manchester in December.¹⁰³ Both schools were focused on television study: realism in Glasgow and the drama serial *Coronation Street* in Manchester.¹⁰⁴

If the Editorial to issue 22 had looked for debate it had arrived by *Screen Education 23*. SEFT groups were forming in the regions and London was not to be left out. Not styling itself as a SEFT regional group, but meeting as an informal reading and study group, the London group's members included some of those on the *Screen Education* Editorial Board. Seven London members wrote to the journal.¹⁰⁵ They were not however responding directly to the major issues raised by the previous *Screen Education* but were concerned about *Screen Education 20* which had focused on *The Sweeney*.

Despite including Richard Exton and Chris Mottershead from the Editorial Board, some of their complaints were basic and perhaps representative of the concerns of some of *Screen Education*'s readers who were finding it difficult to keep up-to-date with reading either or both of the two SEFT journals. To the present reader their resistance seems to have been

both against the rapidity with which the world of screen education was being propelled and against the level of generalisation that this momentum seemed to encourage. It was also perhaps relevant that some of the signatories had stood for, but failed to get elected to, the SEFT Committee at the 1976 AGM.¹⁰⁶

They contested some of the assumptions of *The Sweeney* issue under four headings. They felt that the methodology of the issue was assumed rather than explained. Ideology, they claimed, was used also without explanation and consequently they were forced to conclude that as a concept it was 'all pervasive, infinitely devious and totally inescapable'.¹⁰⁷

We are not convinced that because we live in a capitalist society within which bourgeois ideology is dominant that it follows that this ideology expresses itself in a clear, uncontested way through film or television, or that these art forms are primarily ideological weapons.¹⁰⁸

Their third challenge was to the use of the term 'realism' where they maintained that they detected confusion, while MacCabe's writing on this topic had been rapidly subjected to his own substantial revision.

Whereas MacCabe is putting forward ideas in a journal, *Screen*, not directly concerned with the formal educational system, and can therefore argue a position in an abstract way, it is a matter of concern to us that such ideas can be taken up in a journal, *Screen Education*, which does have a direct concern with the formal educational system, in such a way as to encourage a kind of carelessness and assertion of generalities which does not lead to understanding, but rather to confusion and an actual lack of theory.¹⁰⁹

Writing mostly from the perspective of classroom teachers they claim that the approach to *The Sweeney* downgrades problems of aesthetics, entertainment, genre and teaching.

We do not see the construction of teaching approaches and of theoretical work as being two different activities, nor that the former follows naturally from the latter. The relationship between them is not so simple. If we are interested in, concerned about, or committed to, educating people about a TV series, in this instance, then our knowledge of education has to inform the way in which we construct the theoretical work. We are involved in such work not simply to increase our own understanding, but to provide opportunities for anyone to be able to learn and understand. This process depends on the contribution of our actual, or potential, students whose opinions and knowledge of television already exists, is not waiting for us to formulate the discipline. If we want to teach cultural studies then we must take account of the fact that it is a 'live' area of knowledge and that members of that culture participate in its development. To suggest that we try to suspend the production of teaching materials whilst we try to sort out what to teach them is to overrate our own role in this field and to ignore, even deny, the importance of our students.¹¹⁰

A fundamental problem that was to bedevil SEFT for the remaining decade of its existence was an increasing separation of its constituencies into higher education on the one hand and schools/further education colleges on the other. The reply to their complaints is made by Phillip Drummond, one of the contributors to *The Sweeney* issue, who mostly limits his response to a defence of his own piece. Rather than examine what deeper concerns might be underlying their antagonism to *The Sweeney* issue Drummond, a polytechnic lecturer, is dismissive of their arguments.¹¹¹ He asserts that '*Screen Education* and the Society as a whole needs stronger and more rigorous opponents if it is to progress within that circuit of undeniably difficult and intricate problems over film, TV and media studies which forms its necessary trajectory.'¹¹²

The subsequent Editorial in *Screen Education* 24 recognises that there may be a problem for the journal as it addresses an expanding constituency.¹¹³ It is not going to be able to promote the development of screen education practice substantially if the readers are alienated by being told that they are not worthy of the journal. Recognising too that individual readers will be at the very different stages of accessing screen education knowledge and practice when first coming into contact with the journal, the Editorial determines to adopt a more flexible approach. This had been a long-term problem that *Screen Education* of the 1960s had solved by having a series of topics, such as Film Making or Higher Education, and within an erratic cycle each topic would in turn dominate a specific issue. Therefore if a reader remained a subscriber for just a few years, s/he would have covered all the territory and the articles would then become repetitive. Such was the pace and intensity of developments in screen education in the 1970s that even if such a mechanistic device had seemed justifiable, it would have served only to exclude the readership further.

For the remainder of Alvarado's editorship until mid-1978, *Screen Education* ceased to group articles into specific issues in order to achieve a topical coherence.¹¹⁴ The expectation was that if issues appeared less monolithic, readers would not find the journal so daunting. It was clear that if an account were presented as work in progress and accompanied by other unrelated articles also of other work in progress, readers might find it easier to seek out their own individual points of accommodation. The previous chapter demonstrated that there had been significant growth in film and television teaching by the

mid 1970s. While many teachers might have access to the SEFT journals, what they lacked was up-to-date material for use in the classroom.

Indeed one of the persistent problems for film and television teachers had always been around issues of contemporaneity. The reliance on, for example, BFI selected extracts in teaching inevitably meant that what was chosen for use in the classroom might be dated by the time it became available there. The gradual introduction of video recorders into schools and subsequently a relaxation in copyright law on broadcast material began to change this in as much as a greater range of visual texts became accessible. But as the nature of film and television study shifted from the study of the text in isolation to investigations of how texts were produced, teachers lacked information. Two books coming from authors who were key figures in the *Screen Education* project addressed this directly: *Making Legend of the Werewolf*¹¹⁵ and *Hazell – the making of a TV series*.¹¹⁶

The former by Buscombe was a detailed account of the making of a 'typical' British feature film of the period, where the author had been allowed access to the various stages of production and promotion of the film. A 16 mm print, extracts and slides from the film were available for hire to accompany the use of the book. Valuable for teachers, *Making Legend of the Werewolf* had the additional advantage of being usable by students and was priced so that a set of textbooks might be ordered. Not all teachers were convinced of the book's usefulness as a text book. Foster in reviewing it found much to complain about, both in terms of its accessibility for students and in its theoretical stance, which he saw as extending the territory of the auteur theory to cover many of those working as specialists in various subsidiary film crafts.¹¹⁷

Hazell - the making of a TV series was by Alvarado and Buscombe. They did have a specific readership in mind.

The book is intended for all with an intelligent interest in television, though within that audience we have particularly addressed ourselves to teachers at secondary and further education level who may be teaching television, possibly in the context of a media studies course. We hope that for them this book will provide some basic material on the television production system, material which is difficult for them to obtain by themselves.¹¹⁸

The series of TV monographs published by the BFI had tended to concentrate on the non-fiction output of television. This book deliberately addressed that omission and more

significantly it engaged with the complexity of the enterprise that it sought to describe. The monographs had generally been concerned with the consumption stage of the television process; this book addressed the production stage.

It is useful to consider the phenomena that were *Screen* and *Screen Education* against that of the earlier journals *Scrutiny* and *The Use of English*. The backdrop to *Scrutiny* has been examined in detail by Mulhern in his book *The Moment of Scrutiny*.¹¹⁹ Comparing their operational context with that of *Screen* and *Screen Education* is valuable in that what emerges are revealing contrasts and similarities between them. *Scrutiny* in the 1930s grew out of the recently established English School at Cambridge. Cambridge University had been late in setting up such a school and thereby freeing English from its previous home in Anglo-Saxon Studies. *Scrutiny* reflected the energies of a group of university teachers and their ex-students who wished to promote a particular approach to literature through practical criticism. *Screen* operated at an earlier stage in the evolution of film study. There was no established place in the academy apart from the Slade School of Art (within University College, London) and the extra-mural courses also offered by London University.¹²⁰ With the effective dismantling of the BFI Education Department as the 'embryonic academy', *Screen* had no academy to play to and, as argued elsewhere, it was deliberately non-academic.

But *Scrutiny* and *Screen* were in turn connected with a particular generation of the intelligentsia. For *Scrutiny* it was the grammar-school scholarship boys who entered Cambridge between the two world wars and probably saw themselves as spearheading an attack on the classical tradition of teaching English¹²¹. They were however still advocating an essentially conservative approach in their recognition of a 'great tradition'. The SEFT journal provided a base for a differently motivated post-1968 student generation who saw themselves as disenfranchised. In practice they represented a range of left positions and were the intellectual legacy of various political parties. What they had in common was a belief in the inescapability of politics in the theories they wished to develop.

It was axiomatic given their political beliefs that those involved with either of the SEFT journals would avoid the formation of any hierarchical situation in their working together. *Scrutiny* however had had as its focus F R Leavis, who, though in many ways marginal to the academy at Cambridge, was nevertheless unusually influential as a teacher. *Screen* and *Screen Education* were ultimately the journals of SEFT and answerable to its Executive

Committee which in turn was answerable to members at the AGM.¹²² Nevertheless both groups were distinguished by their conviction and unity around their respective projects.

One notable area of similarity is that both *Scrutiny* and *Screen* had partner 'educational publications'; for *Scrutiny* it was *The Use of English*¹²³ and for *Screen*, the 'revised' *Screen Education*. In each case the educational journal operated independently and in practice found itself addressing a different constituency with a separate group of authors contributing to each magazine. This pattern of repetition some forty years on does seem to reveal an inherent distinction in British education where it is considered proper that the practical needs of teachers should be addressed separately. In its final years this would become an even bigger issue for SEFT.

Scrutiny and also *The Use of English* had as their readership the disciples of Leavis in many classrooms. A whole generation of post-war English teachers contained many who were taught or influenced by Leavis. These teachers passed on their enthusiasm for the Great Tradition to the generation of students that were then to be so affected by the failed student revolution of 1968. It has been shown that the debates in the 1969/70 *Screen*¹²⁴ involving Robin Wood and Alan Lovell demonstrated how persistent the Leavis influence was beyond the study of English literature.¹²⁵ The 'disenfranchised' who were involved in *Screen* found themselves in a different situation. They were on the attack yet they were state-subsidised. Their chosen area of interest was not accepted in the academy, yet by their efforts it would be. They resisted being labelled academics yet they were all academics-in-waiting.¹²⁶ According to Alvarado they all agreed at the time on the Gramscian distinction between the 'academic' and the 'intellectual' and saw themselves in the latter category¹²⁷. Mulhern writes of the small circle around Leavis:

They cast themselves as 'outlaws' whose purpose was to save 'the essential nature' of the Tripos from a narrow academicism that now threatened to extinguish it.¹²⁸

Some would contest that whereas *Scrutiny* and *The Use of English* transformed English studies, SEFT both created a new subject area and transformed other disciplines in the humanities, including English studies. But it is in the very different political stance of the two journals that the greatest discrepancy is to be observed. As Mulhern remarked in the year after *The Moment of Scrutiny* was published,¹²⁹ he had tried to demonstrate in that book that *Scrutiny's* commitment to notions of culture and community had the determinate effect of a 'categorical dissolution of politics as such'. *Screen* came with a very different

stance. As Alvarado explained, 'We saw ourselves as the cultural arm of the *New Left Review* ie independent left and not doctrinaire. We were interested in thinking aesthetics politically.'¹³⁰

The comparison of *Screen Education* with the *Use of English* reveals instructive differences. Film and television study and the emergence of media studies were grass roots, bottom-up enterprises. The 1970s intellectuals were not the first group of dissatisfied learners to see screen education as an enterprise worth pursuing. The Society of Film Teachers had been started by those who were involved in the post-war emergency teacher training programme, whether as mature students or lecturers. Their dissatisfaction was partly with the abbreviated courses that the exigencies of the post-war situation imposed, but it also had some similarity with those of the 1970s' graduates. Both groups saw film as something more significant in society that needed recognition in the education system beyond its instrumental use as an audio visual aid. What the pioneers of the 1940s could not anticipate was that they were creating in SFT an entity that a later generation would inhabit and transform.

In the mid-1970s, it was the journal *Screen Education* that still connected with the grassroots. *Screen*'s contribution has continued to be celebrated in the anthologies of film theory designed for university students and its theoretical writings have thereby achieved a landmark status. However, to trace the evolution of the transition from screen education into media studies and the transmission of those ideas through the education system then it is *Screen Education* which more adroitly documents the legitimate history of the 1970s.

Various issues that had been contentious within the SEFT Committee and *Screen* Editorial Board were confronted at the Society's Annual General Meeting in November 1976. Normal AGM procedure was to request from each candidate standing for the SEFT Executive a 300 word statement in support of that candidate. On this occasion eight members of the Committee who were standing for re-election produced and circulated to only part of the electorate a 'Provisional Policy Document for the SEFT'.¹³¹ Covering five A4 pages of closely typed documentation, the signatories argued that they were addressing 'a lack of consistency in the Society's policy during the past year'. A further five who were also standing for the Committee had joined the eight, so that there was in effect a 15 strong ticket.

The minutes of this AGM (taken by Brewster) provide an unusually detailed record of the discussion.¹³² On the basis of this account, the meeting would appear to have been divided between those who were schoolteachers and those in higher education. But there were schoolteachers among the 13 signatories, so whilst the secondary/higher split was undoubtedly a feature of the Society's make-up, there were broader issues which had their origins in divisions within the *Screen* Editorial Board where that journal's promotion of a psychoanalytical dimension to film theory had become the focus of dispute. The importance of the policy document was in its careful construction, so that its thrust would not be that contentious for a generally left leaning constituency, provided of course that when it came to the vote, there would be an organised core of support for the agreed ticket. In practice, of the 130 members present, it seems that some 90 had come prepared to back the document.¹³³ Both the contents of the document and how it had been selectively circulated were discussed acrimoniously and at length during the meeting.

If the document was designed to provide a mechanism for separating the factions within the Society, the timing and the targets were carefully chosen: schoolteachers who might already feel uneasy at the pressure that was then being exerted on left sympathisers within state education following the Great Debate. It was the perceived neglect of the needs of teachers that the four who resigned from the Editorial Board had used in part to justify their resignations. Lovell and Williams were present at the AGM and vocal in their support for the teacher constituency.¹³⁴ SEFT was about to announce plans to produce teaching materials for classroom use in schools. It had previously acted as a distributor for ILEA materials, making them available to teachers outside London but SEFT had never produced any of its own. Here was an area where the Society had produced nothing yet, so there was no one directly responsible whose work would be implicitly criticised. Thus the nature of the proposal might be framed in such a way in the policy document as to impinge only on those schoolteachers who were not of the 'hard left'. It would produce a defensive reaction from them, since such teachers would inevitably see agreement with its implementation as likely to place them in a very exposed position. Therefore they would consider that they must oppose the Policy Document. By this device they might be forced into further isolation by the election process.

It would seem that the authors of the Provisional Policy Document had devised a carefully constructed strategy to isolate those teachers who were hesitant about the unrelenting politicisation of the Society's projects. Thus in support of SEFT's production of teaching materials the following statement was included.

The decision of the Executive Committee to investigate the production of educational materials is an important innovation in the Society's work. A tremendous void exists in this area, and our work here could be of real value to teachers, but we feel that one danger must be avoided, namely the production of materials on a simple technical basis, without taking into account the ideological use to which they are necessarily subject in the school context. Therefore we propose that materials should be considered which allow the progressive teacher to use them in the context of ideological contradictions within the media, and that their technical production should not be separated from considerations of their potential political use in schools.¹³⁵

Willemen recalls how careful preparations had been made for the AGM with planning meetings involving selected members from the SEFT Committee and from both Editorial Boards.¹³⁶ The first stage of the manoeuvre at the AGM was to replace Mottershead as Chairman. Steve Neale, one of the Policy Document's signatories, was elected Chairman, achieving an almost two to one majority.¹³⁷ Mottershead maintains that he was unaware that this coup was about to happen and only subsequently realised that there had been 'a conspiracy to take SEFT down a radical road'.¹³⁸ Foster agrees that the retiring committee was unprepared for this 'orchestration of the opposition' though he acknowledges that the signatories were not a 'tightly knit group'.¹³⁹ Geraghty's view is that the Policy Document group succeeded in their objective of replacing a committee that had been sympathetic to teachers.¹⁴⁰ Williams describes the result succinctly: 'We lost'.¹⁴¹

Neale had produced his own 'discussion document' in support of his candidature which had a three-point agenda for future SEFT priorities.¹⁴² These were: mutual co-operation with the Independent Film Producers' Association (IFPA); a clear and coherent socialist theory of education; and a coherent socialist analysis of the ideological apparatus that television represented. The poor condition of the SEFT archives is a particular problem here in that Neale under his third priority area states that 'Colin MacCabe's proposals should be taken seriously'. No trace of these proposals has been found. Of greatest significance in Neale's manifesto is the prominence he gives to co-operation with the IFPA. This group would form in the 1980s the basis of a third constituency within SEFT.

In the subsequent SEFT Committee elections after Neale had taken over as Chairman, all remaining Policy Document signatories were elected, filling twelve of the top fourteen places in the members' poll. As a consequence there were only four remaining committee places to be filled and three of these were taken by the re-election of previous committee members, presumably those who were considered least objectionable by the Policy Document group.¹⁴³ In interview MacCabe made reference to 'the Grealy/Wollen document', the genesis of which followed the 1976 AGM. This too has not proved traceable. MacCabe's recollection was that the Grealy/Wollen document laid down the parameters for the subsequent SEFT/*Screen/Screen Education* relationship and how it would in future be formally manifested.¹⁴⁴

CHAPTER SIX 1978-1982

SEFT UNLIMITED

As *Screen* got locked into bitter internal debate, much of the original energy and excitement of the original project was refound in the society's new magazine *Screen Education* where concern both with secondary teaching and popular culture were very much to the fore.

Colin MacCabe, 1985

Screen, under new editorship, becomes less committed to theory and more to exploring a broader perspective on practices of representation while Screen Education's new editor regularly features the emerging area of cultural studies. In 1980 a change of personnel in key positions at the BFI forces a review of SEFT's situation since both journals have changed course and the Society's role beyond publishing the journals is unclear. A resurgent Education Department wants SEFT to have an identity distinctive from the Department's. The new BFI Director sees SEFT in a campaigning role and producing only one journal. SEFT, swayed by the prestige which Screen still holds and the income it produces, keeps Screen and abandons Screen Education by 1982.

Douglas Lowndes left the Educational Advisory Service at the end of 1976, shortly after the SEFT Annual General Meeting. He wrote a substantial document for his BFI colleagues, which had been occasioned by the events of the AGM. He presumably felt justified in his frankness by his imminent departure. What he wrote is indicative of the relative status of SEFT and EAS at the time. Lowndes clearly believed that the ability of some SEFT members to organise and dominate the Society would have repercussions at the BFI.

This situation forces the department into a crisis situation because distribution of the SEFT document coincides with the imminent appointment of a new head of EAS and the governors' seminar on BFI policy.¹

He was aware that members of EAS who had, as SEFT members, opposed the SEFT policy document might wish to pursue the production of an oppositional document. Lowndes is against such a move, as any BFI statement in the circumstances 'would suffer from the historically confused status of the SEFT/EAS relationship and lack of clear policy, agreed, on what should be their priorities'.² Instead he feels that the Department should write its own policy to 'end any fears both within the department and in SEFT that some institutional intervention might be attempted by myself or other members of the department regarding the future of SEFT'. Lowndes clearly felt that he must be seen to be ruling out any such action.³

At the heart of Lowndes's paper is his articulation of concern at the potential for problems in SEFT's relationship with teachers. He detects 'the inherent contradiction between radical theory and formal education as represented by curriculum projects, O-level consortia and regional curriculum initiatives'.⁴ He indicates that he has some sympathy with those who had taken charge of SEFT at their AGM and yet is specific as to the inherent dangers. 'SEFT must know the dangers of a policy that runs the risk of alienating traditional, or even progressive, teachers'.⁵ Lowndes was aware of the damage that had been done to the Education Department in 1971 when a very questionable distinction had been made between giving support and advice to teachers on the one hand and the development of theory on the other. He fears that a similar rift now threatens SEFT. 'What however is not acceptable is the setting up of a critique of SEFT on the ideological dichotomy of teachers work being opposed to intellectual activity.'⁶

He clearly feared that those activists who attended the SEFT AGM would have expectations that EAS should follow suit. He argues that EAS will be in a better position to support SEFT if it is not perceived within the BFI as simply following a SEFT initiative. He specifically cautions that 'departmental work must be clearly marked out from that of SEFT'.⁷ As to the role of the SEFT journals his views are very specific.

It should be apparent that I envisage *Screen Education* as the radical arm of screen education practices and it should not be associated with formal LEA classroom projects. By advocating that role [as a politically active journal] for *Screen Education* I envisage its life, in that form, being not more than two or three years.⁸

Screen is perceived as less of a problem. 'I consider their project a correct one, the introduction of psychoanalysis, semiology and social theory into film and TV study.'⁹

The BFI records contain several subsequent drafts for an EAS Policy Statement proposed by the remaining members of the department during December 1976 and January 1977. Whether a final agreed version of such a draft ever emerged, it is, at the current stage of consolidation of the BFI Document Archive, impossible to say. Of more immediate importance to SEFT was the reaction of the BFI Governors to developments in the Society. Jim Hillier, the Acting Head of Educational Advisory Service after Lowndes had left, had to defend SEFT.¹⁰ He produced a very convincing document which was incorporated into the Director's 1977 Report on Grant-in-Aid Bodies. In the minutes of their meeting at

which the report was received, the Governors were recorded as being very positive about the Institute's support for SEFT.¹¹

Hillier had presented the Society as 'a professional society of educators' which had produced 'one of the foremost journals in the English speaking world'. He argued that *Screen* had 'unjustifiably' become the main activity by which SEFT was noticed. Accordingly he drew attention first to *Screen Education* which had 'a very substantial international reputation' and then to SEFT's Weekend Schools, Easter School and its Regional Groups.¹² What Hillier was able still legitimately to do was present SEFT as 'the only major national professional society representing the interests and concerns of teachers and lecturers involved in film and television study in secondary and higher education'.¹³ While such a professional body might expect BFI's support, it would be increasingly difficult for SEFT in the 1980s continue to match up to Hillier's description.

Lowndes has claimed that he and Director Lucas, sharing an art college background, were not dissimilar in their assessments of situations.¹⁴ It is possible that Lucas was influenced by Lowndes's document, as the Director's response to the latter's departure was to take time in appointing a replacement. Interviews were set up in late spring 1977, but there were clearly still unresolved issues.

During the course of interviewing for a new Head of the BFI's Educational Advisory Service, a number of issues arose about the BFI's educational role which I felt worth airing more widely before an appointment was made.¹⁵

Lucas then decided to consult widely on the purpose and function of the Educational Advisory Service. This included the setting up of a series of seminars with BFI's contacts representing the different sectors of education.¹⁶ Given the numbers of teachers, lecturers and other educationists invited to offer their opinions, the consultation produced a very long list of proposals which the increasingly cash-strapped BFI was in no position to address.¹⁷

The one definite proposal was for a new post of Research and Higher Education Officer. Though the title was new, two of the proposed post's main duties were ones that EAS staff had been familiar with for some time: advising higher education institutions on film and television study and promoting in-service courses for teachers. Only 'the supervision and administration of a research programme' was novel.¹⁸ To describe it as 'new' is misleading.

Whannel had seen this as a desirable function of his Education Department. Indeed several of his staff had researched books during their employment, albeit without anyone being officially paid to do any research. It was the Governors' antipathy to such a theoretical and research emphasis that led to Whannel's resignation and the redesignation of the Education Department as the Educational Advisory Service. Unsurprisingly therefore the research post never materialised and Lucas retired at the end of 1978.

A research post was a particularly inappropriate outcome from the consultation since Lucas's starting point had been the aftermath of the 1976 York conference. In his letter inviting participants to the seminars, Lucas referred to 'film/TV/media studies' and asks of the move to media studies 'is this a productive shift?'¹⁹ The appointment made as Lowndes's successor was unexpected. Richard Sherrington was not known in screen education circles; he was an audiovisual aids specialist from the British Council. Sadly Sherrington never took up the post. He was killed in an airplane hi-jack in the final weeks of his British Council employment. The post of head of EAS was then offered to and accepted by Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, who had recently resigned as Editor of *Screen*.

During the interregnum the Deputy Head, Jim Hillier, had again taken over as Acting Head of EAS. It fell to Hillier not only to defend the BFI's grants to SEFT but also to intercede on behalf of Lucas when the latter was under persistent pressure from the National Association for Film Education (NAFE), which by 1977 had been in existence for six years.²⁰ It was sufficiently recognised to merit inclusion alongside SEFT when *Visual Education* ran a group of articles on 'Film and Television Studies in the UK' in April 1977.²¹ NAFE's distance from SEFT's thinking may be deduced from the NAFE contribution to the articles. NAFE welcomes the 'Great Debate' and sees it as a helpful intervention and believes that Callaghan's curriculum reform will embrace film and television. As a consequence these areas will be retrieved from their isolation from the curriculum, an isolation produced by the action of many film teachers who 'have contributed to this situation in some measure either through their own lack of vision, or through their prior commitment to other goals, such as political change (or sometimes their own academic advancement).'²²

It is clear from the article that NAFE had taken over two of the 1960s' SEFT's successful enterprises - the fortnight Summer School at the Glamorgan College of Education and the

London Co-operative Society's 'Let's Make a Film Festival'. Indeed these are the only two NAFE events that are identified in the article. There is no evidence available as to NAFE after 1977, though the 'Let's Make a Film Festival' survived into the 1990s when, as the 'Young People's Film and Video Festival', it celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1991 at the National Museum of Photography, Film and Television.²³ The Co-op was still the primary promoter, but NAFE had long before been replaced by the BFI.

SEFT and BFI together had been the most influential bodies in the slow evolution of screen education into media education during the post war decades; however this leadership would be challenged in the 1980s particularly by institutions that were able to deliver courses directly to full-time students. The University of London Institute of Education's Department of Educational Media had become significant in the evolution of media education by the end of the 1970s. Previously the only screen education offered at the Institute had been within its Teachers' Centre, run by David Johnstone, an early advocate of film teaching. In spring 1959 the Centre had offered a one term evening course on 'Film Appreciation in Secondary Schools'. The course tutor had been Paddy Whannel and his guest lecturers had come from both BFI and SEFT.²⁴ A similar arrangement had supported 'The Cinema and the Teacher' in spring 1968. This too had been a joint BFI/SEFT arrangement but with a later generation of personnel from those organizations, with Victor Perkins as course tutor. The synopsis in the Teachers' Centre leaflet reflects the period:

This course has been designed to introduce teachers to the practicality of the study of film in all senses, including the consideration of feature films and the use of film as a liberal catalyst helping to break down the rigours of traditional subject barriers.²⁵

With Johnstone's initial encouragement Bob Ferguson, the new departmental head, had been able to move what was essentially an audio-visual aids support section into a training department for media teachers. The first step had been to offer those studying for the postgraduate certificate in education (the PGCE teacher training qualification) the option of taking a combined English and Media course. Then with the recruitment of Alvarado and Phillip Drummond to its staff, the department was able to offer from 1981 an MA in Film and Television Studies for Education, on both a full-time and part-time basis.²⁶ Almost simultaneously the Post-graduate Diploma in Film Study at the Polytechnic of Central London was modified so that it became the first stage qualification *en route* to an

MA. Those in the metropolitan area therefore, by the early 1980s, had the choice between two Masters degrees. The Institute provided for the teacher or further education lecturer looking for an in-service qualification; the Polytechnic perhaps attracted more of those with ambitions to teach in higher education.²⁷

The Institute's MA required students to submit a dissertation and to sit three examination papers of three hours each with a student answering three questions per paper. The papers were:

Paper 1: The Theory and Practice of Film and Television Education.

Paper 2: Film and Television History and Theory.

Paper 3: Children, Education and Television.

After the first year an alternative Paper 3 was made available: Realist and Anti-Realist Theory and Practice in Film and Television.²⁸

The question papers in the early years were demanding, perhaps less so for those who were regular readers of *Screen* and *Screen Education*. A question from the 1982 paper provides a convincing example.

To what extent do you think it is desirable and possible to utilise 'structural analysis' of film and television narrative in the classroom? Answer with reference to: either Levi Strauss's work on myth; or Metz's syntagmatic analysis of film; or Barthes' work on the codes of narrative.²⁹

As Ferguson, Alvarado and at Drummond were all at this time members of the *Screen Education* Board, students were no doubt advised as to the advantages of their joining SEFT. SEFT itself would benefit as students from the PGCE course when taking up teaching posts would be available to be recruited to play volunteer roles within SEFT. Those who joined SEFT from the Institute would have been subscribing at a time when the Society was beginning to face financial difficulties. These would not have been immediately apparent since the Institute's Library had shelves stacked with volumes of *Screen* and *Screen Education* from the 1970s. Close inspection of the issues around the end of the 1970s would have revealed evidence of the transitional processes that both journals were undergoing.

Perhaps the main article of interest in *Screen Education* 26 (published in Spring 1978) was that on 'Examinations and Strategies' by James Donald.³⁰ There are two reasons for this interest. Firstly Donald would shortly be appointed Editor in succession to Alvarado and secondly because the issue of examinations highlighted a dilemma for SEFT. The wider

society valued examinations and for working-class students examination success had for decades provided the route that enabled them to achieve. On the other hand 'the examination system is bound to determine and limit subject areas, and must ultimately stifle the radical potential of the space that any new subject area may create'.³¹ Among the journal's readers were those members of the various consortia who were teaching the GCE O Level in Film Study who would have wished to counter the argument. For them the recognition and money that teaching film had now achieved at institutional level was directly attributable to the status that being able to offer a GCE examination conferred.

The most significant part of Donald's article for the purposes of this investigation is when he poses 'the sensitive question of SEFT's own location in the social formation - it is, after all, funded mainly by the State (although at third or fourth hand). How long will its privileged license [sic] as an oppositional clerisy be secure?'³² Donald then contrasts SEFT with the Media Studies Association. The latter was a short lived attempt to have a professional body for media teachers whereas Donald clearly sees SEFT, long established as such a body for teachers of film and television, as something very different. He asks 'How can SEFT most effectively intervene in the current debate (the struggle between ideologies about education) -- crucially at the level of theory, but also politically?'³³ He wants to put on the agenda 'the question of SEFT's relationship to the organised working class'.³⁴ The questions around SEFT's status and role would stay unresolved for the remainder of the Society's existence.

A response to Donald is provided by 'Reading the Realist Film' which is the most extensive article in the issue.³⁵ Taking up a debate that had been running in *Screen*, the author Tony Stevens, having engaged with the theoretical arguments, enquires as to the role that this theory of realism plays in the teaching of film. For Stevens the class struggle is at the heart of the realism debate because 'For the ruling class film language is transparent, communicating or expressing a world of meaning which confirms its rule'.³⁶ Teaching 'realism' therefore means engaging with the class struggle and demonstrating to working-class students that realism is 'the very term of the involvement of film in that struggle'.³⁷

Screen Education 27 (the last to credit Alvarado as Editor) has an editorial which seeks to identify the problems confronting both BFI and SEFT in the development of a British film culture. The BFI is perceived as making a virtue of its reluctance to adopt a political

stance, since in so doing it avoids being targeted by those who might take a different stance. But *Screen Education* argues that not taking a political stance is by default the adoption of a political stance. It argues that pre-1971, SEFT too had avoided taking a political stance but had subsequently decided that 'financially and institutionally, it was in a key position to attempt to make a more serious and sustained intervention into the existing British film and TV culture'.³⁸ To assist in the widening of the horizons of the Society's work, 'education' was defined in its widest sense. 'As all practices are political so too are they educational'.³⁹

Alvarado was joined in the editing of this issue by Roy Stafford and Elizabeth Cowie. The established practice was for Alvarado to draft an editorial and for the issue editors then to comment.⁴⁰ Given that Alvarado was on the point of leaving SEFT, perhaps here he was concerned to redefine the Society's fundamental task and the distinctiveness of its status in relation to the BFI. However it is clear that, whatever means are to be employed, both organisations have a fundamental responsibility to film culture. It would become increasingly apparent in the succeeding years that the territory which the BFI and SEFT had once occupied in isolation would be increasingly impinged upon as higher education expanded and academics saw the potential for developing courses in a wide range of new study areas (Communications/Culture/Media/Film). These would necessarily include the study of film and television.

Although *Screen Education* 28 was the first to have Donald credited as Editor, its editorial is signed by Donald, Alvarado, Richard Collins and Bob Ferguson. It reads as a continuation of the thinking of the previous editorial and attempts to define 'the central concern of *Screen Education*' or at least to identify the kinds of questions that need to be asked if someone is to 'teach about film and television against the grain of both the media and the education system'.⁴¹ In the light of how *Screen Education*'s priorities were to change under the new editorship, it is less important to list here what the questions were than to note how *Screen Education* still clearly saw its role as being in the arena of teaching film and television. There was then an assumption that those choosing to engage in this arena were politically progressive. If *Screen* had championed certain theorists, here *Screen Education* would promote Gramsci and Bourdieu.

By *Screen Education* 29 there were two new members of the editorial board: Simon Frith, a lecturer in sociology and Irene Payne, a London teacher. The issue's innovation was to foreground articles on sexuality, the principal ones being by Frith and Angela McRobbie. McRobbie was a research student at the Leicester Centre for Mass Communication Research who would succeed Donald and become *Screen Education's* final editor for its closing issues. There had been little previous contact between SEFT and the Leicester Centre. McRobbie's involvement and Frith's being on the board were indicative of Donald's intention to seek contributions from institutions that had previously not had an effective connection with SEFT. Another relatively new contributor was Jo Spence, co-founder of Photography Workshop, whose article explored how class was insufficiently considered in the representation of women. The third contributor on sexuality was Gregg Blachford, a member of Gay Left collective, who wrote on pornography and its potential for subversive readings.

Given the new territory which these articles were introducing to *Screen Education*, the introductory editorial refers back to the beginnings of the revived *Screen Education* and to its declaration that the journal had to be involved in the construction of the theory that would support the film and television teacher. The editorial concedes that the articles may be read as provocative but argues that together they change the way in which much of the then current teaching about stereotyping was being effected. Simply to deplore the use of stereotypes as demeaning to individuals who might be thereby identified was to miss the fundamental point that stereotypes were 'ideological constructions with determinate political outcomes'.⁴²

At this period, Donald, as both Education Officer and Editor of *Screen Education*, established closer contact with the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.⁴³ There had been little contact between it and SEFT for most of the 1970s, despite the broad similarity of their projects. It might be assumed that the BCCCS, housed within the University of Birmingham's English Department, would have been the better funded organisation. It seems however that SEFT with its two printed journals and four staff was in the stronger position. The Birmingham Centre for many years had only duplication facilities by which it published the papers of its research graduates. *Screen's* contributors had access to a more prestigious form of publication. Notably absent from the Centre's research programme were papers on aspects of film. The reason was simple. While

Screen, through its BFI connection, had easy access to screening facilities, the Birmingham Centre could not even afford a 16 mm projector.⁴⁴

Stuart Hall (Acting Director of the Centre from 1968-72 and then Director till 1978) welcomed Donald's involvement of researchers and staff from the Centre in writing for *Screen Education* and he subsequently regretted its ceasing publication since he regarded it as the more accessible of SEFT's magazines.⁴⁵ The Centre's relationship with *Screen* had been rather different. The contacts between them had been limited. *Screen* had published an article by Rosalind Coward to which the Centre had responded.⁴⁶ Coward had attacked both *Screen* and the Centre. In his editorial introducing Coward's article, Nowell-Smith had summarised her attack on *Screen*, where he considered that she was claiming that the journal had 'failed to develop adequately certain implications of its work on representation'. Her onslaught on the Centre was more severe,

...arguing that its theory of culture as an expression of class and class interests fails to recognise, in fully Marxist terms, the complexity of the way 'cultural' representations are produced and the determining action of the means of representation (with its attendant possibilities of subject position) on the represented.⁴⁷

In its defence, the Centre sought first 'to repudiate the sectarian manner in which this attack was conducted'.⁴⁸ The authors from the Centre felt that Coward had picked only two of its papers and generalised her attack from these. Hall now concedes that Coward was correct in demonstrating that the Centre whilst 'always at a distance from a full-blown theoreticist paradigm' retreated into 'an anthropological class-based version of culture'.⁴⁹

It is useful to compare the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and SEFT/*Screen*/*Screen Education* as 1970s institutions. There were several notable similarities. Each was regarded as potentially subversive by a larger 'parent' institution, respectively the University of Birmingham and the British Film Institute. This reputation for subversiveness then served to attract graduate students to Birmingham and activists to SEFT. Marxist thinking was fundamental to both but, as John Ellis discovered when joining SEFT after time spent researching at Birmingham, each answered to a very different kind of Marxism.⁵⁰ Each had survived an attempt to close it down: SEFT when Whannel and his colleagues resigned from the BFI in 1971 and BCCCS when it became clear that Hoggart would not return to continue as Director of the Centre when he left his

secondment to UNESCO in 1972. Both organisations survived these attempts, though by different mechanisms: Rohdie deployed the activism of the New Left against a vulnerable BFI management; Hall called on the academic reinforcements of Raymond Williams and James Halloran.⁵¹

The legacy of Leavis impinged on both SEFT and BCCCS and the shared intellectual quest was for a more theoretical and less intuitive approach to their non-literary investigations. In neither case would the search be for a home-grown replacement theory; the choice was considered to lie between European and US alternatives. Both took the European option. *Screen* defined itself by being outside the academy. The Centre, despite its physical location within the Birmingham University Campus, was effectively also operating outside the academy. It had from its inception in 1964 gathered together graduates engaged in collective research at a time when such a phenomenon had no formally agreed status within the academy.⁵² Perhaps it was this uncertainty around its position within the University which resulted in the Centre neither approaching nor being approached by the BFI when there was the offer of funded film lectureships. The Centre would certainly have welcomed both the funding which the lectureship would have brought and the novel intellectual stimulus that film study might have provided. Hall now regrets that no such overture was ever made by either party. 'It would have been an inspired move but it never happened.'⁵³

There were differences between SEFT and the Centre, as Hall acknowledges. Since it was he rather than Hoggart who had recognised the need to go beyond Leavis in the search for theory and had therefore taken the Centre in that direction, Hall is perhaps being rather self-effacing when he describes the Centre's approach as 'always bringing a low-flying pragmatism to these over elaborated questions'.⁵⁴ Nevertheless there was a fundamental difference specifically between *Screen* and the Centre in that *Screen* sought to develop theory while the Centre wanted to find a methodology for applying theory to society. Hall's assessment is similar to that which Willemen would make.

Occupying Marxist theory at a very advanced level was for *Screen* the only justification needed for their politics. ... Theory was operating in a realm of theory which generated theory.⁵⁵

SEFT had two journals. Each needed to meet publication deadlines and to have copy ready for the printers. This regime imposed its own discipline which was absent from the Centre

where individual post-graduates worked at their own pace on their own projects. Each journal wanted to demonstrate a collective authority in its publication, rather than individual authorship. The Editorial Board meetings were therefore experienced very differently by board members from the way in which the Centre's graduates were able to move between a selection of 'work in progress' seminars. But some of the work presented at these seminars found its way into the later issues of *Screen Education*.

By *Screen Education* 30 two additional members had been recruited to the Board. They were: Philip Simpson, who was the newly appointed Adult Education Officer in the BFI's Educational Advisory Service, and Madeleine McDonald, a member of the Faculty of Education at the Open University. This issue would have reached members in the run-up to the 1979 General Election. The tone of the editorial with its references to cuts, to the declining school population and to the wide circulation of 'a coherent critique from the radical, populist Right' reflects what must have been the mood of many SEFT members.⁵⁶ The *Screen Education* project is defined. The statement takes on a political urgency and is expressed with a precision of language that suggests the involvement of Jim Grealy, one of the joint editors for that issue.

This project remains the elaboration of the theoretical bases of critical teaching about film and television and an investigation of the relationship of these strategies to the developing knowledge about the mass media's place in the social formation.⁵⁷

As a statement of intent it is wide ranging, but by virtue of its generality it will enable the inclusion by the end of the next paragraph of 'socialists working within the educational and cultural apparatuses' who can 'try to transform the relations of the State... in the interests of dominated social classes'.⁵⁸

There follows the only piece that Donald would write for *Screen Education* during his editorship, a response to the 1977 Green Paper *Education in Schools*, in which he calls for 'a theory of ideological struggle'.⁵⁹ A role in this struggle is envisaged for SEFT, here redefined as 'a cultural organisation' and associated with (among others) the Socialist Teachers' Alliance. Such organisations should, Donald suggests, follow Gramsci and produce 'a series of ideological, religious, philosophical, political and juridical polemics, whose concreteness can be estimated by the extent to which they are convincing, and shift the previously existing disposition of social forces'.⁶⁰ However since SEFT, Donald concedes, is not a political party he is then somewhat constrained in what he proposes that

the Society may offer. What he does in the article is to prescribe a course of action for teachers. Those in state education 'should be using all the resources available to them to create an expanding layer of "organic intellectuals"'.⁶¹

In the same issue Philip Simpson (a former college of education lecturer) writes about the closure of many colleges of education (as the teacher training colleges had been re-designated). This had a particular resonance for lecturers in film where during the 1960s and early 1970s film and television study had found its only higher education niche. Now it seemed that the small number of colleges offering such a specialism was threatened. Simpson's case is that even though the consequences of the imminent fall in school pupil numbers that had triggered the closure programme had been resisted by those working in the colleges, this resistance had had almost no effect since decisions were being taken on a simplistic numbers basis at a very remote governmental level. Readers of this issue would have had to confront the disparity between what Donald was proposing as a potentially influential role for SEFT (in the opening pages) and what Simpson was identifying as the reality dominating the lives of those who were college of education lecturers (at the back of the journal). Perhaps this was an inevitable outcome for SEFT where the boards of its journals were increasingly occupied by those furthest from the educational front lines.

Another new board member, John Tagg, then an art historian from Leeds University but formerly at the BCCCS, had joined by *Screen Education* 31. He had previously contributed to *Screen Education* 28 where he had continued the interest that the journal had been showing for several issues in photography. The poor quality of photographic reproduction in *Screen Education*, consequent upon the type of paper on which it was printed, would soon be remedied with the introduction of a section printed on glossy paper, starting with *Screen Education* 34.⁶²

Issue 31, with its contents generated entirely under Donald's editorship, has a range of articles covering areas which had been addressed in the previous sequence of issues. Their diversity is used as justification for the reorientation of *Screen Education* which returns to the recently abandoned practice of having a title for the issue. This one is 'Interventions'.

The logic of *Screen Education*'s shift from its original limited concern with teaching about film and television to engagement with broader cultural questions is made clear by the way that certain issues cut across these articles.⁶³

The rebranding it seems is now a *fait accompli*, though a specific announcement is made to the effect that the next issue is going to include 'a new look at some of the central terms in the field of film studies'.⁶⁴ However, when *Screen Education* 32/33 appeared its title was 'History/Technology/Culture'.

Francis Mulhern's book *The Moment of Scrutiny* had just been published.⁶⁵ This was an account of the intervention by Leavis into the teaching of English. *Screen Education* engages with the book's publication and *Scrutiny* is exhibited as an example of effective journalistic intervention into cultural practice. However the editorial has to concede that 'such journalism can only become effective if it fits in with a range of other - often more direct - tactical engagements with educational practices and institutions'.⁶⁶ By which one must infer that the effectiveness of Leavis was probably more the result of cohorts of Cambridge English graduates going into school teaching, than simply through the publishing of *Scrutiny*. What appears to be happening in this editorial is a retreat from its previous hard-line position on the class struggle: 'we do not see a strategic perspective in terms of donning a set of political certitudes like the team colours before a football match'.⁶⁷ Mulhern had argued that *Scrutiny*'s flaw had been that it had attempted to ignore politics. The lesson that *Screen Education* had taken from the *Scrutiny* experience seemed to be that it might be in danger of going to the other extreme. If avoiding politics was one danger, the other would be to retreat from 'a concern with specific cultural struggles into a notion of politics as nothing but the clash of pre-given, economically defined class interests'.⁶⁸

Screen Education 32/33 despite its cover designation of 'History, Technology, Culture' is divided into three different sections: 'On Photography', 'Studies in Film' and 'Culture and Communication'. Another recruit had joined the Editorial Board: Hazel Carby, a researcher at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. At 100 pages the 'Studies in Film' section dominates the issue. The editorial is more reflective and considered than some of its immediate predecessors. This might have been stimulated by the arrival of Anthony Smith as Director of the British Film Institute and his immediate intervention in order to discover what the three grant- in-aid bodies did for the money the BFI allocated for them.

The editorial of this *Screen Education* is important for several reasons. Firstly the issue's editors were members of the Educational Advisory Service. Simpson would soon take over as Head of what would be once again known as the Institute's Education Department. Cary Bazalgette would remain in the Department until 2007. Secondly it addresses the issues raised at a conference 'Film and Media Studies in Higher Education' held in 1979. Thirdly it identifies the question that must have perplexed readers who had been long-term SEFT members: how was film study regarded in relation to the ever extending variety of discourses that now preoccupied *Screen Education*?

Simpson's interventions at the BFI will be discussed subsequently. Undoubtedly his style of management of the Department and his engagement with the Boards of both *Screen Education* and then *Screen* would indicate that he was prepared to operate as Head of the Department very much as Paddy Whannel had done. At this stage Simpson was notable for being a long time SEFT member, an activist in the North East Film and Television Teachers' Association and a former lecturer in film at Alnwick College of Education. He had a very different pedigree from the other new recruits to the *Screen Education* Board. (Bazalgette had been a member of the Board since joining *Screen Education Notes* in 1973.) Quite apart from their commitment to film study, both would have been very aware of how the closely the SEFT journals were read and interpreted inside the British Film Institute.

The 1979 Conference had been a very different event from that in York three years earlier. The differences reveal how rapidly the world of screen education within the UK was changing. 'Film and Media Studies in Higher Education' had been held at the University of London Institute of Education in summer 1979, promoted by both the EAS and the Institute's Department of Educational Media. 'Media Studies' now shared equal billing with 'Film' in the conference title. Only three years earlier at York, the status of Media Studies had still been in question. The York conference had been aimed at secondary school teachers, but in attendance they had been outnumbered by other interested parties. The 1979 conference had been for those in higher education and the attendance had reached 170.⁶⁹ Indeed it seems that the expectation of the organisers had been such that initially two separate conferences were envisaged to cope with the potential numbers.⁷⁰ At the event numbers were so great that each individual seminar group contained around thirty people.

Simpson had delivered a paper at the conference where he had drawn on research that he had carried out before joining the BFI. He revealed that the study of film was offered on courses in fourteen colleges/departments of education, twenty two universities and seventeen polytechnics. In five of the polytechnics, film was offered in more than one department.⁷¹ The attendance figures at the conference confirmed Simpson's research which indicated that some fifty eight higher education departments already had staff teaching film. There were undoubtedly numerous other conference participants about to start such courses. A key paragraph in his report is revealing.

... lectures and seminars are structured around perspectives opened up by film theory in the last few years. Ideology and cinema has already been mentioned as an important concern, but the more recent work on film derived from structural linguistics and psychoanalysis also tends to be introduced in courses where the teachers recognise an obligation to ensure that students who have committed most of their final year to Film Studies have an awareness of the current issues in the field. Meeting this sense of obligation can often present difficulties since few film teachers would claim competence in those disciplines from which much film theory is currently derived.⁷²

This huge expansion had been carried out by lecturers who had only minimal - if any - training in what they were teaching. Some students might be taught by lecturers who were current recipients of the BFI funded university lectureships. Seven were in place at the time, either directly BFI funded or formerly funded lectureships which had been taken over by the universities. But most students were probably taught by lecturers who were aware that film study was now supported by theory, but a theory of which they had only a limited grasp. The conference might have assisted/alarmed them when they saw how many others shared their predicament.

It was in this environment that, as the *Screen Education* editorial reports, an atmosphere of disenchantment was discernible. Given the background to the conference outlined above, it is not surprising that negativity was to be found at the event. Clearly expectations of the new subject area had been high in some quarters since the editorial reports that the accusation which had been voiced about Film and Media Studies was that 'it has not only failed to undermine traditional academic hierarchies and practices but has even become "just another discipline" itself'.⁷³ The editors suggest that the responsibility for this state of affairs was judged by the dissatisfied participants to be the consequence of two flaws; a tendency to be ahistorical and to fetishise the film text. The editors refer to articles in the

journal which they consider demonstrate that film study does not necessarily possess these flaws and may therefore be read as a refutation of such claims.

A common implication of all these articles is that the 'object' of Film Studies is *not* the film text as a unique object, but film-making practices (technological, industrial and semiotic), bodies of films conceptualised generically or according to their conditions of production, the history of film theory, and so on - in short, the apparatus cinema.⁷⁴

Rather, they turn the argument back on the protesters at the conference and the protesters' failure to conceptualise with equal rigour the institutional context in which Film and Media Studies has been put to work - the education apparatus. Clearly the editors were determined to resist the level of dissatisfaction that had been directed against film study. Some share of the responsibility lay with the institutions that had in effect directed a largely untrained workforce to teach in an emerging discipline, a discipline that was known for its engagement with difficult theory.

Most importantly the editors seize the opportunity to commit the now wide-ranging *Screen Education* to a definition of the specific version of film teaching that it wished to endorse.

It

...has a different and perhaps more precise educational purpose. This is to show students how films produced within determinate socio-economic conditions themselves produce *meaning* through systems of signification - meaning which by its modes of representation in turn sustains social identities and categories. Film Studies, in this view, is a way of challenging the ideological power of the cinema; it can interrogate the nature and effectivity of the pleasure derived from films and can give conceptual coherence to audiences' resistances to them.⁷⁵

Nevertheless *Screen Education* was being moved, by Donald, towards Cultural Studies. At the end of the editorial the next issue, *Screen Education* 34, was trailed. It would focus on 'parallel growth in recent years of activities given coherence by notions of 'cultural struggle' and 'cultural studies'.⁷⁶ Therefore there needed to be a clear link from the statement of endorsement about the nature of film study to cultural studies articles with which the readers would not already have been familiar. This is approached diplomatically, given how the editors had reacted to the conference.

Although the magazine occupies a space bounded neither by 'film culture' nor by the context of school, college or university, it has to be responsive to what is actually happening in those institutions. Because the journal's work is by definition theoretical, it strives to be consistent and systematic in its analysis and the strategic perspectives. But because it is precisely this theoretical work that makes it *useful*

and *effective*, *Screen Education* will continue to be intellectually accessible and open to the expression of different positions.⁷⁷

To demonstrate that it would deliver on this claim *Screen Education* 32/33 included an article by Claude Bailblé which was designed to relate technical knowledge to broader considerations of film theory.⁷⁸ Its translator was Susan Bennett whose expertise in rendering difficult French constructions into accessible English had resulted in her falling out of favour with *Screen*. But her style clearly fitted *Screen Education's* agenda and was particularly appropriate for Bailblé's writing which involved concepts from biology, physics and mathematics and sought to connect the approach of the theorist with the knowledge of the technical practitioner. Thus for example he challenges the long established notion that the spectator's engagement with the film was analogous to her/his reading it. Instead he offers insights into what might be involved in the process of looking.

In February 1980 SEFT organised a weekend conference on 'Culture and Politics'.⁷⁹ The speaker invited to start the event was Francis Mulhern, Editor of New Left Books. Among the other speakers were Stuart Hall, then recently arrived at the Open University, and Ernesto Laclau, Lecturer in Politics at Essex University. Mulhern recalls that the main interest generated by the event was how Hall and Laclau would interact.⁸⁰ It seems probable that *Screen Education* 34 had been expected to publish papers from the conference and space in the journal had been provisionally allocated accordingly. Only Mulhern's introductory paper is printed as evidence of the conference.⁸¹ There are pieces by Hall and Laclau but unrelated to the conference. The former reviews Raymond Williams's *Politics and Letters* while the latter is represented by a paper delivered in Montréal in 1979.⁸² Mulhern's contribution is a model of good practice in getting a conference off to a controversial start but without the publication of any of the responses, it serves only to whet the appetite for what no longer follows.

As advertised in the preceding double issue, *Screen Education* 34 engages with cultural studies. It begins by referring back to *Screen Education* 22 where the editors had contested the separation of the elements 'screen' and 'education' and had instead placed screen education 'within the nexus of politics/ideology/culture'.⁸³ These circumstances are considered to have changed in the intervening three years and the editors now seek a mechanism to underpin oppositional education. A redefinition of 'culture' is sought which

will admit 'the social relations that have been excluded from education'. In negotiating the incorporation of 'culture' this issue of *Screen Education* seeks substantial contributions from Richard Johnson, who had succeeded Hall as Director of the Birmingham Centre and Tony Bennett, the Course Chairman for the Open University's forthcoming undergraduate course on Popular Culture.⁸⁴

Increasingly a feature of the journal is the mode of address that is adopted towards its readers. Their engagement with, and commitment to, an oppositional practice is assumed, but if they happen to be teachers they may be found wanting. Johnson writes 'the teacher must take, or be capable of taking, the standpoint of the oppressed'.⁸⁵ Hazel Carby writes 'the anger evoked by texts representing the oppression of black women could not be separated from anger directed at the white teacher, herself implicated as a direct source of oppression'. Making its annual report to the BFI earlier in the year, the Society had felt it appropriate to reassure its funder that it was 'by no means merely a professional association for teachers and lecturers'.⁸⁶

Readers of *Screen Education* 35 may have felt that they were back with a more familiar version of the journal. Some older readers might have become nostalgic for the 1960s' version in that the final fifteen pages contain listings of reference material and resources available for teaching television drama.⁸⁷ The listings are preceded by an article by Vincent Porter detailing the many legal limitations in force that constrained the use of video recording equipment in schools.⁸⁸ The editors of this issue on 'Television Drama' were Alvarado, Cowie and Grealy who had elicited contributions from well established writers such as Buscombe, Murdock and McArthur. The editorial deals directly with anomalies of the copyright law. As more video recorders were being purchased by schools for the sanctioned (temporary) recording off-air of educational television programmes, teachers were becoming aware of the prohibition on their recording of any other material. The editorial concludes 'it should surely be possible to negotiate agreements that protect the interests of authors, performers and technicians without perpetuating the absurd anomaly of outlawing television studies'.⁸⁹

The final issue produced under Donald's editorship had Bennett and Tagg as its joint editors.⁹⁰ Their editorial is revealing of the shift that the journal had undergone during the two years of Donald's editorship. Increasingly it had shared with *Screen* an impetus to

explore a specific area of theory. Here there are references to Althusser, Lacan, Derrida, Gramsci and Foucault. But where *Screen* had primarily sought to develop theory in order better to understand the nature of film, *Screen Education*'s priority had become the understanding of the politics of culture. This had supplanted the search, under the previous Editor, for theories that might facilitate a better understanding of the problems faced in education. Consequently the journal's 'advocacy of media teaching' is quoted in this editorial as simply one example of how *Screen Education* is now approaching the politics of culture.

If culture is thus defined as the complex unity of practices and institutions that produce sense -- if 'experience' is always experienced, organised and expressed through linguistic and other semiotic representations -- there is a clear political significance to struggles around the hierarchies of institutions in which representation are [sic] produced, circulated, regulated and have their effects.⁹¹

The editorial then justifies its interest in media teaching because such teaching intervenes within 'the education and entertainment apparatuses'.⁹² The intervention is important because it elaborates terms for 'reading' modes of representation 'within film, television and other popular cultural forms'.⁹³

At this time 2000 copies of *Screen Education* were being printed per issue of which 1300 were going to subscribers.⁹⁴ No records survive of who these subscribers were. Some presumably were long time SEFT members, but the composition of the remainder may only be guessed at. Even the most dedicated and assiduous reader of *Screen Education* would have been aware of the intellectual distance between those who wrote for it on the one hand and most of its readership on the other. Donald had recruited authors from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and from the Open University's Popular Culture team. These were the people with the time, commitment and responsibility to develop their thinking, to follow through their ideas and then to deploy the results of this thinking within articles and degree level teaching materials. Simultaneously higher education teaching institutions, as Simpson demonstrated in relation to film alone, were promoting courses around culture, media and communication that would necessarily incorporate this thinking. It is pertinent here to refer to the reactions of some of those who attended the higher education conference.

Those who had kept pace with *Screen Education* would recognise its fundamental premises. They would therefore perhaps accept that it was now the politics of culture which preoccupied the attention of academics and that consequently screen education was but an aspect of media teaching, which was itself but an instance of a range of mechanisms for engaging with culture. Some articles in the journal were clearly commissioned to assist in this process, particularly Colin Mercer's 'After Gramsci' and Iain Chambers's 'Rethinking Popular Culture'.⁹⁵ Those who were reported as voicing a protest at the conference were possibly those who were maintaining their reading and keeping up with the thinking. They were dissatisfied both with the limitations imposed on them at work and then had to listen to papers at the conference which they interpreted as insufficiently engaged with recent developments in theory. Despite their acceptance of these innovative approaches this dissatisfied cohort worked in institutions where they had to construct syllabuses and award qualifications. In these tasks too they would have found themselves constrained by 'old' thinking. But there must have been other conference participants who found the pace of developments daunting and whose professional profiles matched those, as identified by Simpson, who struggled to keep themselves informed about theoretical developments.

There were important changes taking place simultaneously at the other SEFT journal. Mark Nash became Editor of *Screen* with the Summer 1978 issue. He was able in some measure to signal that he had taken over by changing the colour of the cover paper to a vibrant green.⁹⁶ The next four Nash issues would have covers made distinctive by their brighter colours. The interregnum between Nowell-Smith and Nash had been covered by Elizabeth Cowie as 'Interim Editor'. For his first three issues Nash drew heavily on the *Screen* old guard: Brewster, Heath, MacCabe, Wollen, and Nowell-Smith. The editorials which he signed personally were generally brief exercises in contexting the articles that followed in each *Screen*. The Editorial Board was unchanged from that which had operated when Brewster was Editor.

With the first *Screen* of 1979, Nash and Steve Neale wrote the editorial jointly for an issue that had a more unified shape with three major articles on authorship. The editorial confronts an obvious reality. Despite there having been much examination of the concept of authorship in the *Screens* of the early and mid-1970s, the journal had subsequently moved to other theoretical preoccupations. But if notions of authorship had been displaced

from *Screen*, the editors were now recognising that these notions were still dominant not only in film criticism but also in film production, distribution and exhibition. As a first step a ten year old article by Foucault is printed.⁹⁷ Nash was maintaining the *Screen* procedure of transmitting French theory to the English-speaking world, though in this case the article had previously appeared in book form having been translated for publication in the USA.⁹⁸

Big changes for *Screen* are anticipated in the next editorial where five new members are listed as joining the Editorial Board.⁹⁹ Subscribers are alerted to the fact that they will have to wait six months for the next issue, but it will be a double issue. When it appeared in Winter 1979/80, *Screen* Volume 20 Number 3/4 had a larger format and had been completely redesigned by Julian Rothenstein. The substantial editorial, signed on this occasion by the Editorial Board, attempts to make an assessment of what *Screen* has achieved and, recognising that 1980 is the 30th year of SEFT's existence, states that the journal has 'a revised project and a new format'.¹⁰⁰ *Screen's* achievements are summarised both by identifying the particular theories it has advocated and by listing those categories of its English-speaking readership which it has influenced, whether in education, filmmaking or aesthetic practices more widely. It concludes the section on its influence thus.

Finally, *Screen* has offered to cultural and literary theory, and to theories of the place of 'ideology' in the social formation, a constant insistence on language in its specificity as signifying practices rather than as communication; in the light of this insistence it has worked to examine the nature of the text as systematic process and to explore the subject, as conceived by psychoanalysis, as an area of political struggle.¹⁰¹

The debate then concerns *Screen* and its relationship with the academy. Previously it had determined not to be an academic journal. This editorial is therefore an exercise in careful diplomacy. It sets out to facilitate the transition from the *Screen* of the 1970s, but without appearing to dissociate itself from the achievements of that decade. Those who were activists around *Screen* during the editorships of Rohdie, Brewster and Nowell-Smith have, when interviewed for this research, been emphatic that the *Screen* of their period was not an academic journal. It was the vehicle in which intellectuals committed to theorising film study were able to put their thinking into print. Here the editorial comments that *Screen* 'is sometimes mistaken as the academic journal of film studies'.¹⁰²

Since there had been almost no 'film study academy' for most of the 1970s, this had not been a difficult position to maintain. However, as Simpson's research had revealed, by the end of the decade there were the strong beginnings of such an academy in the UK. *Screen's* subscription income had, since Brewster's time, been buoyed up by the contributions from United States university libraries where there was a substantial film academy. Thus there were practical economic reasons why the journal might need to modify its position. This is effected in the editorial by distinguishing between how the term 'academic' had been interpreted in the 1970s and how it might now be reinterpreted.¹⁰³

For the *Screen* authors of the 1970s regular academic practice entailed 'an essentially reflective mode of thought and writing', whereas the *Screen* strategy had been designed to recognise that deploying such a practice changed 'the object it analyses by virtue of the systematisation it imposes on it'.¹⁰⁴ Certain articles had been written to make explicit this displacement. However, there was now an emergent film study academy and *Screen* inevitably had become part of the discourses circulating within it. Thus while still seeking to be oppositional to the academy, *Screen* was 'simultaneously within and against academic institutions'. The consequence of these manoeuvres was to see *Screen* as 'extremely vulnerable' to the pressures of the academy.¹⁰⁵ By professing vulnerability, perhaps the Editorial Board was acknowledging that they might need a cover story for any modifications in approach that might be adopted in order for *Screen* to survive. John Ellis recalls that the aim was very deliberately to move *Screen* towards a more journalistic engagement.¹⁰⁶

The *Screen* Editorial Board would have been as aware as the *Screen Education* Board that the new BFI Director would be perhaps their most diligent reader. In January 1980 it was reported to BFI Governors that Smith had required the three grant-in-aid bodies to provide the Governors with evidence to justify the continuation of BFI support.¹⁰⁷ Smith was being approached by numerous other bodies which wanted BFI funding and he needed to be convinced that the BFI's support for SEFT, the British Universities Film Council (BUFC) and the British Federation of Film Societies (BFFS) continued to be appropriate. Other organisations were discovering, as had NAFE, that only those which had grant-in-aid status had any security of income.

Having dealt with this transitional sequence, the editorial lists the new *Screen*'s priorities. Firstly, though its primary commitment to film and television remains, 'all practices of representation' will now be included in its remit.¹⁰⁸ As with previous *Screen* statements of intent there is recognition of the need to provide space for the consideration of independent film. This would prove to be a better indication of commitment at this point than previously when stated good intentions toward independent film-making had produced little in *Screen*. SEFT had recently committed itself to supporting independent filmmakers as a third constituency alongside its subscribers in schools and higher education.¹⁰⁹

One issue to be addressed was that of the difficulty represented by the style of writing which had become an essential characteristic of *Screen*. First there needed to be a justification for this difficulty, which is ascribed to the specific requirements of the *Screen* project up to this point. These included

... first the need to introduce a number of unfamiliar terms, drawn from the discourses of semiotics and psychoanalysis, whose use was justified by the precision with which they enabled certain arguments to be handled; and secondly the need to promote arguments in a way which broke with traditional (and for the most part liberal-academic) formulations and modes of address.¹¹⁰

Academic writing was perceived as 'essentially reflective'; much critical writing as 'bourgeois journalistic'. *Screen* therefore needed to have a style that prevented the reader from 'being given the chance to be confirmed in one's position of already knowing what one has just been told'.¹¹¹

But as with the circumstances surrounding its status as an academic journal, so too with the concerns about a *Screen* style, the editorial had to find room to manoeuvre. It had to concede that '*Screen* does not disturb the film and television establishment as it ought to: it merely irritates it'.¹¹² Thus if it is to extend both its readership and its influence, *Screen* must be more reader friendly. Here a deliberate tactic is deployed: find some real villains to attack who just happen to be few in number. They are neither the readership nor even the non-readers among critics and broadcasters. Instead they are revealed to be other film magazines which allegedly criticise *Screen* 'as though it were what it has never claimed to be: a marxist journal in the traditional sense'.¹¹³ The two writers then targeted are Andrew Britton and Kevin Robbins, writing in *Movie* and *Media, Culture and Society* respectively.¹¹⁴

Britton's article, though printed in *Movie*, was essentially a personal response to *Screen*, not an official *Movie* rebuff.¹¹⁵ It was nevertheless written from a film theory perspective. Britton introduced the term 'intellectual terrorism' to describe the attitude adopted by *Screen* towards its readers. This was a term which, although not in currency until the end of the decade, might have first been applied to the atmosphere of the 1972 BFI Summer School.¹¹⁶ Robins, a sociologist, was in the process of using the material in the article to shape a chapter for the forthcoming publication *Recovering Marxism*. Both writers are dismissed on the grounds that they have criticised *Screen* for not adopting whatever set of 'marxist postulates a particular author might at that moment have espoused'. 'Such pieces are evidence of an obstinate foreclosure of understanding for which *Screen* need bear no responsibility.'¹¹⁷ Today MacCabe considers the Robins article to be the best analysis of the mid-1970s *Screen*, since Robins identified *Screen*'s selective linking of Althusser with Lacan as the nub of its project.¹¹⁸ Perhaps it was impossible for this jointly produced editorial to take up the challenges of its critics, since to do so would almost certainly have exposed divisions within the Editorial Board. Britton's article presented particular problems for joint editorial comment in that he was prepared to identify some *Screen* authors as writing more effectively and consistently than others. Nash has conceded that he found, as Editor, he was answerable to a great many strong-minded individuals.¹¹⁹ This is corroborated by MacCabe who concedes that Nash 'had a dreadful time dealing with all us monsters'.¹²⁰

It is surprising how little impact was felt at *Screen* during the 1970s as a result of the emergence of feminism.¹²¹ One influential feminist, Claire Johnston, was a long-term activist within SEFT and indeed the second of the Society's two occasional pamphlets was written by her.¹²² However, despite SEFT's publication of this early pamphlet in 1973, during the editorships of Rohdie and Brewster, few women ever wrote for the journal. Laura Mulvey, whose 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' has been reprinted in almost all English-speaking film theory editions, was not a *Screen* regular.¹²³ This celebrated article was the only piece she ever wrote for the SEFT journal. Linda Williams, who also wrote for *Screen* at this time, must have been considered to have had a strong claim for inclusion, in that she had worked with Metz in Paris.¹²⁴ Other articles contributed by women tended to be either reprints or collaborative pieces written with men.

During the Nash editorship, there was a stated commitment to recognise and include the contributions being made by feminists. However compared with *Screen Education*, there were very few women writers employed, though women were a substantial part of the attendance at SEFT Weekend Schools, notably at the 1976 Weekend School on Feminism. Willemen considers that such events were important as a means of recruiting new writers.¹²⁵ Among those he identifies as having been enlisted in this way was one woman: Claire Pajaczkowska. In fact Pajaczkowska's experience was not one of being recruited. She had attended the Weekend School on Pornography in May 1980 as a filmmaker. Having made a number of interventions from the floor in response to the succession of male speakers, she felt sufficiently exercised to want to write up her reactions more comprehensively. This was completed over several months while supervising independent film exhibition, after which Pajaczkowska turned up speculatively at the SEFT office and handed over her article to Mark Nash. It was duly printed in *Screen* without any amendments being made.¹²⁶ In turn her article was reprinted along with Mulvey's in the *Screen Reader in Sexuality*.¹²⁷ These were the only two articles written on that subject by women to be published in *Screen* before its first woman editor, Mandy Merck, was appointed in 1982.

In the 1970s there had been several relatively short lived film journals that had circulated in the UK.¹²⁸ Apart from *Screen*, the other survivors by the end of the decade were the intermittently produced *Movie*, *Afterimage* and *Framework* which had been started by undergraduates at Warwick University, some of whom had attended Robin Wood's early film classes there. In certain respects, if early issues of *Framework* were compared with *Screen*, *Framework* might have been considered to be the more academic journal.¹²⁹ Subsequently *Framework* moved from Warwick to the University of East Anglia and then became independent. One of its most active contributors and then Editor was Paul Willemen, who had been a very influential force on *Screen*. In part Willemen's move to *Framework* was triggered by his increasing disillusion with *Screen*, about which he wrote at length.¹³⁰ In Willemen's view by 1979 *Screen* was 'politically and intellectually vacuous'. In particular he blamed (unnamed) 'post-structuralists' who dominated the Editorial Board.

By the time meetings started, heads had been counted, positions regarding issues to be discussed were known in advance and the rest was just a painful ritual to be endured.¹³¹

Willemen, who worked within the BFI for a long period, ascribes his engagement with film theory in Britain to his initial involvement with the BFI Education Department seminars starting in the late 1960s where he had first encountered Peter Wollen.¹³²

Willemen considers the outcome of the 1976 SEFT AGM to be a victory that went wrong, leading to 'theoreticism'.¹³³ For him *Screen*'s concern with theory was appropriate when theory was developed in order to be relevant to the cultural struggle; instead he considers that the production of theory became a self sufficient activity: 'the journal set itself up as a Laboratory of Pure Theory'.¹³⁴ He considers that the abandoning of the section on Film Culture (when Nowell-Smith became Editor) accelerated *Screen*'s 'trajectory towards the deep space of academia'¹³⁵ which occurred at a time when government financial cuts constrained the 'marginal spaces available for oppositional practices' that had previously been accessible in educational institutions. Willemen is brutal in his assessment of just why theoreticism became attractive

One result of this development was the re-emergence of theoreticism as a credible doctrine enabling academics to maintain a radical rhetoric which in no way would interfere with the serious business of careerism.¹³⁶

Nevertheless Willemen remained on the Editorial Board until the two SEFT journals merged. He had always seen the role of *Screen Education* as subsidiary to *Screen*: 'cutting edge theoretical work on the one hand and transmission belt work on the other'.¹³⁷ At this point he saw no possibility of a return to a *Screen* committed to the cultural struggle.

While appearing to its members as successful, with two substantial journals in regular publication, SEFT was facing problems by 1979. Already at this time, Donald recalls that the Society was being challenged as to the viability of its having two journals. They were clearly not functioning as complementary publications as Brewster's *Screen* and Alvarado's *Screen Education* had been. Once Smith was in post at the BFI, he and Donald had conversations in which Smith made clear that the BFI expected to be supporting a membership organisation with a single journal, not two journals each with a separate subscription list.¹³⁸

Although Donald had left the Society before the final decision had been made, it was clear to him that *Screen* had the more survivable reputation for SEFT's future. He was replaced

as Education Officer by Rod Stoneman but the editorship of *Screen Education* went to Angela McRobbie as caretaker editor,¹³⁹ albeit her editorship lasted for the last five issues until the Winter/Spring *Screen Education* in 1982. BFI Governors were told that SEFT was ceasing publication of both journals and starting a new one.¹⁴⁰ The new journal was however styled *Screen incorporating Screen Education*.

Strong long-standing support for SEFT had come in June 1980 from Colin McArthur, now established as Head of the BFI's Distribution Division, through whose department the grant to SEFT was channelled.¹⁴¹ McArthur's report had been presented to the Governors when they scrutinised the case made to them for the continuation of SEFT's grant-in-aid status. The Society's Officers had then to convince the BFI that they were prepared to take strong measures and subsequently they had to convey this to the membership. These measures included changing the legal status of SEFT into that of a company limited by guarantee. This was agreed at the AGM following the divisive 25th AGM in 1976. Delayed until early 1978, at this 26th AGM those nominated for the Executive Committee were elected unopposed.¹⁴²

A short term measure was the appointment of Steve Brockbank to a temporary new SEFT post of Publications Sales Officer at the end of 1978.¹⁴³ By this stage SEFT was offering for sale a wide range of periodicals and books from its small offices now at 29 Old Compton Street. These publications were available to callers, but mostly they were dispatched by mail. What had started as a service to members seeking copies of 'hard to find books', had grown substantially. A list of what was available went out as a regular insert in the journals. Storage of stock became a problem, which was resolved first by some space being found at the BFI and then by the hiring of a lock-up garage in Docklands.¹⁴⁴ In the event Brockbank's temporary post was not renewed after a year.¹⁴⁵

During 1979 further economies had to be found. *Screen's* contributors were no longer paid and both journals made savings by simultaneously producing double issues for the winter 1979/80.¹⁴⁶ 1980 would be the year when hard decisions had to be taken, including that of running on a small deficit. It was also the occasion of facing up to other realities. An Interim Report at the end of 1980 spells out that membership of SEFT consisted 'of little more than a subscription to one or both journals'.¹⁴⁷ Whereas in the 1970s, the different roles of *Screen* and *Screen Education* had been such that each might be

perceived as validating the existence of the other, currently in 1980 it was becoming evident that 'the two journals, envisaged as complementary within SEFT's project, were now the only visible part of the Society, and their twin concerns were seen as potentially polarising and factionalising tendencies'.¹⁴⁸

Not only had the Executive Committee decided in July 1980 to publish only one journal but, as a further element in this re-organization, there were to be three new full-time posts of Education Officer, Editor and Clerical Officer. These posts were to be offered on a three-year contract basis, justified as giving SEFT as a 'part-time voluntary employer' more control over its staff.¹⁴⁹ Nash, as part-time Editor of *Screen*, and Susan Honeyford, the full-time Editorial Assistant to both journals, were faced with a redundancy. Although their individual situations were eventually resolved and they left with compensation, there had been an Emergency General Meeting in June 1981, called because of the manner in which these employees had been treated.¹⁵⁰ Both journals continued until early 1982. The replacement journal would revert to bi-monthly publication and would have a 'proselytising role' so that it might achieve a wider readership. Its remit would be to cover 'Film and Television Culture and Education'.¹⁵¹ As part of this new project the proposed Education Officer would be expected to recruit members and would have a 'substantial budget' in order to achieve this.¹⁵²

While the SEFT Executive attended to this internal reorganization, the Society's role and influence in media education generally was in danger of disappearing. In November 1981, BFI Education and a new partner organisation, Goldsmiths College, organised a two-day event: 'Media Education Conference 1981'. It attracted 117 teachers and lecturers, but despite this attendance the event was described as being 'far from the euphoria of 1976'.¹⁵³ Like the 1979 conference for those in higher education, the very process of gathering teachers together had stimulated the articulation of a range of concerns. If the inclusion in its title of 'film and television' and 'secondary education' had been crucial in defining those for whom the earlier event in 1976 might have been appropriate, 'media education' had been deliberately chosen on this occasion for its vagueness.¹⁵⁴ 'Media studies' had been considered too specific a reference to an already existing curriculum subject. In the event such a wide range of participants turned up that

...some who were about to take their first steps in media teaching found themselves in seminars with teachers of considerable experience in the field and so it was

difficult to pursue questions about the definition and institutionalisation of media education *and* retain everyone's involvement.¹⁵⁵

There were thirty four group leaders at Goldsmiths, some of whom had connections with SEFT, but although each leader is identified by her/his professional involvement with media teaching, none is listed as having a role within SEFT. When the report of the conference was published, it became clear how marginal to such proceedings SEFT as an organisation was becoming. There had been a debate about the need for a national body to protect and foster the interests of media educationists. SEFT, in the opinion of Philip Simpson, the new Head of the BFI Education Department, 'already had an ill-defined role in this field'.¹⁵⁶ This is re-emphasised subsequently in the independent report commissioned by the BFI from two group leaders.¹⁵⁷ In the section of their report dealing with the need for such a national body they comment that 'SEFT has too wide a brief to allow it to function in this way'.¹⁵⁸ In the same paragraph they regret the imminent disappearance of *Screen Education*, so SEFT's wide brief was clearly perceived as impinging on its effectiveness, even if this brief no longer included the Society's producing an educational/pedagogic journal or its involvement in an important conference for media teachers.

The conference had a dual function – to provide a retrospective of the 1970s and to offer a planning opportunity in which to develop a strategy for the 1980s. David Lusted had the task of reviewing the previous decade. He makes no mention of SEFT's contribution during the period, even though he had been on the SEFT Executive for several years. There is a single mention of *Screen Education*.¹⁵⁹ When the conference came to look forward, anxiety among participants focused on the imminence of the plans for a new 16 plus examination structure to replace 'O' level and CSE. Such was the level of concern that the conference organisation was modified and Len Masterman, who had been the speaker scheduled to lead on 'Media Education in the 1980s', was allowed to introduce background information around the proposed examination structure as an additional emergency presentation.¹⁶⁰ A working party was set up to take the topic forward and to lobby the Joint Council of GCE and see CSE Boards. The immediate outcome was a letter to the Boards from the Conference.¹⁶¹

Murdock and Phelps a decade earlier had surveyed teacher attitudes to media; they had not targeted those involved in teaching media. This conference set out to attract those who had some interest or involvement in media education, yet there was evidence of the same hostility to media that the earlier researchers had detected in teachers generally. The divisions among the participants were categorised.

For instance, many came from a broad left perspective, with particular concern over questions of gender, race and class in the media. Some had a concern with teaching practical media skills in their own right, while others had a Leavisite, high/low culture perspective, concerned with protecting students from the dangerous influences of the mass media.¹⁶²

It would seem that the 'vagueness' of the term 'media education' had tempted some of those who were generally hostile to the mass media to turn up.

The invitation to Masterman to present the keynote speech at the conference was no doubt in recognition of the influence that his book *Teaching about Television* was having.¹⁶³ If *Teaching about Television* had a predecessor, it was *The Popular Arts*. Hall and Whannel had attempted to combine for a teacher audience a reference book, a theoretical justification for studying popular culture and demonstrations of classroom expertise that might be copied. In order to authenticate the authors' credentials, the dust jacket of the book had made reference to their having been teachers in secondary modern schools. Masterman's book, published sixteen years later, employed the same combination of ingredients, but had the advantage of an educational audience that was much better briefed about media issues. The imminent arrival of Channel 4 and its potential for difference had generated a focused interest and expectation that had eluded the arrival of BBC2 just before *The Popular Arts* was published.

Josephine Langham who researched the outcomes of the Independent Broadcasting Authority Fellowship scheme has high praise for Masterman, albeit it is *Talking About Television* that she considers, rather than the report that he wrote for the Fellowship.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, as he acknowledged, his book was the final stage of a lengthy research process. Her assessment is quoted in full

What Masterman did in *Teaching About Television* was not simply provide practical ideas about the way to approach television education in the classroom but he engaged in a major debate about the nature of education and confronted key

philosophical issues about teaching and learning. It was not just the book that was important for television studies: it had everything to say about education too. Television Studies attracted scholars who were interested in the problems of society, they were concerned about the alienation of working-class students from the educational system and they were prepared to confront conventional pedagogy. Teaching children about television stimulated many of these teachers to challenge accepted teaching practices and syllabuses. They accepted the significance of popular culture and developed a corresponding suspicion of elitist assumptions and indoctrination. They began to uncover what they saw as the spurious mystique surrounding the educational machine in order to reveal the hypocrisy which lay behind much of the cant about democratic societies. In short, they began to use the language of revolution and made many traditional educators, broadcasters (and politicians) not just merely uncomfortable but ferociously angry.¹⁶⁵

It might be inferred from this paragraph that Masterman did it single-handedly, which is not a claim that he would make. Certainly the issues that Langham identifies in Masterman had received much attention in *Screen Education* and undoubtedly many of that journal's readers would have bought and valued the book. What Masterman had done was to make very particular use of the freedom that being a teacher trainer in the 1970s allowed. He linked theory and practice and tested the outcomes over time in the school situation. It was different organisationally from what Lowndes had done in *Viewpoint* in that Lowndes had tried out different ideas but with different student groups on a short time scale. But both were focusing on the need to develop an educational response to the impingement of television.

SEFT became a very different operation from 1982. It was not just that it now published only one journal; the basis of its organisation was changed. For the first time *Screen* had a full-time Editor: Mandy Merck, an experienced journalist from *Time Out/City Limits* with a commitment to film and a determination to position the journal within the Academy.¹⁶⁶ The post of full-time Education Officer fell vacant when Rod Stoneman resigned in July 1983. Discussions with the BFI about the nature of his replacement delayed any appointment until the post was re-designated as National Organiser with a brief extending far beyond education. Sean Cubitt, subsequently appointed in spring 1984, was a community activist with experience of teaching in higher education.¹⁶⁷ Not only was SEFT now seeking to operate in a fundamentally different way, it was doing so in the changed political circumstances of the Thatcher government years. An almost unavoidable consequence was, as the Conclusion will seek to demonstrate, the closure of the Society in 1989. What this investigation has attempted to demonstrate is how SEFT and the various

SEFT/BFI collaborations had, by the start of the 1980s, provided a lead in transforming a grass-roots movement which had started in schools and further education colleges into a discipline increasingly gaining status in higher education. Once the momentum for entering the Academy was established and with *Screen* committed to the same enterprise, SEFT then failed successfully to engage with other, perhaps less prestigious, projects. It would become increasingly an enterprise that lacked an identity at a time when education involving media was expanding in many institutions.

CONCLUSION

Certain questions were identified in the Introduction and it has been the aim of this investigation to address them continuously chapter by chapter. This conclusion functions in two ways. It provides a resumé of how those initial questions were addressed in the period under scrutiny and it has to describe and interpret how SEFT met an abrupt end when its volunteers were confronted with their own disengagement from the project.

This investigation has concentrated on just two specific decades of SEFT's existence. In both decades the life of the Society had been sustained by volunteer effort, though it became increasingly able to operate more effectively by employing staff to undertake a range of specialist tasks. But the control of the Society was always with its Committee and Board members and it was because of where control was vested that any contesting of views within these groups was significant. There were in the 1960s and 1970s always some sympathetic senior figures within the BFI who were prepared to accommodate to this SEFT regime. They were matched by a SEFT Committee whose members (whatever their internal differences) ensured that the BFI was kept well informed about the Society. These SEFT activists recognised that part of this process involved demonstrating the extent of the Society's independence, both intellectually and financially.

Mutual recognition of the importance of the relationship did not extend beyond the early 1980s. Furthermore once it had been decided that *Screen Education* should be discontinued and that the production of *Screen* should be conceived as a more journalistic enterprise, an essential part of SEFT's identity was undermined. It had taken the wrong decision. *Screen* represented an asset which would readily have found a home in the Academy, while *Screen Education* needed the continued support of the Society. The final outcome was that *Screen* would survive into the twenty first century as a university-based academic journal while SEFT would disappear before reaching its fortieth anniversary in 1990.¹ It would be nearly twenty years before a media teachers' organisation would be formed to replace SEFT.²

Yet from its inception in 1950 SFT/SEFT had existed to service a constituency of film/media educationists drawn from teachers and lecturers in schools and further

education colleges. What distinguished this constituency was that members of the Society shared the perception that the education system within which they were operating was choosing to ignore or even attack an alternative popular culture that was spreading through and by the twentieth century media. These educationists encountered two fundamentally different attitudes to this popular culture. In their classrooms it prompted displays of enthusiasm but in staff rooms it frequently generated opposition and resistance. For many of these media friendly teachers, their response was to find practical ways of manoeuvring film and television education into the crevices of the curriculum. This was a self-help process and the exchange mechanism provided by SEFT's regular publications supported these isolated teachers.

There was however a wider view from Paddy Whannel's Education Department which made him dissatisfied with these arrangements. Essentially, as the succession of beginners' accounts published in *Film Teacher* and the original *Screen Education* demonstrated, it was as if the wheel was being reinvented on a regular basis. Very few had been trained as film/television/media teachers and the career ladder within those subject specialisms was non-existent. It followed that the teaching was being done by enthusiasts whose engagement with these new specialisms would of necessity be short-lived. They would in all probability be succeeded by the next cohort of self-taught and enthusiastic film and television teachers; but the individuals in this successor generation might well be located in a different set of schools. Whannel saw the need for a comprehensive range of solutions which were perceived in some quarters as disrupting the established, familiar and rather cosy self-help model.

He addressed the popular culture issue head-on: the film extract material that his Department selected deliberately reflected the priorities of genre and authorship in the American cinema. From today's perspective this emphasis on the United States output is considered by some to have distorted the development of film scholarship in the United Kingdom. But in the context of the 1960s, it was a distinctive course to follow. It privileged the enthusiasms of *Movie* over the art cinema predilection of *Sight and Sound*. It challenged both the financially determined canonisation of the free loan and worthy documentary film and the emphasis on the 'history of cinema' extracts that formed the early basis of BFI distribution to schools.

By appointing teacher advisers, Whannel was attempting to cover on a national scale for film and television what education authorities were providing locally for those curriculum areas already firmly embedded in school provision. These BFI advisers had a similar function of introducing good practice, but their intervention was of necessity spread very thinly. When sustained collaboration with an education authority did subsequently become practicable, as notably in the ILEA Sixth Form Film Study Course, the outcome was very productive. But for the most part advice had to be spread by duplicated materials describing successful established courses.

By the late 1960s both SEFT and BFI Education had perceived the need to move the situation on. SEFT decided to create *Screen* and the BFI began to address the issues around research and developments in higher education. Both Stanley Reed and Whannel had put energy into the promotion of the teacher training colleges as the places where film and television might establish a foothold in higher education. Not only did this fail to materialise on a wide scale, but as the teacher training programme was curtailed to match reducing pupil numbers, so the out-on-a-limb departments that had experimented with media teaching were likely to be axed. However, whereas both the Reed and Whannel had long identified a base in the universities as their ultimate goal, Reed seems to have faltered in this commitment, whereas Whannel persisted. His strategy was specifically defined: only when the study of film and television was in the Academy would media gain appropriate purchase and recognition in schools.

As a prelude to acceptance in the Academy, the Education Department embarked on two ventures: promoting seminars attended by sympathetic academics and book publishing. Whannel had already indicated to the BFI Governors that the development of a serious research programme was called for. These seminars were intended to make a start by introducing and making connections with thinkers from other academic disciplines. However given the New Left connections of Whannel and Wollen, there was a clear political identity to the speakers. The *Cinema One* project (shared with *Sight and Sound*) began to address another problem which Whannel had long identified: there were very few texts for the self-improving film teacher to access. Significantly - and in demonstration of this - when the first *Cinema One* books appeared, they lacked bibliographies.³

Then there came the report on the Education Department by Asa Briggs - the report that has disappeared. Briggs was Vice Chancellor of the prestigious new University of Sussex and therefore the acceptable face of higher education. His status would serve to reinforce the thrust of the report, which appears to have been to warn off the BFI from replicating a university department. If, as the Governors apparently feared, the presence of the SEFT Office within the BFI had been a source of contagion, then locating SEFT elsewhere and severing its close links with education would have seemed appropriate.

When he resigned Whannel left a substantial legacy in film education. One of the practical ways in which he had advocated that the BFI might directly intervene was in the funding of university posts. After his departure, a succession of such pump-priming posts was set in train. The motivation for their introduction was not to be interpreted as a belated recognition of what Whannel had believed. It resembled the removal of SEFT to Old Compton Street in that it franchised to universities the thinking that had previously been integral to the Education Department. It also demonstrated the BFI's commitment to higher education – but at arm's length.

Perhaps elements within the BFI expected SEFT to flounder once Rohdie's close links with the Education Department had been severed. Certainly Director Reed seems to have been actively supporting the National Association for Film Education (NAFE) and to have seen it as a potential replacement organization to SEFT.⁴ However Reed, whose health problems had meant that he was absent during most of the BFI's negotiations with SEFT, was soon to be retired. Whatever factors had been involved behind the scenes, SEFT had achieved by 1972 what would have seemed fantasy in 1970. It had its own premises and two full-time employees and a substantial grant of public money from the BFI. SEFT also had a nucleus of activist volunteers, incorporating just a few survivors from the Committee of the 1960s.

Where these teachers/lecturers differed from their predecessors was, albeit they did not know it then, that they were going to be around for the long term. They were a cohort that would not return to the security of the conventional school/college promotion ladder. They would remain in the business of screen/media education during their working lives. The commitment they made to SEFT in the early 1970s would have lasting consequences for themselves and for the development of media education.

Once independent and established in Old Compton Street, SEFT in the 1970s offered an extraordinary opportunity. It was a well funded organization which had been around for nearly a quarter of a century and so it had a membership that expected to renew its subscriptions annually. It was a state funded apparatus in want of an ideology. Unsurprisingly, a number of individuals recognized in SEFT, and particularly in *Screen*, an irresistible opportunity for making an intervention. Their engagement with popular culture became a mechanism for directly challenging academic traditions or, as Nowell-Smith put it, for 'blowing up the Humanities'.⁵

If *Screen* had been the only outcome of this intervention then the achievement of SEFT in the 1970s would have been much less substantial. *Screen Education* must be judged an equal part of the enterprise, even though it received less funding. The pairing of the two journals is important. On a very practical level, while both publications existed it was possible to demonstrate that the existence of each helped to justify the remit of the other. *Screen* and *Screen Education* in partnership came close to the scope of the enterprise that Whannel had sought to establish either by the BFI alone or in partnership with SEFT. There was genuine engagement with both schools and higher education.

The predicament of film/media study by the 1970s was a very specific one. The grassroots upwards movement was in danger of coming to a halt. It needed a theoretical basis that might support its position in higher education. Victor Perkins recalls how the pioneers devising early film courses at degree level were challenged by academics from other disciplines about the lack of any substantial volume of literature to support these new courses.⁶ But the grass roots also needed reviving: teachers and lecturers in schools and colleges who wished to support media education needed help too. It would have been very easy for the rather unfocused interest in media education to become submerged in the child-centred educational thrust of the 1970s. The Humanities Curriculum Project had attempted even to deny the nature of media products and to use them simply as 'evidence' in discussions where the teacher was expected to take on the neutral role of Chair.

What *Screen Education* did was to make a case for media study as altogether more rigorous. Not only did media artefacts deserve close attention *per se*, but because these media products were readily accessed by working-class students, there was an additional

duty on media teachers to find ways of intervening in their students' familiarity with media, but not by conniving with it. In so doing, the position taken by the majority of *Screen Education*'s writers came to resemble certain of the attitudes of the Educational *Black Papers* of the period. They argued that the educational priority was for working-class students to be made aware of what they did not know and of the agencies that operated to sustain their ignorance. Discovery methods were not appropriate in this context. SEFT took a fundamentally different position from the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.⁷ *Screen* and *Screen Education* were addressing different audiences but they were each targeting the needs of a particular moment in the evolution of media study.

This moment had to be brief. If the protagonists of Old Compton Street wanted to be regarded as intellectuals, not academics, this was not a status that could endure. There was a momentum building up to which the journals had contributed. Lectureships were becoming available in universities and in departments of education. Local authorities were offering advisory posts in film and media. The lure of these appointments was irresistible. There is a very impressive correlation between individuals currently holding or recently retired from senior professorships and their involvement in SEFT in the 1970s. Thus even if it is convenient to see '*Screen* Theory' as denoting an episode of intellectual history, from the certainties of which film study may be deemed to have moved on, what is undeniable is the durability of the SEFT legacy as represented by those whose long-term careers it launched.

Following the disappearance of *Screen Education*, SEFT was in increasing difficulty. The Society had cut back and produced only one journal, but this did not reduce pressure from the BFI. Simpson's Education Department was developing a clear identity and the BFI wanted SEFT to be a body with a mode of operation which was totally distinct from its own Education Department.

...we want SEFT to be an organisation which seeks to bring together all of the formal and informal media education constituencies. It ought also to act as a source of pressure on official bodies to help improve the standards and availability of media education.⁸

SEFT's response was astonishing. It was, it seems, prepared to be 'all things to all men'.

Our aim will be to heighten public awareness of media education in all its senses and of SEFT as an appropriate agency through which to secure that objective. This will be facilitated by substantial campaigning activities in regard to media education at all levels, in partnership with like-minded organisations. These activities will be organised by an Officer/Officers with a wide ranging familiarity with the personnel and concerns of such organisations, from NATFHE to IPPA, from IDEA to the DES. Their work will stretch from journalistic interventions in the UK educational media and general press to organising special discussion events and a regular national media education conference, to direct contact with relevant teachers and academics, civil servants, councillors and MPs, art officers and film and television producers and exhibitors.⁹

If the Society had had in reserve numerous committed volunteers waiting to engage in these interventions, it would have been difficult to sustain. In practice it would have just one paid member of staff to do all this - its National Organiser. The Society's record in engaging with important events was becoming inconsistent. SEFT had played no part in the 1983 'TV and Schooling Conference' which had followed the publication of the much publicized DES document *Popular TV and Schoolchildren*, about which SEFT had said almost nothing.¹⁰ BFI Education, however, took advantage of the strategic opportunity these events offered to engage with the Department of Education and Science and Her Majesty's Inspectorate.¹¹

When the post of SEFT's National Organiser was advertised early in 1984, the wording of the advertisement and the job description it contained were very different from what had been expected of any previous applicant for a job with the Society. Whereas the previous comparable post holder had been styled as Education Officer, the National Organiser's proposed relationship with education was to be more distant. The experience which applicants might bring was described thus

Candidates should have a good knowledge of current debates in Film and Television theory. S/he should have experience of Film and Television education in both the institutional and informal sectors. If this is not the case, the officer must be prepared to familiarise her/himself with the educational field quickly.¹²

Presumably drafted as a compromise in committee, the expectation that anyone might 'familiarise her/himself with the educational field quickly' seems both to demonstrate the inexperience in recruiting staff of the members of the SEFT Executive at this stage and a dismissive attitude towards the complexities of the 'educational field'.

At a Special General Meeting in 1984, held shortly after the National Organiser had been appointed, several motions were debated including one where SEFT became the body hosting the Television Users' Group. The final motion proposed by David Lusted and seconded by Barry Curtis was

That a strategy be developed re-establishing SEFT as a professional body representing the interests of teachers, film and media studies.¹³

Curtis recalls that the aim of the motion was to encourage teachers to 'rally round' and support SEFT.¹⁴ If teachers might be encouraged once again to become an important part of SEFT, this would strengthen SEFT's remit if it came increasingly under threat as Government cuts impacted on the BFI. Despite the Society's new-found enthusiasm for taking on additional tasks, this motion, unlike those taken earlier in the meeting, was not passed unanimously. Instead it was amended:

That the SEFT Education Board develop strategies to heighten SEFT's campaigning role to represent the interests of teachers of film, television and media studies.¹⁵

Shedding its origins as a teachers' organisation had been a characteristic of SEFT for some time, as demonstrated in the previous chapter. Here the Executive is delegating to its Education Board the task of developing strategies to accommodate teachers who presumably should take comfort from the fact that SEFT's campaigning will apparently be 'heightened' by their inclusion.

An indication of the health of the Society had often been evidenced by the scope and productivity of its publications. *Screen Education* was discontinued in early 1982. *Initiatives* appeared late in 1984, an eight-page newsletter produced initially by the Education Board and intended to connect associations in the Media Education Initiatives network. These were groups throughout England and Wales, some set up directly by SEFT but most had developed from existing local education authority media education groups. The total number of these MEI groups peaked at 36 in 1987.¹⁶ Unfortunately publication schedules for *Initiatives* became haphazard as the responsibility for producing subsequent issues was devolved to local groups.¹⁷

Apart from SEFT's internal difficulties, there were numerous contributory external factors. In the 1970s BFI Education had been in the shadow of SEFT, now under Philip Simpson it

was resurgent. Other players had entered the field. Film Education, which had started in 1985 as part of British Film Year, had become well established by 1988 with guaranteed financial support from the British film industry.¹⁸ The Inner London Education Authority's English Centre had for many years played a role in media education for inner London's schools. From 1987, in an arrangement with the National Association of Teachers of English, the Centre's resources and courses became available outside the ILEA, though at a higher cost than that incurred by London teachers.¹⁹ The Centre would outlast the ILEA and, once independent, style itself as the English and Media Centre, now legitimately able directly to access a national constituency. As GCSE and A-level examinations in media and film were established, so the influence of Chief Examiners penetrated directly into syllabuses and indirectly into the wider media curriculum through examination conscious text books. Teachers were on the receiving end of directives, no longer influential as they had been in the days of Mode III CSE and GCE examinations.

As teachers were able to offer media within their own institutions, so their emphasis shifted from the national to the particular. It was now possible to deploy in one's own patch those ideas about which one had previously theorised in Old Compton Street. But if the specialist examination courses for older students gave Media Studies an increasingly assured position within institutions, the wider spread of media education was threatened by the introduction of the new National Curriculum. In this arena BFI Education was more politically attuned, producing substantial curriculum statements for Primary and Secondary Education, in 1989 and 1991 respectively.²⁰

As the volunteer energy that had previously driven SEFT diminished, by default the employees became more independent and more influential. As Geraghty has pointed out, there was the additional complication in the SEFT operation that the employers and employees were essentially the same kind of people.²¹ This replication of identity made the definition of employer/employee roles more difficult both to establish and maintain. It also became clear in the Comedia Report (see below) that 'ownership' of SEFT was something that most of the Committee volunteers were surprisingly reluctant to embrace.²²

The incorporation of *Screen Education* into *Screen* was fundamentally unmanageable and Merck as Editor was reluctant even to attempt the manoeuvre.²³ The exercise might seem to have been justified administratively by making the Editorship a full-time post and by

increasing the number of issues published per year from four to six, but this was not a merger susceptible to an administrative solution. Even the true identity of the partners to the marriage was in doubt. *Screen* under Nash and *Screen Education* under Donald had cohabited and to an extent had overlapped, as the former extended the remit of *Screen* to cover a range of the visual arts and the latter pursued the development of cultural studies. These were not the elements that came to be represented in *Screen incorporating Screen Education*.

With the emerging presence of film in higher education internationally, the new journal attempted to engage with those academics who were both establishing new courses and developing their own research. The space allocated to screen education was not only limited but tended to be restricted solely to aspects of pedagogy. It was as though *Screen* had incorporated *Screen Education Notes* of the early 1970s. When *Screen* did address issues that might be relevant to teachers, the references they contained served to demonstrate just how much work was already in evidence beyond SEFT.²⁴ The status of the readers had in effect changed: whatever their notional description, SEFT's members were now simply subscribers to its journal.²⁵ There was no longer a body of teacher practitioners who represented a shared interest. There was no longer the potential for activating lobbyists as Rohdie had done in 1971.

Screen had the established reputation and a brand name which made SEFT decide that if it might only afford one journal, it would have to abandon *Screen Education*. Having supported *Screen* which took the bulk of the Society's funding, there was then the problem of what other activity might be possible. Pressure from the BFI to be a lobbying organisation had been manifested in the creation of the post of National Organiser with an impossible remit.²⁶ One element of Cubitt's brief as National Organiser was to organise an annual national conference. The first of these in Bradford in 1985 was residential and attended by over one hundred delegates.²⁷ Subsequent conferences were to be less ambitious one day events in Birmingham (1986) and Liverpool (1987).²⁸

Changes of personnel within the BFI increased the pressure on SEFT which had experienced a rapid turnover of voluntary officers by 1988. Matters came to a head when in the Spring of that year the BFI proposed to the Society that the Institute would pay for consultants from Comedia to look closely at the SEFT operation and make

recommendations.²⁹ The Comedia Report appeared in September.³⁰ Its essential conclusion was that while there was clearly a future for *Screen*, it saw no future for SEFT. The Report is a contradictory document in that *Screen*, SEFT's most substantial achievement, is barely mentioned other than to be praised briefly, while all other aspects of SEFT are found wanting. The picture is painted of a chaotic office occupied by fiercely territorial staff who operate independently of the weak and ineffectual management, which in turn lacks a proper understanding of the Society with which it is involved. Merck in her letter of response, when members of staff were invited to comment on the draft, made the obvious point that 'the neglect of the concrete achievements of the Society to date is simply staggering'.³¹ The Report fails to explain how a successful journal had emerged for so long from such alleged chaos.

It would be surprising if the consultants had not been aware of the outcome that the BFI expected and it is clear that a possible future for *Screen*, separated from SEFT had already been envisaged for some time.³² What the report does reveal is the imbalance in SEFT between the staff and the voluntary management and the failure of the latter group to understand the nature of the body with which it was engaged.

There is an extraordinary level of confusion about where overall responsibility for SEFT's actions is vested. De facto control of the organisation seems to be split up between the three major committees: the Executive, the Education Board, the 'Screen' Board. Their respective roles and remits are unclear - both to us and to many of those we spoke to who sit on them.³³

The consultants also reported that the volunteers occupying the places on the Executive and its two Boards at the time of the review were so disengaged from the Society they failed to attend meetings with the consultants.

Given the importance of this consultancy for the future of SEFT, we were surprised, to say the least, how few executive and board members came to these meetings or engaged in the process of the study. In total, only six out of a possible 30 plus board members turned up to these crucial meetings.³⁴

An interest group that the consultants did interview was 'the BFI'. Unfortunately no further identification of the Institute's spokespersons is provided. Crucially the BFI's concerns were firstly that SEFT's grant took '85 per cent of the budget allocated to media education initiatives' and that the BFI would make better use of the money.³⁵ Secondly that SEFT 'has not met the Institute's expectations in terms of its function as a national membership organisation for media education'.³⁶ The 1984 *Screen* figures reveal that there were only

369 individual subscribing members in the UK. Thus at a time when media education was growing rapidly, individual members were a hundred fewer in number in the early 1980s than they had been in the 1960s.³⁷ Even if SEFT had been minded to mobilize its members to lobby, it had only a tiny base of individuals on which to draw.

One very important interest group that seems not to have been consulted was the *Screen* Editorial Board, presumably because the future of the journal itself was not in doubt. There are records of views being sought only from current SEFT Board members (which one must infer as meaning the SEFT Executive Committee) and of 'current education board members'.³⁸ This omission is particularly curious when the records in the *Screen* archive show responses protesting to the Report only from members of staff and from *Screen* Board members, but not from members of the Executive or the Education Board whose attitudes to SEFT presumably were in accord with those taken by Comedia. Writing from the perspective of the *Screen* Board, Ginette Vincendeau picks up on the gaps in the report.

I do not think that the report as it stands gives sufficient information to support the conclusions you are drawing. On the one hand the range of people you have consulted seems rather limited (and I certainly have not been approached to give my opinion); on the other there is a complete absence in the report of *any* information on what SEFT - and *Screen* - actually do and have achieved over the years: eg who SEFT services, what events it has mounted, how many issues *Screen* has produced, what its reputation and standing in the field are, both in Britain and abroad, etc.³⁹

The Report's references to the BFI, which was funding the exercise, indicate that offering the consultancy was not the action of a neutral paymaster.

As one BFI member rather harshly put it "there are those within the BFI who wish SEFT a humane death and those who wish to cut its throat".⁴⁰

It has been one of the themes of the concluding chapters of this investigation that there seemed to have been forces at work in SEFT that resisted its maintaining the identity of a teachers' organisation. In the interviews conducted by Comedia with members of the Education Board, this issue is dominant. There is an extraordinary reference to the relationship between the teaching profession and SEFT.

Discussions with this constituency - which would logically form the cornerstone of the Society's work - have led us to the unhappy conclusion that SEFT has quite comprehensively alienated this sector. Media educators of all kinds clearly feel that the Society - whilst claiming to speak on their behalf - is often dismissive of

their concerns. As a result, many of them considered that SEFT was out of touch with class room and lecture hall realities.⁴¹

It appears that the constituency which was alienated was the Education Board and one might therefore be tempted to infer that SEFT had succeeded in alienating itself. If SEFT's operation now seemed to generate confusion, there were other newer bodies with more accessible agendas.

SEFT had few friends by late 1988. The evidence quoted by the Comedia Report suggested that even those who held elected office in the Society resented its impingement on their lives. SFT in the 1950s and SEFT in the 1970s had unsurprisingly prospered when driven on by volunteer effort. There might have been infighting between volunteers during these periods but that would only happen because there were issues considered to be worth fighting over. Therefore while the Society's employees were justifiably concerned about their futures following publication of the report, for their employers there seemed to be nothing at stake.

The BFI Education Department was in almost unanimous agreement with the conclusions of the Comedia Report, whilst acknowledging shortcomings in its methods. The dissenting voice was that of David Lusted whose association with SEFT had started when he was a student in the 1960s. Lusted was prepared to articulate his responses to 'what I fear may look like a simple BFI hatchet job'. He questioned whether the outcome might not have been a foregone conclusion. 'Did the authors set out with their conclusion in mind or did they reach it during their research?'⁴²

Lusted's essential points as to the failings of the report are stark: it lacks any adequate account of SEFT's activities and outcomes; the Society's history is ignored; and it exposes 'poor staff organisation and low morale' without any adequate explanation why this might be the case. Had there been a will to fight back, there was much in the report to be questioned. In the Education Department's response it is stated 'BFI Education has an exceptionally strong interest to declare in the future of SEFT or any successor body'.⁴³ If the funds previously directed to SEFT were retained by BFI then the scope of the Institute's educational activities would be enlarged.

Some members of the SEFT Education Board, notably David Buckingham and Marie Gillespie, put their case to Wilf Stevenson, the Acting Director of the BFI, that a teacher focused successor body to SEFT was essential.⁴⁴ One outcome of their lobbying was to get financial support from BFI for two further issues of *Initiatives*. In the first of these Buckingham offers an analysis of what had happened to SEFT.⁴⁵ He was, it seems, like many who had offered opinions to Comedia out of sympathy with the organisation in which he had participated. He writes '... for most media teachers in schools and in further education, SEFT was at best an irrelevance, and at worst an obstacle'.⁴⁶

There are several elements to Buckingham's analysis with which he is '95 per cent still in agreement' almost two decades later.⁴⁷ He acknowledges the far-reaching influence that *Screen* had in the 1970s when its theoretical explorations had implications across the Humanities. But he is out of sympathy with *Screen Education* and its attitude to child-centred education which, he claims, it 'relentlessly caricatured'.⁴⁸ He is hostile to the SEFT of the 1970s and argues that the Society's problems began with the shift from the teachers' organisation it had been in the 1950s and 1960s. Thus while his assessment of the Society's difficulties in the 1980s is largely accurate, he mistakenly attributes the state of SEFT by 1988 to be an outcome of not one but two decades of misdirected effort.

The Society experienced two periods when it was particularly influential – the 1950s and the 1970s. The parallel between the two decades is very clear: these were the years when the volunteer input was greatest. It was not that sets of individuals happened to direct their energies simultaneously first into SFT, then SEFT. In each of these decades an identifiable cohort with shared experiences and convictions dominated the arena that the Society offered. Put in very simple terms, SFT provided a base for the post war emergency trained generation and SEFT in the 1970s attracted the post-1968 generation of university educated theorists disillusioned by their experience of the Academy. Both cohorts were adept at setting their agendas and defining those priorities for film/media education that they wished to pursue. They did this with such clarity and determination that the Society's agenda became the dominant agenda within the film/media education movement.

In the 1960s and 1980s without the energy of a pioneering volunteer core driving its Committee, SEFT's relationship with the BFI and its Education Department became the defining factor. When Whannel offered the joint appointment, such was the pressure on

the Society that his offer was perceived as a lifeline by members of a beleaguered Committee. The legacy from the 1950s was becoming a problem for them. There had been much activity and interest generated by SEFT during that period with the result that the Society had subsequently come to be perceived as a much more substantial operation than it in fact was. The volunteer officers were under daily pressure for help and information from members, would-be members and interested educational bodies.

Prior to the creation of the joint appointment, SEFT had received a modest £500 annually from BFI.⁴⁹ In the 1980s BFI Director Smith was operating under a Government regime very different from that which funded Whannel's operation. When Smith reviewed SEFT's accounts in March 1988 and had the consultancy in mind, he would have noted that the BFI's grant to the Society had reached £62,000.⁵⁰ SEFT would have to work hard to keep that level of support. Then in September he would read in the Comedia Report that, given the opportunity to make the case for the Society's continuation, most of SEFT's volunteers had failed even to attend the meetings with the consultants. SEFT, he might have concluded, had ended not with a whimper, nor even a whinge.

REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

- ¹ Terry Bolas *Projecting Screen* Unpublished MA dissertation Middlesex University 2003
- ² Terry Bolas 'Film and the School' *Screen Education Yearbook 1967* November 1966 p 25
- ³ Terry Bolas 'Afraid of the Dark' *Screen Education* No 42 January/February 1968 p 6
- ⁴ See below Chapter 2 for discussion of the Newsom Report *Half Our Future*
- ⁵ Early school leavers were a group that had to be catered for until the school leaving age was raised to 16 in 1973.
- ⁶ Terry Bolas 'Developments in Film Education' *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 [May/June 1970] p 101
- ⁷ Christine Geraghty "'Doing media studies": reflections on an unruly discipline' *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education* Vol 1 No 1 2002 p 26
- ⁸ See for example Jim Cook and Jim Hillier *The Growth of Film and Television Studies 1960-1975* London BFI Education 1976 and David Buckingham *Media Education* London Polity 2003
- ⁹ Perry Anderson 'Components of the National Culture' in A Cockburn and R Blackburn *Student Power* Harmondsworth Penguin 1969 pp 214-284
- ¹⁰ *Sequence* was first published in 1947 and then intermittently until 1952 at which point some of its leading writers moved to *Sight and Sound*. *Monthly Film Bulletin* had started in February 1934 but was primarily a listings source for all films entering distribution. Entertainment films were at the back.
- ¹¹ John Ellis 'Art, Culture and Quality' in *Screen* Vol 19 No 3 Autumn 1978 pp 9-49
- ¹² *Critic's Choice* was edited by Stanley Reed and first appeared in April 1952. The final issue, edited by Frank Hazell and David Robinson, was in February 1956.
- ¹³ These reports were produced regularly as a service to members. The panel's composition was probably small and involved only Committee members.
- ¹⁴ The early film teacher might be employed for having expertise in one of a wide range of subjects: Physical Education, Art, Chemistry, History, Geography or English. These particular instances are quoted because the author recalls that at one point in the mid 1960s there were members of the SEFT Committee representing all these subject specialisms.
- ¹⁵ See for example Stanley Reed *A Guide to Good Viewing* London Educational Supply Association 1961 which was aimed at a child readership.
- ¹⁶ Michael Orrom and Raymond Williams *Preface to Film* London Film Drama Limited 1954. Williams was an Extra-Mural tutor for Oxford University; Orrom a film industry professional. They met at Cambridge in 1939.
- ¹⁷ Op cit Promotional comment on rear dust jacket
- ¹⁸ Ibid p vii
- ¹⁹ As an instance of hostility see *The Journal of Education* Vol 90 February 1958 where the editorial 'A Negative Light' (p 43) and an article T R Barnes 'Art and Ketchup' (p 61) demonstrate how pervasive was the opposition.
- ²⁰ Ibid pp 26 and 39
- ²¹ What Williams intends to do is to set up parameters of expectation for Orrom's subsequent essay. He establishes that film may be regarded as a form of drama by virtue of its display of performance and imitation which he regards as the defining qualities of drama. Film has the particular advantage, since it becomes a finished product, of allowing total expression, by which Williams means its unity of speech, movement and design. However, he argues that with the coming of sound, films became over dependent on dialogue and therefore this has delayed the integrated film form which had yet to be achieved: 'the principle of integrated expression and performance, in which each of the elements being used - speech, music, movement, design - bears a controlled, necessary and direct relation, at the moment of expression, to any other that is being then used'. Ibid p 54
- ²² Ibid p 54
- ²³ Ibid p 116
- ²⁴ Ibid p 116
- ²⁵ Probably the most influential was Ernest Lindgren *The Art of the Film* London Allen & Unwin 1948 with a revised second edition in 1963. Roger Manvell *Film* Harmondsworth Penguin 1944 went through several reprints and revisions into the 1950s. Rudolf Arnheim *Film as Art* London Faber & Faber 1958 was based on his pre-war publication *Film* London Faber & Faber 1933.

- ²⁶ See Helen Rand and Richard Lewis *Film and School* New York D Appleton – Century Company 1937. Here the authors want to replace the familiar term ‘moving-picture appreciation’ with ‘evaluating motion-pictures’.
- ²⁷ For a concise account of the first ten years of SFT/SEFT see R C Vannoey ‘Ten Years On’ in *Screen Education Year Book 1960-61* London SEFT October 1960
- ²⁸ The endorsement of American cinema established at this time is now being identified by some academics as having distorted the development of the serious study of film. See below endnote 66 to Chapter Two.
- ²⁹ *The British Film Institute Quarterly Gazette* gives detailed lists of lectures and who gave them on the Institute’s behalf between 1952 and 1965
- ³⁰ The author became aware of this frequent duplication when working simultaneously for both organisations in 1969.
- ³¹ The two other members of the Committee were Helen Forman and Paul Adorian
- ³² The others who resigned were Eileen Brock, Alan Lovell, Gail Naughton, Jennifer Norman, Jim Pines.
- ³³ Philip Rosen *The Concept of Ideology and Contemporary Film Criticism: A Study of the Journal Screen in the Context of the Marxist Theoretical Tradition* Unpublished PhD thesis University of Iowa 1978
- ³⁴ Anthony Easthope ‘The Trajectory of *Screen* 1971-1979’ in Francis Barker et al (Eds) *The Politics of Theory* Colchester University of Essex 1983
- ³⁵ Pam Cook (Ed) *The Cinema Book* London BFI 1985
- ³⁶ Robert Lapsley and Michael Westlake *Film Theory An Introduction* Manchester Manchester University Press 1988; David Rodowick *The Crisis of Political Modernism* was first published by the University of Illinois in 1988 and reprinted by the University of California Press Berkeley 1994
- ³⁷ David Bordwell and Noel Carroll (Eds) *Post-Theory Reconstructing Film Studies* Madison University of Wisconsin Press 1996
- ³⁸ John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (Eds) *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies* Oxford Oxford University Press 1998
- ³⁹ Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams *Reinventing Film Studies* London Arnold 2000
- ⁴⁰ See Bolas (2003) op cit
- ⁴¹ The BFI publishing arrangements were altered following the Briggs Report. Thereafter the Educational Advisory Service was required to concentrate on specifically ‘educational’ publications.
- ⁴² The SFT/SEFT documents from the first decade and a half of its existence had been preserved by the volunteers and were handed over to the safekeeping of the SEFT Office within the BFI in early 1967. They were still in evidence when I succeeded Richardson as the paid Secretary of SEFT in 1968 and remained (augmented by more recent material) when I left in August 1970. None of these documents has come to light during any of my investigations.
- ⁴³ A subsequent visit (18 May 2004) when I was accompanied by Manuel Alvarado confirmed how restricted a resource this was. Alvarado, SEFT Education Officer during the mid 1970s (and extensively involved with the Society for much of the decade), confirmed that almost no correspondence from the period had been archived. During the research for my thesis, further information about the origins of this archive has come to light. The material was originally removed from the SEFT office by Phillip Drummond, SEFT Chairperson in the late 1970s, and housed in the University of London Institute of Education. When a media education archive was subsequently established at Portsmouth Polytechnic, the SEFT material was moved there - with some assistance from David Lusted, then at the BFI. The Portsmouth venture did not succeed and the material went on to Bretton Hall.
- ⁴⁴ Chris Mottershead in interview with the author 9 November 2005 revealed that he was engaged to undertake some preliminary evaluation and organisation of the BFI documentation.
- ⁴⁵ AHRC History of the British Film Institute Research Project based at Queen Mary University of London 2004-2008
- ⁴⁶ Janet Hills *Are They Safe at the Cinema? A considered answer to critics of the cinema* London BFI 1953
- ⁴⁷ A problem for further researchers wishing to follow up my research is likely to be that my references to these sources are to the possibly temporary boxes in which such materials were archived upon initial discovery.
- ⁴⁸ For a succinct account of film in the war years see Dilys Powell *Films Since 1939* London Longman Green 1949
- ⁴⁹ Leslie Heywood in telephone interview with the author 30 May 2004
- ⁵⁰ For an account of work at the college see SGP Alexander ‘Not so much a philosophy ... more a way of life’ in *Screen Education* No 27 January/February 1965 pp 6 - 11
- ⁵¹ E Francis Mills ‘The Film Lesson’ *Sight and Sound* Vol 5 No 17 Spring 1936 p 33 and ‘The Classroom Film’ *Sight and Sound* Vol 5 no 18 Summer 1936 p 41
- ⁵² Both Hodgkinson and Alexander remained active in SEFT until the mid 1960s.

⁵³ Reed, who eventually became Director of the BFI (1964–1973), wrote numerous accounts based on his classroom experience. An early example is ‘Teaching Film Appreciation in the Classroom’ in *Sub-Standard Film* December 15 1949 p 122

⁵⁴ *Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema* London HMSO 1950

⁵⁵ Forman at the BFI paid for the production and distribution of *School Film Appreciation* to the summer school students and others who had expressed interest. The document was written by Hodgkinson, John Huntley, Mills and Jack Smith. The positive response that the document received led to the setting up of the Society of Film Teachers

⁵⁶ Unfortunately the Committee suffered some early setbacks when some of its potentially influential members died. R R Jones, Deputy Director of Education in West Ham and the Society’s first Chairman, died as a result of a car accident in 1951. G T Hankin, a recently retired HMI who was very sympathetic to the Society’s work, died in 1952. Maurice Woodhouse, who had been the first person in the United Kingdom to research film appreciation in schools and who received a PhD from Leeds University in January 1953, died later that year. Janet Hills, a young journalist working for the *Times Educational Supplement*, who was writing a book about film appreciation at the time of her death, died suddenly in 1954.

⁵⁷ There were two international conferences where the contributions of both BFI and SFT were notable: in Amsterdam in November 1957 and in London in October 1958.

⁵⁸ The Joint Council for Education through Art organised several forums on aspects of popular culture. The most important of these was ‘The Visual Persuaders’ that ran for a week at the newly opened National Film Theatre in May 1959

⁵⁹ Roy Shaw who lead the Extra Mural programme at Keele University confirmed in interview with the author (29 September 2004) that his film study courses were entirely dependent on support and staffing from the BFI Education Department

⁶⁰ These had been preceded (in sequence) by the *SFT Bulletin*, *The Film Teacher* and the *SFT Newsletter*.

⁶¹ *Film Guide* was developed from a series of posters that circulated in youth clubs in Liverpool, examples of which were submitted to the Wheare Committee. It was produced by the BFI Film Appreciation Department between January 1954 and September 1959. Renamed *Screen Guide* in October 1959 it was then produced jointly by BFI and SEFT until April 1961.

⁶² ‘3D and TV’ in *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 2-6

⁶³ Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education and the British Film Institute *Film and Television in Education for Teaching* London BFI 1960

⁶⁴ See ‘The Good with the Bad - positive effects of mass media’ *Times Educational Supplement* 8 January 1960 p 40

⁶⁵ Jane M C Allen ‘Need for Experiment in Training Colleges’ *Times Educational Supplement* 29 June 1962 p 1325

⁶⁶ The original review appeared in *Universities and Left Review* Spring 1959

⁶⁷ ATCDE and BFI op cit p 25

CHAPTER ONE

¹ Richard Hoggart *The Uses of Literacy* London, Chatto and Windus, 1957; Raymond Williams *Culture and Society* London, Chatto and Windus, 1958

² *Report of the Committee on Broadcasting* (Pilkington Report) London, HMSO, 1962

³ J M L Peters *Teaching about the Film* Paris UNESCO 1961

⁴ A W Hodgkinson *Screen Education - Teaching a critical approach to cinema and television* Paris UNESCO 1964

⁵ *The National Film School – Report of a Committee to consider the need for a national film school* London HMSO 1967

⁶ The term ‘landmark’ was first used by Marghanita Laski in proposing the vote of thanks at the end of the Conference. *The Schoolmaster* November 4 1960 p 948

⁷ Tom Steele *The Emergence of Cultural Studies 1945-65* London, Lawrence & Wishart 1997 Chapter 1 pp 9-32

⁸ Stuart Laing *Representation of Working Class Life 1957-1964* London, MacMillan, 1986 p 193

⁹ Brian Groombridge in interview with the author 3 August 2004 and Fred Jarvis in interview on 15 July 2004

¹⁰ J Morgan Roberts ‘Cinema Behaviour Problems’ in *Screen Education* 9 July/August 1961 pp 42-43

¹¹ In *The Film Teacher* of Spring 1953 much of the issue was devoted to consideration of ‘the question of violence’. Simultaneously the BFI published *Are They Safe at the Cinema?* by Janet Hills

- ¹² Martin Barker *A Haunt of Fears* London, Pluto Press, 1984
- ¹³ See below for the references made by Butler, Exworthy and King.
- ¹⁴ Mark Abrams *The Teenage Consumer*, London Press Exchange Ltd, July 1959
- ¹⁵ Central Advisory Council for Education (England) *Fifteen to Eighteen* (Crowther Report) London, HMSO, 1959 pp 222-223
- ¹⁶ Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel *The Popular Arts* London Hutchinson Educational 1964
- ¹⁷ Interview with Jarvis op cit
- ¹⁸ National Union of Teachers *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility* Verbatim Report London NUT 1961 pp 341-347
- ¹⁹ Brian Groombridge *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility A Study Outline* London National Union of Teachers May 1961
- ²⁰ *Verbatim Report* p 1
- ²¹ Ibid Frontispiece
- ²² Ibid p iii
- ²³ *The Schoolmaster* November 4 1960 p 941
- ²⁴ Ibid p 941 The President was SW Exworthy.
- ²⁵ Ibid p 942
- ²⁶ Interview with Jarvis op cit
- ²⁷ Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility Conference Programme October 1960 [From the private collection of Fred Jarvis]
- ²⁸ *Verbatim Report* p 253
- ²⁹ Ibid p 251
- ³⁰ Ibid p 178
- ³¹ Ibid p 96
- ³² Ibid p 98
- ³³ *Nice Time*, a product of the BFI Experimental Film Fund directed by Claude Goretta and Alain Tanner, was a short film about a typical Saturday night in London's Piccadilly Circus.
- ³⁴ Ibid p 94
- ³⁵ Ibid p 95
- ³⁶ Ibid p 98
- ³⁷ Ibid p 104
- ³⁸ Ibid p 104
- ³⁹ *Screen Education* 6 January 1961 p 31
- ⁴⁰ Brian Groombridge op cit
- ⁴¹ Ibid p 5
- ⁴² Brian Groombridge and Paddy Whannel 'Pop, Posh and Pedagogue' in *Times Educational Supplement* 5 January 1960 p 217
- ⁴³ Ibid p 216
- ⁴⁴ Ibid p 217
- ⁴⁵ Ibid p 217
- ⁴⁶ Ibid p 217
- ⁴⁷ Ibid p 217
- ⁴⁸ Mildred Masheder, Anthea Holme and Anthony Higgins *Family Viewing – a study of early evening television* London Council for Children's Welfare November 1960
- ⁴⁹ Ibid p 39
- ⁵⁰ Ibid p 1 The authors acknowledge assistance in devising their research methods from Hilde Himmelweit and Joseph Treneman.
- ⁵¹ Ibid p II
- ⁵² Ibid p 40
- ⁵³ A similar exercise was repeated (but with considerably greater publicity) in 1983 by the Department of Education and Science under Sir Keith Joseph. See the references to *Popular TV and Schoolchildren* in the Conclusion.
- ⁵⁴ 'The Pilkington Committee A summary of evidence submitted by the Society to the Committee on Broadcasting' in *Screen Education* 8 May-June 1961 pp 4-5
- ⁵⁵ Ibid p 5
- ⁵⁶ 'Television Supplement' in *New Left Review* 7 January- February 1961 pp 30-48
- ⁵⁷ Ibid p 45
- ⁵⁸ Ibid p 48
- ⁵⁹ Raymond Williams *Britain in the Sixties: Communications* Harmondsworth Penguin Books 1962

- Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel *The Popular Arts* London Hutchinson Educational 1964
 Denys Thompson (Ed) *Discrimination and Popular Culture* Harmondsworth Penguin 1965
 Nicholas Tucker *Understanding the Mass Media* Cambridge Cambridge University Press 1966
- ⁶⁰ Steele op cit p 184
⁶¹ Hall and Whannel op cit p 311
⁶² Stuart Hall in interview with the author 17 March 2004
⁶³ Ibid p 312
⁶⁴ Fred Jarvis in interview op cit recalled a phone call asking for his approval when the book was ready for printing.
⁶⁵ Denys Thompson (Ed) *Discrimination and Popular Culture* Harmondsworth Penguin 1964 p 9
⁶⁶ Ibid p 15
⁶⁷ The teacher quoted by Thompson by way of illustration is Stuart Hall whose attendance at the Conference in a personal capacity was probably more appropriately ascribed to his then role as Editor of *New Left Review*. There is no evidence from the List of Participants that Thompson attended the Conference.
⁶⁸ Thompson op cit p 19
⁶⁹ Ibid p 17
⁷⁰ Ibid p 19
⁷¹ Ibid p 18
⁷² Ibid p 18
⁷³ Ibid p 22
⁷⁴ Robert Hewison *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics since 1940* London Methuen 1995 p 105
⁷⁵ A W Hodgkinson *Screen Education* Paris UNESCO 1964
⁷⁶ Ibid Preface [p 3]
⁷⁷ Ibid p 9
⁷⁸ Ibid p 10 The quotes from Raymond Williams are from *Communications* Harmondsworth Penguin 1962
⁷⁹ Richard Hoggart is quoted from his 1960 paper to the Congress for Cultural Freedom Conference in Berlin 'The Quality of Cultural Life in Mass Society'
⁸⁰ Ibid p 11 The quote is from *Report of the Committee on Broadcasting* London HMSO 1962 Cmdr 1753
⁸¹ Ibid p 11 The quote is from *Report of the Committee on Children and the Cinema* London HMSO 1950 Cmdr 7945. The Nuffield Foundation funded H T Himmelweit, A N Oppenheim, P Vince *Television and the Child* Oxford Oxford University Press 1958
⁸² Ibid p 14 Herbert Read is quoted from *Education Through Art* London Faber and Faber 1943
⁸³ Ibid p 140
⁸⁴ Ibid p 16
⁸⁵ Ibid p 18
⁸⁶ Ibid p 18
⁸⁷ The article quoted is by Norman Fruchter 'Two Hours a Week' *Sight and Sound* Vol 31 No 4 Autumn 1962 pp 198-200
⁸⁸ See endnote 118 to Chapter Two.
⁸⁹ Ibid p 21
⁹⁰ Ibid p 23
⁹¹ Ibid p 23
⁹² Ibid p 24
⁹³ Ibid p 24
⁹⁴ Ibid p 27
⁹⁵ Ibid p 27
⁹⁶ Ibid p 27
⁹⁷ JML Peters *Teaching about the Film* Paris UNESCO 1961 Almost simultaneously there appeared *The Influence of the Cinema on Children and Adolescents* Paris UNESCO 1961, an annotated international bibliography. In 1964 *Screen Education* (Hodgkinson op cit) was published.
⁹⁸ Peters op cit p 20
⁹⁹ Sir Sidney Harris 'The Child and the Cinema' *The Film Teacher* Summer 1952 pp 6-10
¹⁰⁰ Particularly the Centre for Mass Communication Research at Leicester University, the London School of Economics and the University of Leeds
¹⁰¹ Roy Knight (Ed) *Film in English Teaching* London Hutchinson 1972
⁹⁸ Jim Cook and Jim Hillier *The Growth of Film & Television Studies 1960-1975* BFI Education April 1976
¹⁰³ Len Masterman *Teaching About Television* London Macmillan Press 1980 p 19

- ¹⁰⁴ James D Halloran and Marsha Jones *Learning About the Media: Communication and Society* Paris UNESCO 1986 pp 55-60 reproduced in Manuel Alvarado and Oliver Boyd-Barrett (Eds) *Media Education: An Introduction* London BFI/Open University 1992 pp 10-13
- ¹⁰⁵ F R Leavis and Denys Thompson *Culture and Environment* London Chatto and Windus 1934
- ¹⁰⁶ Board of Education *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools* London HMSO 1938
- ¹⁰⁷ Central Advisory Council for Education (England) *Fifteen to Eighteen* London HMSO 1959
- ¹⁰⁸ Ministry of Education *Half Our Future* A Report of the Central Advisory Committee (England) London HMSO 1963
- ¹⁰⁹ Graham Murdock and Guy Phelps *Mass Media and the Secondary School* London Macmillan 1973
- ¹¹⁰ James D Halloran *Mass Media and Society* Leicester Leicester University Press 1974 p 14
- ¹¹¹ Murdock and Phelps op cit p vi
- ¹¹² Ibid p vi
- ¹¹³ Halloran op cit p 14
- ¹¹⁴ Murdock and Phelps op cit p 14
- ¹¹⁵ Ibid p 14
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid p 33
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid p 38
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid p 37
- ¹¹⁹ David Buckingham *Media Education* London Polity Press 2003 p 7
- ¹²⁰ National Film Theatre *Fifty Famous Films 1915-1945* London BFI 1960
- ¹²¹ Victor Perkins 'Fifty Famous Films 1915-1945' *Oxford Opinion* No 38 April 30 1960 p 36
- ¹²² Ian Cameron 'Films' *Oxford Opinion* op cit
- ¹²³ Ian Cameron 'All Together Now' *Film 25* September/October 1960 p 12
- ¹²⁴ Ibid p 13
- ¹²⁵ Penelope Houston 'The Critical Question' *Sight and Sound* Autumn 1960 Vol 29 No 4 pp 160-165
- ¹²⁶ Ibid p 163
- ¹²⁷ Peter John Dyer 'Counter Attack' *Film 26* November/December 1960 p 8
- ¹²⁸ Ibid p 9
- ¹²⁹ Lawrence Alloway 'Personal Statement' in *Ark 19*, Spring 1957 reprinted in *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty* David Robins (Ed) Cambridge Massachusetts The MIT Press 1990 p 165
- ¹³⁰ Lawrence Alloway *Violent America: The Movies 1946-1954* New York Museum of Modern Art 1971 p 7
- ¹³¹ Lawrence Alloway Transcript of Extract from the programme 'Comment' transmitted 15 December 1960 on the BBC Third Programme p 1
- ¹³² Ibid p 1 The 'weekly ladies' is presumably a reference to Dilys Powell of *The Sunday Times* and Caroline Lejeune of *The Observer*.
- ¹³³ Charles Barr in interview with the author 7 June 2005
- ¹³⁴ Alloway transcript op cit p 2
- ¹³⁵ 'Lawrence Alloway on the Iconography of the Movies' *Movie* 7 February and March 1963 pp 4-6
- ¹³⁶ 'The Current Picture' *Film 27* January/February 1961 p 7
- ¹³⁷ This is as recalled by Victor Perkins in interview with the author on 19 April 2005. Alan Lovell in interview on 7 June 2005 had only a "vague memory" of the event. It would appear from a report in *Film 28* March/April 1961 that Gillett was also present.
- ¹³⁸ 'The Current Picture' *Film 28* March/April 1961 p 4
- ¹³⁹ Ian Cameron 'What's the Use?' *Film 28* March/April 1961 pp 10-11
- ¹⁴⁰ Ian Cameron 'Purely for Kicks' in *Screen Education* 7 March-April 1961 pp 31-33
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid p 31
- ¹⁴² Ibid p 31
- ¹⁴³ Houston op cit p 162
- ¹⁴⁴ Cameron *Screen Education* 7 op cit p 33
- ¹⁴⁵ Ibid p 33
- ¹⁴⁶ Ibid p 33
- ¹⁴⁷ Dai Vaughan *Screen Education* 9 July-August 1961 p 50
- ¹⁴⁸ Alan Lovell 'The Best we've Got' *Definition 2* p 3
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid p 3
- ¹⁵⁰ Penelope Houston 'Enthusiasm for What?' *Definition 3* p 8
- ¹⁵¹ Robin Wood 'New Criticism?' *Definition 3* p 11

¹⁵² Ibid p 11

¹⁵³ Alan Lovell 'Robin Wood – A Dissenting View' *Screen* March/April 1969 Volume 10 No 2 pp 42-55; Robin Wood 'Ghostly Paradigm and HCF: An Answer to Alan Lovell' *Screen* May/June 1969 Vol 10 No 3 pp 35-48

¹⁵⁴ Paddy Whannel 'Receiving the Message' *Definition 3* p 14

¹⁵⁵ Ibid p 14

¹⁵⁶ Ibid p 15

¹⁵⁷ Ibid p 15

¹⁵⁸ Paddy Whannel 'Where Do We Go From Here?' *Screen Education* 7 March-April 1961 p 7

¹⁵⁹ Ibid p 8

¹⁶⁰ Alan Lovell in interview with the author 7 June 2005 reinforced this point.

¹⁶¹ F R Leavis *Education and the University* London Chatto and Windus 1948

¹⁶² Ibid p 9

¹⁶³ H R Wills 'Concern for Children' in *Screen Education* 7 March-April 1961 pp 4-5

CHAPTER TWO

¹ Ministry of Education *Half Our Future* A Report of the Central Advisory Committee (England) London HMSO 1963

² 'A Sensible Attitude to the Cinema- Hertfordshire schools co-operate in evolving a more critical approach' in *Look and Listen* April 1950 Vol 4 No 4 pp 77-76. These reports described: film clubs running in 14 secondary schools; how in another school an intensive study of one film, *Cyprus is an Island*, had been undertaken following the publication of a book detailing its making and its script; and then in a further report a case was made for the making of a film by children, the effect of which would be to 'stimulate a more discriminating approach to the commercial film'. The reports encouraged the committee to purchase a 16 mm camera for the county to be shared between schools to facilitate further film-making.

³ *Newsom on Film* Education Department BFI London 1963

⁴ Don Waters 'Newsom' and 'Newsom on the Screen Media' in *Screen Education* 22 January/February 1964 pp 7-9

⁵ Ibid p 7

⁶ Alex Richardson 'Postscript to the screen education references in the Newsom Report' in *Screen Education* 22 pp 9-10. See below endnote 31 for further reference to *Film and TV News*

⁷ Ibid

⁸ *Half Our Future* pp 29-30

⁹ Ibid pp 73-74

¹⁰ Ibid p 74

¹¹ Ibid pp 155-156

¹² Ibid p 156

¹³ Ibid p 156

¹⁴ See advertisement in *Screen Education* 23 March/April 1964 p 68.

¹⁵ See advertisement in *Screen Education* 26 September/October 1964 p 29.

¹⁶ The first notification of such a booklet is to be found in *Screen Education* 25 July/August 1964 p 36. It is to be called 'Best of the Free Films' and readers are told 'all suggestions welcomed'.

¹⁷ Author's recollection

¹⁸ Eric Else *The Back of Beyond* London Longmans Green & Co Ltd 1968

¹⁹ By the time the book was published there was 'a small handling charge' for this free loan film. See Else op cit p 158.

²⁰ Alex Richardson 'Talking to John Heyer' in *Film Society News* 9 Summer 1961 pp 3-6 and in *Film Society News* 10 Winter 1961 pp 4-6. *Film Society News* began as a supplement to *The Film Teacher* and was edited by Ray Wills for the issues published in 1958/59 (Nos 1-5). The issues 6-12 from June 1960 to Summer 1962 were edited by Alex Richardson and distributed to Group Members of SEFT. This category of membership was abolished with the coming of *Film and TV News*.

²¹ Else op cit pp 159-173

²² Ibid p 173

²³ Paddy Whannel and Peter Harcourt (Eds) *Film Teaching* London BFI Education Department 1964; Ernest Lindgren *The Art of the Film* London Allen & Unwin 1963

²⁴ Whannel and Harcourt op cit p 7

²⁵ Else op cit p 159 quoting from Whannel and Harcourt op cit p 15

- ²⁶ Author's recollection of a confidential report-back by Vannoey in 1966
- ²⁷ Author's recollection of private conversations with Whannel in 1965
- ²⁸ Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel *The Popular Arts* London Hutchinson Educational 1964 p 399
- ²⁹ Roger Mains 'The *Teenscreen* Story' in *Screen Education* 18 March/April 1963 pp 53-54
- ³⁰ BFI Governors' Minutes 2 April 1962 Item 4550 'Education Department'
- ³¹ *Film and TV News* was a development of and replacement for *Film Society News* and followed the final (twelfth) issue of the latter in Summer 1962
- ³² There is an editorial plug for 'First SEFT Filmstrip' in *Screen Education* 14 May/June 1962 p 38. Members were encouraged to 'Reserve your copies, with cash please'. The cost was £1 to members, 25 shillings to the public.
- ³³ The author remembers glimpsing the slide originals in the safe-keeping of a committee member.
- ³⁴ 'New Camera Hire Scheme' in *Screen Education* 19 May/June 1963 p 47
- ³⁵ It has proved difficult to obtain details of how this arrangement was originated or maintained. In 'Towards Higher Education' (*Screen Education* 26 September/October 1964 p 26) Peter Harcourt writes 'With the assistance of SEFT, the Rank Organisation have put some twelve new extracts into distribution which should prove useful in the schools...'
- ³⁶ Thirteenth Annual Report of SEFT 1962/63
- ³⁷ Advertisement in *Screen Education* 17 January/February 1963 p 45
- ³⁸ Paddy Whannel *The Work of the Education Department* London BFI 1963
- ³⁹ Ibid p 3
- ⁴⁰ Alan Lovell in interview with the author
- ⁴¹ Whannel op cit p 5
- ⁴² Ibid p 3
- ⁴³ Ibid p 4
- ⁴⁴ SEFT was involved particularly with the Hornsey Course, having been represented on the Steering Committee and subsequently provided lecturers as reported in the Fifteenth Annual Report of SEFT 1965-1966, presented 7 May 1966.
- ⁴⁵ Whannel op cit p 5
- ⁴⁶ The publications of the first half of the 1960s were: *Film Making in School* (1960) Sidney Rees and Don Waters; *A Handbook for Screen Education* (1963) Alex Richardson, R C Vannoey and Don Waters; *Young Film Makers* (1963) Sidney Rees and Don Waters; *100 Films for Juniors* (1964) S G P Alexander; *Young Film Makers Symposium* (1964) H R Wills (Ed); *A Film Society Handbook* (1965) R C Vannoey (Ed)
- ⁴⁷ Richardson, Vannoey, Waters op cit p 4
- ⁴⁸ See Edward Buscombe *Films on TV* London SEFT *Screen* pamphlet No 1 1971 p 16
- ⁴⁹ Vannoey op cit p 1
- ⁵⁰ Rees and Waters (1963) op cit p 2
- ⁵¹ Whannel op cit p 6
- ⁵² National Archives File ED181/92 Memo from D M Basey to P T Sloman CLC7 23 July 1963
- ⁵³ BFI Interoffice Memorandum 20 January 1992 from Manuel Alvarado to Richard Paterson [Author's collection]
- ⁵⁴ National Archives File ED181/92
- ⁵⁵ *Half Our Future* p 266
- ⁵⁶ Basey op cit p 2
- ⁵⁷ Ibid
- ⁵⁸ National Archives File ED181/92 Memo from P T Sloman to J F Embling C40/7 20 August 1963 p 1
- ⁵⁹ Fifteenth Annual Report of SEFT 1965-1966
- ⁶⁰ National Archives File ED181/92 The British Film Institute Education Department proposed budget 1964/65 shows funding for full-time Lecturer/Teacher Adviser and part-time Lecturer/Editor of Materials.
- ⁶¹ Ibid This new budget also had the designated post of Lecturer/Editor of Publications which was initially Harcourt, then Wollen.
- ⁶² When the project started individual books were credited either to *Sight and Sound* or to the Education Department.
- ⁶³ Pam Cook (Ed) *The Cinema Book* London BFI 1985 See p (v) for an account of the book's evolution.
- ⁶⁴ Whannel (1963) op cit p 7
- ⁶⁵ Ibid p 7
- ⁶⁶ Ginette Vincendeau in conversation with the author (25 April 2006) expressed the view that the way in which these extracts had been chosen constructed film study as an Anglo-American enterprise with an emphasis on American genre cinema.

- ⁶⁷ *British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service Documents* 1973
- ⁶⁸ Whannel and Harcourt (1964) op cit
- ⁶⁹ Jim Kitses with Ann Mercer *Talking about the Cinema* London BFI Education Department 1966
- ⁷⁰ A P Higgins *Talking about Television* London BFI Education Department 1966
- ⁷¹ Whannel and Harcourt op cit p 5
- ⁷² Ibid p 7
- ⁷³ Ibid p 26
- ⁷⁴ Ibid pp 28-51
- ⁷⁵ Ibid p 23
- ⁷⁶ Ibid pp 83-93
- ⁷⁷ Higgins op cit p 95
- ⁷⁸ Kitses and Mercer op cit p 12
- ⁷⁹ Jim Kitses *Film and General Studies* London BFI Education Department 1966 p 1
- ⁸⁰ See below endnote 83
- ⁸¹ Peter Harcourt and Peter Theobald (Eds) *Film Making in Schools and Colleges* London BFI Education Department 1966 p 4
- ⁸² Douglas Lowndes in interview with the author 5 June 2003
- ⁸³ 'Film Making at Hornsey College of Art' – all day Film Workshop at the National Film Theatre organized by BFI Education Department January 1966
- ⁸⁴ Peter Harcourt 'Towards Higher Education' *Screen Education* 26 September/October 1964 pp 20-30
- ⁸⁵ Ibid p 20
- ⁸⁶ Ibid p 20
- ⁸⁷ Ibid p 21
- ⁸⁸ S G P Alexander's 'History of SEFT' sequence:
 'Not so much a philosophy...' *Screen Education* 27 January/February 1965 pp 6-11
 'Forming the Society of Film Teachers' *Screen Education* 28 March/April 1968 pp 33-40
 'From SFT to SEFT' *Screen Education* 29 May/June 1965 pp 59-67
 'SEFT onwards' *Screen Education* 30 July/August 1965 pp 66-73
 'We've Come a Long Way' *Screen Education* 31 September/October 1965 pp 53-62
- ⁸⁹ Harcourt *Screen Education* 26 1964 op cit p 24
- ⁹⁰ *Announcing the National Children's Film Awards 1961* London National Union of Teachers 1961 - from the private collection of Fred Jarvis.
- ⁹¹ Ibid
- ⁹² In the report of the 1962 competition (*Screen Education* 15 July/August 1962 p 33) it is stated that 'Cornwell have dominated this section of the competition [Under 16] for so long that the judges were anxiously looking out for challengers.'
- ⁹³ 'Will the judges' choice have a bad effect on future productions?' *The Teacher* June 30 1967 p 7
- ⁹⁴ Letters to the Editor 'Young film makers: some words in their defence' *The Teacher* July 21 1967 p 5
- ⁹⁵ British Film Institute Education Department *Film Study Materials* London BFI 1962
- ⁹⁶ Ibid p 3
- ⁹⁷ *Young Screen 1969* Entry form and information London NUT 1969 [Author's private collection]
- ⁹⁸ *Young Screen 1971* Invitation to the Festival and Exhibition London NUT 1971 SEFT Archive Bretton Hall BH/PL/155
- ⁹⁹ Given the existing scheduling of 'Young Film Makers', the first LCS/SEFT 'Let's Make a Film Festival' was incorporated into the 1968 SEFT Annual Conference as reported in the Seventeenth Annual SEFT Report 1967-1968, presented 4 May 1968.
- ¹⁰⁰ BFI Governors' Minutes 6 June 1966 Director's note to Item 4859
- ¹⁰¹ Whannel and Harcourt op cit 1968 reprint p 98
- ¹⁰² BFI Governors' Minutes 6 June 1966 Item 4859 'Society for Education in Film and Television'
- ¹⁰³ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁵ Whannel and Harcourt (1964) op cit p 35
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid pp 90-91
- ¹⁰⁷ Victor Perkins in interview with the author 19 April 2005
- ¹⁰⁸ Advertisement in *Screen Education* 46 September/October 1968 p 101
- ¹⁰⁹ Alex Richardson *Screen Education for Schools* London Schoolmaster Publishing Company Ltd 1967
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid p 20
- ¹¹¹ Ibid p 21
- ¹¹² Ibid p 20

¹¹³ Ibid p 22

¹¹⁴ Ibid p 22

¹¹⁵ Ibid p 25

¹¹⁶ Ibid p 30

¹¹⁷ Jim Hillier and Andrew McTaggart 'Film in the Humanities Curriculum Project' in *Screen* Vol 11 No 2 March/April 1970 pp 46-51

¹¹⁸ Roger Mainds (Ed) *Screen Education Yearbook 1969* Editorial p 5

¹¹⁹ No record now exists of this meeting. It must have taken place in the early Summer of 1968, since the Seventeenth Annual Report of SEFT of 4 May 1968 makes no reference of any change in the Society's publications policy.

CHAPTER THREE

¹ *SEFT Seventeenth Annual Report 1967-1968* dated 4 May 1968 is signed by T J Bolas as Acting Secretary.

² An account of these activities is to be found in the Nineteenth Annual Report 1969-1970 published in *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 pp 96-111.

³ 'SEFT Conference May 3rd', *Screen* Vol 10 No 2 March/April 1969 p 4

⁴ 'SEFT 1970 Annual Conference' *Screen* Vol 11 No 2 March/April 1970 p 2

⁵ Terry Bolas 'Seft/Ilea Film Teaching Experiment' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 87-92

⁶ See the Foreword to *Screen* Vol 10 No 3 May/June 1969 p 4 where it is indicated that the issue includes 'Paddy Whannel's annual report to the British Film Institute, which for the first time was partly conceived for publication in the SEFT journal.'

⁷ See the advertisement 'Twenty Regional Film Theatres are ready to help you' in *Screen Education* 45 July/August 1968 p 71 including such centres as Petworth, St Austell and Street alongside those in Edinburgh, Manchester and Sheffield

⁸ BFI Special Collections Box 89 Paddy Whannel *The Education Department: Policy and Role* BFI Governors' Minutes G381 Paper No 2, 4 November 1968

⁹ Ibid p 5

¹⁰ The papers considered at these seminars were subsequently made available as duplicated material by the Education Department.

¹¹ Peter Wollen 'Towards a New Criticism?' *Screen Education* 41 September/October 1967 pp 90-91

¹² Alan Lovell 'The Western' *Screen Education* 41 pp 92-103. This seminar was held jointly with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.

¹³ Five of these seminar papers were edited by Wollen and reprinted as *Working Papers in the Cinema: Sociology and Semiology* London BFI Education Department 1971

¹⁴ Wollen (1967) op cit p 90

¹⁵ Alan Lovell 'The Aims of Film Education' Seminar paper 15 February 1968 [Author's collection]

¹⁶ BFI Special Collections Box 91 'Film Research' memo to Paddy Whannel from Peter Wollen 23 August 1968 p 2

¹⁷ BFI Special Collections Box 91 'Research Scholarships' memo to Paddy Whannel from Peter Wollen 3 September 1968

¹⁸ Whannel (1968) op cit p 5

¹⁹ Minutes of the 381st Meeting of the BFI Governors 4 November 1968 Section 5071

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Ibid

²² 'The British Universities Film Council-Past, Present and Future' *University Vision* No 11 April 1974 p 8

²³ 'Ernest Lindgren OBE Obituary' *University Vision* op cit pp 6-7

²⁴ Stuart Hall 'The Impact of Film on the University' *University Vision* No 2 October 1968 p 29

²⁵ L-A Bawden 'Film Studies in the University' *University Vision* No 4 November 1969 pp 25-35

²⁶ Ibid p 34

²⁷ Editorial in *Screen* Vol 10 No 1 January/February 1969 p 3

²⁸ See below endnote 31

²⁹ David Gladwell 'Editing Anderson's *If*' *Screen* Vol 10 No 1 January/February 1969 pp 24-33

³⁰ Gillian Hartnoll's reading lists for *Screen*:

Film History Vol 10 No 4/5 pp 187-191

British Cinema Vol 10 No 6 pp 108-109

Theory of Film Vol 11 No 1 pp 101-102

- Reference Books Part I Vol 11 no 2 pp 96-98
 Reference Books Part II Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 133-136
- ³¹ Roy Armes 'Duplicated Materials' *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 pp 105-106
³² Alan Lovell 'Robin Wood's Criticism' *Screen* Vol 10 No 2 March/April 1969 pp 42-55
 Robin Wood 'An Answer to Alan Lovell' *Screen* Vol 10 No 3 May/June 1969 pp 35-48
 Alan Lovell 'The Common Pursuit of True Judgment' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 76-88
³³ Andrew McTaggart 'Signs and Meaning in the Cinema' *Screen* Vol 10 No 6 pp 67-75
 Roy Armes 'A Polemic' *Screen* Vol 10 No 6 pp 75-79
³⁴ Peter Wollen *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* London Secker and Warburg 1969
³⁵ Foreword in *Screen* Vol 11 No 1 January/February 1970 p 2
³⁶ Edward Buscombe 'The Idea of Genre in the American Cinema' *Screen* Vol 11 No 2 March/April 1970 pp 33-45
 Richard Collins 'Genre: A Reply to Ed Buscombe' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 66-75
³⁷ See Alan Lovell *Anarchist Cinema* (1962) published by *Peace News* for which Lovell was the Film Critic.
³⁸ Alan Lovell (1968) op cit p 1
³⁹ Ibid p 7
⁴⁰ Lovell (1970) op cit p 87
⁴¹ Ibid p 88
⁴² See for example: Christine Gledhill *Film and Media Studies in Higher Education* London BFI Education 1981 p (i); Manuel Alvarado, Robin Gutch, Tana Wollen *Learning the Media* London MacMillan 1987 p 24
⁴³ Paddy Whannel 'The Problem of Film Availability' *Screen* Vol 10 No 1 January/February 1969 p 67-73
⁴⁴ Terry Bolas 'Developments in Film Education' *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 May/June 1970 p 99
⁴⁵ Whannel (1969) op cit p 68
⁴⁶ Douglas Lowndes in interview with the author 5 June 2003
⁴⁷ Roger Watkins *CSE Examinations in Film* London BFI/SEFT 1969 on first of unnumbered pages following the Introduction
⁴⁸ Paddy Whannel 'Film Education and Film Culture' *Screen* Vol 10 No 3 May/June 1969 p 49
⁴⁹ Ibid p 50
⁵⁰ Ibid p 51
⁵¹ Ibid p 51
⁵² Ibid p 53
⁵³ Ibid p 53
⁵⁴ Ibid p 54
⁵⁵ Ibid p 55
⁵⁶ Ibid p 56
⁵⁷ Ibid p 59
⁵⁸ Ibid p 58
⁵⁹ Paddy Whannel 'Servicing the Film Teacher' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 1970 p 48
⁶⁰ Ibid p 49
⁶¹ Ibid p 49
⁶² Ibid p 50
⁶³ The author's recollections of meeting Young at the BFI in 1970
⁶⁴ Ibid p 52
⁶⁵ Ibid p 52
⁶⁶ Ibid p 53
⁶⁷ Ibid p 54 There is no record of any reaction on Whannel's part to Richardson's 1967 book.
⁶⁸ Ibid p 55
⁶⁹ Roger Watkins 'Chairman's Foreword' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp7-8
⁷⁰ 'SEFT Nineteenth Annual Report 1969-70' published in *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 (pp 96-111) p 102
⁷¹ The SEFT accounts for 1969-1970 have not been found. The 1970-1971 accounts show the costs of *Screen* consuming £2960 out of a total SEFT expenditure of £3780.
⁷² It was also agreed that relevant expertise of the new postholder would be available to the Education Department to a limited extent.
⁷³ When Sam Rohdie produced his first issue of *Screen* (Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971), there was a nine person Editorial Board identified. Three members were from the BFI Education Department (Whannel, Lovell, Hillier), two SEFT Committee members (Buscombe and Cook) and three others (Terry Lovell, Jon Halliday, Peter Wollen). Rohdie would have made the SEFT representation up to three.
⁷⁴ Watkins op cit p 8
⁷⁵ Watkins op cit p 8

- ⁷⁶ SEFT Nineteenth Annual Report 1969-70 *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 p 102; SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1972 p 2
- ⁷⁷ Christopher Williams in interview with the author 28 April 2005
- ⁷⁸ Gerald Cinamon was designer of the prestigious Allen Lane at the Penguin Press. He had designed the cover of *New Left Review* and the new SEFT logo.
- ⁷⁹ Editorial *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 p 4
- ⁸⁰ Op cit p 5
- ⁸¹ See 'Soviet Film 1920s' *Screen* Vol 12 No 4 Winter 1971/72 pp 25-160
- ⁸² *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 Jean-Luc Comolli and Paul Narboni 'Cinema/Ideology/Criticism' (translated by Susan Bennett) pp 27-36; Ben Brewster 'Structuralism in Film Criticism' pp 49-58; Claire Johnston 'Film Journals: Britain and France' pp 39-46. Paul Willemen in interview with the author in July 2005 claimed that much of the article was his work, but that his position at the time as a BFI employee prevented his taking any credit.
- ⁸³ 'Introduction to Education Notes' *Screen* op cit p 77
- ⁸⁴ Sam Rohdie 'Education and Criticism – Notes on work to be done' *Screen* op cit pp 9-13
- ⁸⁵ Rohdie op cit p 12
- ⁸⁶ Christopher Williams in interview with the author 28 April 2005 and Jim Cook in interview with the author 13 January 2007
- ⁸⁷ Colin McArthur in interview with the author 28 June 2005
- ⁸⁸ BFI Governors' Minutes 17 February 1970 Section 5209
- ⁸⁹ BFI Special Collections Box 19 Memo from Ernest Lindgren to all BFI Staff Office Notice No 28/71 20 August 1971 The other four to resign were Eileen Brock, Gail Naughton, Jennifer Norman and Jim Pines
- ⁹⁰ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5338
- ⁹¹ Jim Cook in email to the author 10 January 2007
- ⁹² BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5344
- ⁹³ BFI Governors' Minutes 19 January 1971 Section 5306
- ⁹⁴ BFI Governors' Minutes 16 March 1971 Section 5327
- ⁹⁵ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5344
- ⁹⁶ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5338
- ⁹⁷ Ibid
- ⁹⁸ Ibid
- ⁹⁹ BFI Members' Action Committee 'A New Screenplay for the BFI' *Screen* Vol 12 No 3 Autumn 1971 p 44
- ¹⁰⁰ Colin McArthur interview op cit and Jim Hillier in interview with the author 25 April 2005
- ¹⁰¹ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5338
- ¹⁰² Ibid
- ¹⁰³ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁴ Jim Kitses *Horizons West* London Thames & Hudson 1969; Peter Wollen *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* London Secker & Warburg 1969
- ¹⁰⁵ Colin McArthur *Underworld USA* London Secker & Warburg 1972; Alan Lovell/Jim Hillier *Studies in Documentary* London Secker & Warburg 1972
- ¹⁰⁶ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5338
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁸ BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5344
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid
- ¹¹⁰ Eileen Brock *et al* 'Open Letter to the Staff of the British Film Institute' *Screen* Vol 12 No 3 Autumn 1971 p 5
- ¹¹¹ Alan Lovell in interview with the author 7 June 2005
- ¹¹² BFI Governors' Minutes 20 April 1971 Section 5344
- ¹¹³ 'The Future of the Education Department' BFI Governors' Paper No 3 G413 21 September 1971 p 1
- ¹¹⁴ BFI Special Collections Box 19 Ernest Lindgren Office Notice to all Staff No 28/71 20 August 1971
- ¹¹⁵ See Forman's 'Foreword' to *School Film Appreciation* 1950 which was funded by the BFI soon after Forman's arrival as BFI Director.
- ¹¹⁶ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Jim Cook to Denis Forman 17 August 1971
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid p 2
- ¹¹⁸ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Denis Forman to Jim Cook 18 August 1971
- ¹¹⁹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Jim Cook to Denis Forman 19 August 1971
- ¹²⁰ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Denis Forman to Jim Cook 24 August 1971
- ¹²¹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Sam Rohdie to Denis Forman 9 September 1971
- ¹²² BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Ernest Lindgren to Sam Rohdie 31 August 1971

- ¹²³ Letter from Rohdie op cit
- ¹²⁴ Jim Cook in interview with the author 13 January 2007
- ¹²⁵ Letter from Rohdie op cit p 3
- ¹²⁶ SEFT accounts for 1970/71 put membership/subscription income at £1237 for the twelve months ending 31 March 1971 – an average income of £103 per month. The SEFT accounting year was then changed to the calendar year so that the next accounts cover only the subsequent nine months to 31 December 1971. In that period membership/subscription income amounted to £990 or £110 per month, an average increase of 6.8 per cent.
- ¹²⁷ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Ernest Lindgren to Sam Rohdie 7 September 1971
- ¹²⁸ Minutes of BFI Governors' Meeting 21 September 1971 Paragraph 5380
- ¹²⁹ Jim Cook in email to the author 11 January 2007
- ¹³⁰ Sam Rohdie in email to the author 2 October 2005
- ¹³¹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Fred Gee to Vernon Saunders 15 October 1971
- ¹³² Advertisement in *Screen* Vol 12 No 3 Summer 1971 inside back cover
- ¹³³ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Sam Rohdie to Denis Forman 11 October 1971
- ¹³⁴ Ibid p 2
- ¹³⁵ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Referred to in a memo from Sam Rohdie to Stanley Reed 20 October 1971
- ¹³⁶ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Ernest Lindgren to Denis Forman 21 October 1971
- ¹³⁷ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Denis Forman to Asa Briggs 28 October 1971
- ¹³⁸ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Letter from Alan Leighton Davis to Denis Forman 21 October 1971
- ¹³⁹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Sam Rohdie to Stanley Reed 20 October 1971
- ¹⁴⁰ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Stanley Reed to Sam Rohdie 21 October 1971
- ¹⁴¹ Tom Ryall 'SEFT Annual Conference Report' *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1971 p 28
- ¹⁴² Ibid
- ¹⁴³ David Lusted in interview with the author 16 May 2005
- ¹⁴⁴ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Stanley Reed to Denis Forman 26 October 1971
- ¹⁴⁵ Ryall op cit p 28 gives the attendance as 'over 170 film educationists'
- ¹⁴⁶ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Sam Rohdie to Stanley Reed 25 October 1971
- ¹⁴⁷ Minutes of BFI Governors' Meeting 19 October 1971 Paragraph 5394
- ¹⁴⁸ Minutes of BFI Governors' Meeting 16 November 1971 Paragraph 5412
- ¹⁴⁹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Memo from Sam Rohdie to Stanley Reed 9 November 1971
- ¹⁵⁰ Sam Rohdie 'Foreword' in *Screen* Vol 12 No 4 Winter 1971/2
- ¹⁵¹ Lowndes's influential book *Film Making in Schools* had been published by Batsford in 1968.

CHAPTER FOUR

- ¹ Recollection of the author
- ² For the calendar year 1973 (which became SEFT's published accounting year at this point) the BFI grant total was £11,392.
- ³ See the account of the 1971 SEFT Annual Conference in the previous chapter
- ⁴ At the May 1971 AGM Jim Cook was elected Chairman and Ed Buscombe Treasurer. No listing is given for Committee Members in the Minutes of the 1971 AGM. Chris Mottershead (in interview with the author 9 November 2005) remembers that he volunteered for the SEFT Committee as a direct result of the conference, as did Richard Exton, Christine Gledhill, Geoff Goldstein and Felicity Grant. By the time that the 1972 AGM was called in November Jim Cook had taken up a post at the BFI and resigned; Les Reynolds was in the Chair and Mark Nash was Treasurer. A further twenty two individuals are listed as members of the Committee. Of these only four were survivors from the Committee elected in 1970.
- ⁵ Jim Cook in telephone interview with the author 22 January 2007
- ⁶ *Screen* Vol 12 Nos 1 - 3
- ⁷ *Screen Education Notes* International Edition October 1972 p 1
- ⁸ Among those who made up the Editorial Board between 1971 and 1974 were: Manuel Alvarado, Cary Bazalgette, Ed Buscombe, Richard Collins, Jim Cook, Elizabeth Cowie, Christine Gledhill, Jim Hillier, Chris Mottershead, Tom Ryall.
- ⁹ *Screen* Vol 12 No 4 Winter 1971/2
- ¹⁰ It is important to clarify the numbering of *Screen Education Notes*. The first issue in Winter 1971 was not numbered. The second issue in Spring 1972 was identified as No 1. The third issue in Summer 1972 was correctly identified as No 3. For the sake of clarity, the first and second issues will always be here only

by their publication dates. Therefore the reference for this quote is: Ed Buscombe 'Editorial' in *Screen Education Notes* Spring 1972 p 2.

¹¹ Brian Groombridge *Television and the People* Harmondsworth Penguin 1972

¹² Tom Ryall 'Editorial' *Screen Education Notes* Autumn 1972 No 4 p 2

¹³ When the course was re-written in 1976 it became the BFI/ILEA Film Study Course.

¹⁴ For example in London University the Italian Department at University College and the Spanish Department at Queen Mary College offer such MAs

¹⁵ Len Masterman in interview with the author 15 September 2006

¹⁶ Len Masterman (1) 'Film and the Raising of the School Leaving Age' *Screen Education Notes* Spring 1973 No 6 p 21

¹⁷ Ibid p 23

¹⁸ Ibid p 23

¹⁹ Richard Collins 'A Diploma Course in Film Study at the Polytechnic of Central London' *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1973/74 No 9 p 11

²⁰ Richard Collins in interview with the author 24 May 2004

²¹ SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1972 p 6

²² Chris Mottershead in interview with the author 9 November 2005

²³ SEFT Annual Report op cit p 7 and see also National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall Box BH/PL/132 (2) 1973 SEFT Annual Report and Accounts

²⁴ *Screen Education Notes* Summer 1972 No 3 p 48

²⁵ BFI Special Collections Box 117 SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1974 p 5

²⁶ Roy Knight (Ed) *Film in English Teaching* London, Hutchinson Educational November 1972

²⁷ 'Film in English Teaching' Len Masterman (2) 'Review One' and Jim Cook 'Review Two' in *Screen Education Notes* Spring 1973 no 6 pp 29-35

²⁸ Masterman 1973 (2) p 31

²⁹ Cook op cit p 35

³⁰ Masterman 1973 (2) p 31

³¹ Roy Knight op cit p 9

³² The four monographs (all published by British Film Institute Educational Advisory Services) were: Nicholas Garnham *Structures of Television* 1973; Richard Dyer *Light Entertainment* 1973; Trevor Pateman *Television and the February 1974 General Election* 1974; Ed Buscombe (Ed) *Football on Television* 1975. These were reviewed by Richard Paterson in *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 'Review of EAS publications' pp 45-50

³³ Collins interview op cit

³⁴ Manuel Alvarado in interview with the author 15 July 2003

³⁵ Paul Willemen in interview with the author 18 August 2005

³⁶ Alan Lovell in interview with the author 7 June 2005

³⁷ Victor Perkins in interview with the author 19 April 2005 and Charles Barr in interview with the author 15 June 2005

³⁸ Colin MacCabe in interview with the author 11 December 2006

³⁹ Stephen Heath, Colin MacCabe and Christopher Prendergast *Signs of the Times – Introductory Readings in Textual Semiotics* Reprint London BFI 1978

⁴⁰ Geoffrey Nowell-Smith in interview with the author 30 June 2003

⁴¹ BFI Special Collections May 2005 BFI Education File Memo from Christopher Williams to Douglas Lowndes 24 November 1972

⁴² British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service/Society for Education in Film and Television Joint seminars flyer November 1973 [Author's collection]

⁴³ Ibid

⁴⁴ Douglas Lowndes in interview with the author 5 June 2003

⁴⁵ Sam Rohdie 'Editorial' *Screen* Vol 13 No 3 Autumn 1972 pp 2-3

⁴⁶ Ibid p 3

⁴⁷ Perkins interview op cit

⁴⁸ Sam Rohdie 'Review: *Movie Reader, Film as Film*' *Screen* Vol 13 No 4 Winter 1972/3 pp 135-145

⁴⁹ Ibid p 141

⁵⁰ Ibid p 141

⁵¹ Ibid p 143

⁵² Victor Perkins 'A Reply to Sam Rohdie' *Screen* Vol 13 No 4 Winter 1972/3 pp 146-151

⁵³ Alan Lovell 'Editorial' *Screen* op cit pp 2-3

⁵⁴ Sam Rohdie 'Education and Criticism' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 p 10

- ⁵⁵ Lovell op cit p 3
- ⁵⁶ Independent Film and Video Producers' Association Archive Sheffield Hallam University Letter from Sam Rohdie to Malcolm Le Grice 12 January 1973
- ⁵⁷ Independent Film and Video Producers' Association Archive Sheffield Hallam University Letter from Sam Rohdie to Malcolm Le Grice 7 June 1973
- ⁵⁸ Ibid
- ⁵⁹ Ibid
- ⁶⁰ Independent Film and Video Producers' Association Archive Sheffield Hallam University Letters from Le Grice to Rohdie on 10 June and 20 June 1973; letter from Rohdie to Le Grice 15 June 1973
- ⁶¹ Christopher Williams in email to the author 20 March 2006
- ⁶² Ibid
- ⁶³ Roaslind Delmar in interview with the author 30 June 2003 She recalls that other members of the group included Jean McCrindle, Laura Mulvey and Margaret Walters
- ⁶⁴ Claire Johnston *Notes on Women's Cinema* London SEFT 1973
- ⁶⁵ Ed Buscombe *Films on TV* London SEFT 1971
- ⁶⁶ Claire Johnston and Paul Willemen (Eds) *Frank Tashlin* Edinburgh Film Festival in association with *Screen* 1973
- ⁶⁷ Figures from SEFT's Annual Report and Accounts for 1972 and 1973
- ⁶⁸ *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/6
- ⁶⁹ Laura Mulvey in interview with the author 24 July 2003
- ⁷⁰ The documents are identified as Document One and Document Two and are unsigned and undated. Each is a response to the 'Document from SEFT Committee to the General Secretary'. Document One is a response to 'crises' that the SEFT document revealed. Document Two is a response to 'rules and procedures affecting the General Secretary' that the SEFT document had detailed. [Author's collection]
- ⁷¹ BFI Special Collections Box 117 Minutes of the AGM of SEFT held on 17 November 1973
- ⁷² MacCabe interview op cit The information concerning the attitude of the replacement editors to their predecessor was provided by Manuel Alvarado 2 July 2007
- ⁷³ Introduction to *Screen Education* Nos10/11 Spring/Summer 1974 p 3
- ⁷⁴ Lowndes interview op cit
- ⁷⁵ BFI Special Collections Box 117A statement of policy from the SEFT Executive Committee to the membership of the Society for Education in Film and Television 15 May 1974
- ⁷⁶ Ibid Note 4 p 3
- ⁷⁷ SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1974 p 1
- ⁷⁸ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall PL/133 (2) Chris Mottershead 'Some Background Notes on the BFI/ILEA Film Study Course' March 1978
- ⁷⁹ Mottershead interview op cit
- ⁸⁰ Michael Simons in email to the author 1 February 2007
- ⁸¹ Mottershead interview op cit
- ⁸² Ibid
- ⁸³ Jim Hillier in interview with the author 25 April 2005
- ⁸⁴ 'Inner London Education Authority Film Study Course for Sixth Form Students' *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1972 No 5 p 12
- ⁸⁵ Mottershead interview op cit
- ⁸⁶ Christine Ridge 'Reflections on the ILEA 6th Form Film Course' *Screen Education Notes* Autumn 1973 No 8 p 11
- ⁸⁷ 'Teachers' Introduction to Teachers' Guide to Narrative' *ilea:bfi 6th form film studies course 1983-1984* [Author's collection]
- ⁸⁸ BFI/ILEA Film Study Course Teachers' Notes Introduction 1976
- ⁸⁹ Mottershead 1978 op cit
- ⁹⁰ Hillier interview op cit
- ⁹¹ Recollection of the author who was Lecturer in Educational Technology at Wandsworth Technical College when the first intake of MROs was trained there
- ⁹² David Lusted in interview with the author 16 May 2005
- ⁹³ Manuel Alvarado, Jim Cook, Geoff Goldstein, Chris Mottershead, 'Editorial' in *Screen Education* No 16 Autumn 1975 p1
- ⁹⁴ Jim Cook 'Teaching the Industry' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 4-18
- ⁹⁵ Ibid p 6
- ⁹⁶ Ibid p 16
- ⁹⁷ Ibid p 17

- ⁹⁸ Ibid p 17
- ⁹⁹ Planning had already started on the 1976 school when the NUT withdrew. SEFT continued on its own but teamed up with the BFI Educational Advisory Service subsequently.
- ¹⁰⁰ Karen Brumer, Mike Hagen, Josie McDonough, Will Scurlock, Philip Simpson 'Report of the NUT/SEFT Easter School "Approaches to the Teaching of Film Studies" York, 1975' *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975
- ¹⁰¹ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall ME/PL/133 (2) Manuel Alvarado 'NUT/SEFT Easter School Report 1975' April 1975
- ¹⁰² Bremer et al op cit p 48
- ¹⁰³ Ibid p 47
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid p 50
- ¹⁰⁵ Williams interview op cit
- ¹⁰⁶ Lusted interview op cit
- ¹⁰⁷ This has been a consistent theme in many of the interviews conducted for this investigation.
- ¹⁰⁸ Philip Simpson in interview with the author 4 September 2006
- ¹⁰⁹ Williams interview op cit
- ¹¹⁰ Jim Cook, Nicky North *BFI Summer Schools 71-79* London BFI Education Department April 1981
- ¹¹¹ Ibid p 1
- ¹¹² Ibid pp 3-8
- ¹¹³ Ibid pp 38-51
- ¹¹⁴ Leaflets advertising the Summer Schools in 1974 and 1975 [Author's collection]
- ¹¹⁵ Cook and North op cit p 4
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid p 9
- ¹¹⁷ Victor Perkins interview op cit
- ¹¹⁸ List of students 1972 [Author's collection]
- ¹¹⁹ Manuel Alvarado, Cary Bazalgette, Andrew Bethell, Stephen Crofts, Christine Geraghty, Felicity Grant, Robert Lapsley, Chris Mottershead, Steve Neale, Tom Ryall, Philip Simpson
- ¹²⁰ Cook and North op cit p 16
- ¹²¹ Ibid p 28
- ¹²² Roy Stafford in interview with the author 11 May 2005
- ¹²³ Cook and North op cit p 39
- ¹²⁴ Ibid p 55
- ¹²⁵ Edward Buscombe, Christine Gledhill, Alan Lovell, Christopher Williams 'Statement: Psychoanalysis and Film' *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/6 pp 119-130
- ¹²⁶ Edward Buscombe, Christine Gledhill, Alan Lovell, Christopher Williams 'Statement: Why We Have Resigned from the Board of *Screen*' *Screen* Vol 17 No 2 Summer 1976 pp 106-109
- ¹²⁷ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall ME/PL/133 (1) Steve Crofts 'SEFT Weekend School Papers' 20 June 1977
- ¹²⁸ Christine Geraghty in interview with the author 2 August 2005
- ¹²⁹ Weekend Schools Costing 1975/76 [Author's collection]
- ¹³⁰ Narrative Cinema Weekend School 11-13 April 1975 Students' Advance Programme [Author's collection]
- ¹³¹ Lovell interview op cit
- ¹³² Minutes of the Meeting of the Governors of the British Film Institute 21 March 1972 Paragraph 5453 contains a reference to University Research Centres where Douglas Lowndes is to liaise with Asa Briggs
- ¹³³ Williams interview op cit and Colin McArthur in interview with the author 28 June 2005
- ¹³⁴ BFI Governors Minutes 9 May 1972 Section 5471
- ¹³⁵ Robin Wood 'Film Studies at the University of Warwick' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 pp 51-54
- ¹³⁶ Richard Dyer 'Film Studies at the University of Keele' and Peter Wollen 'Film Studies at the University of Essex' *Screen Education* op cit pp 54-60
- ¹³⁷ Wollen ibid p 57
- ¹³⁸ Ibid pp 59-60
- ¹³⁹ *Viewpoint* Teachers' Notes London Thames Television 1975 p1
- ¹⁴⁰ The author is grateful to Bob Ferguson of the London University Institute of Education for the loan of video recordings of the *Viewpoint* series
- ¹⁴¹ Manuel Alvarado and Richard Collins 'The Viewpoint Controversy' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 pp 74-81
- ¹⁴² Ibid p 75

¹⁴³ Ibid p 80

CHAPTER FIVE

¹ Philip Simpson 'Film and TV Studies in Secondary Education Report of the BFI/SEFT York Conference 1976' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 p 35

² Julius Gould *The Attack on Higher Education: Marxist and Radical Penetration* London Institute for the Study of Conflict September 1977

³ George Foster in interview with the author 18 November 2003

⁴ Robin Wood 'Film and television Studies in the UK' in *Visual Education* April 1977 p 21

⁵ Manuel Alvarado in a letter to the author 16 February 2007

⁶ Manuel Alvarado in email to the author 1 March 2007

⁷ Manuel Alvarado, Richard Collins 'The *Viewpoint* Controversy' in *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 pp 74-81

⁸ Len Masterman in interview with the author 15 September 2006

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Philip Simpson op cit pp 35-44

¹¹ Jim Hillier in interview with the author 25 April 2005

¹² Len Masterman *Teaching About Television* London Macmillan Press 1980 p7

¹³ Richard Collins in interview with the author 24 May 2004

¹⁴ Roy Stafford in interview with the author 11 May 2005

¹⁵ Manuel Alvarado in interview with the author 15 July 2003

¹⁶ Geoffrey Nowell-Smith in interview with the author 30 June 2003

¹⁷ Members of the *Screen Education* Editorial Board held a similar view in respect of their journal.

¹⁸ Nowell-Smith interview op cit

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ Laura Mulvey in interview with the author 24 July 2003

²¹ Peter Wollen *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* Expanded Edition London: BFI, 1998 p 155

²² John Ellis in interview with the author 4 July 2003

²³ Alvarado interview (2003) op cit

²⁴ *Screen Reader 1: Cinema/Ideology/Politics* (1997) and *Screen Reader 2 Cinema and Semiotics* (1981) were published by SEFT. *The Sexual Subject A Screen Reader on Sexuality* (1992) was published by Routledge. *Screen Histories A Screen Reader* (1998) was published by Oxford University Press.

²⁵ David Rodowick in interview with the author 9 June 2004

²⁶ Ellis interview op cit

²⁷ Andrew Britton 'The Ideology of *Screen*' in *Movie* No 26 Winter 1978/79 pp 2-28

²⁸ *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 pp 27-36

²⁹ Susan Bennett in interview with the author 5 June 2003

³⁰ Op cit

³¹ Alvarado interview (2003) op cit

³² Ellis op cit

³³ Paul Willemsen in interview with the author 18 August 2005

³⁴ Anthony Easthope 'The Trajectory of *Screen*, 1971-79' *The Politics of Theory* Ed Francis Barker *et al* Colchester University of Essex 1983 p 121

³⁵ Janet Bergstrom (Ed) *Endless Night Cinema and Psychoanalysis – Parallel Histories* Berkeley University of California Press 1999 p 4

³⁶ E Ann Kaplan (Ed) 'From Plato's Cave to Freud's Screen' *Psychoanalysis and Cinema* New York Routledge 1990 p 8

³⁷ Robert Lapsley and Michael Westlake *Film Theory An Introduction* Manchester Manchester University Press 1988 p10

³⁸ Nicolas Tredell (Ed) *Cinemas of the Mind A Critical History of Film Theory* Cambridge Icon Books 2002 p 131

³⁹ Stuart Hall 'Recent Developments in Theories of Language and Ideology: A Critical Note' *Culture, Media, Language Working Papers in Cultural Studies* Hutchinson: London, 1980 p 157

- ⁴⁰ Annette Kuhn and Jackie Stacey (Eds) *Screen Histories A Screen Reader* Oxford Oxford University Press 1998 p 2
- ⁴¹ Christine Geraghty in interview with the author 2 August 2005
- ⁴² Manuel Alvarado interview (2003) op cit
- ⁴³ Laura Mulvey in interview with the author 24 July 2003
- ⁴⁴ Willemen interview op cit
- ⁴⁵ Anthony Easthope *British Post-Structuralism* London Routledge 1988 pp 43-59
- ⁴⁶ Philip Rosen (Ed) *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology* New York Columbia University Press 1986 In this volume of articles collected mostly from Anglo-American film journals, reprints from *Screen* account for seven chapters while five other journals together contribute a combined total of eleven chapters. What is significant for a study of *Screen* is that only three of the reprinted articles were written specifically for it. Four were in fact translations of Bellour, Barthes, Metz and the Editors of *Cahiers du Cinema*. Apart from the last, the translations all appeared during Brewster's editorship and were the work of Heath (on Barthes) and Brewster. The *Screen* originals were MacCabe on 'Theory and Film: Principles of Realism and Pleasure', Heath on 'Narrative Space' and Mulvey on 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema'.
- ⁴⁷ Mark Nash in interview with the author 21 April 2005
- ⁴⁸ Rosen op cit p viii
- ⁴⁹ See *Screens* Vol 16 No 2 Summer 1975 pp 5-6, Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/76 pp 119-130 and Vol 17 No 2 Summer 1976 pp 106-116.
- ⁵⁰ Geraghty interview op cit
- ⁵¹ The present state of access to SEFT archive materials is such that one can only make inferences from the published material and from what was recollected by those interviewed.
- ⁵² *Screen* Vol 16 No 1 pp 5-6
- ⁵³ Thus Stephen Heath is quoted by Nicolas Tredell (*Cinemas of the Mind A Critical History of Film Theory* Cambridge Icon Books 2002 p 13):
'*Screen* had a marginal institutional position as a subsidiary part of the Society for Education in Film and Television which was itself an outpost of the British Film Institute'
Colin MacCabe writes (*Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature* Manchester Manchester University Press 1985 p 4):
'Originally *Screen* and its parent body SEFT (Society for Education in Film and Television) were set up at the end of the fifties by teachers interested in bringing film into the classroom, and it was practical questions about the teaching of film which dominated the magazine for its first twelve years. Throughout this period both the Society and the magazine were located within the offices of the BFI, which was the Society's funding body.'
- ⁵⁴ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BH/ME/PL/132 (2) The supporting evidence for this is drawn from the rather inadequate record in the Minutes of the November 1972 SEFT AGM
- ⁵⁵ Ed Buscombe in interview with the author 13 June 2003 'Lovell had also been Whannel's deputy from 1969-71. He became a SEFT committee member after his resignation from the BFI.
- ⁵⁶ *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 p 130
- ⁵⁷ Stephen Crofts 'Debate Film and Psychoanalysis' *Framework* No 4 Autumn 1976 p 16
- ⁵⁸ Ibid
- ⁵⁹ Manuel Alvarado interview (2003) op cit
- ⁶⁰ Nowell-Smith interview op cit
- ⁶¹ *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/76 p 121
- ⁶² NAFE was founded in late summer 1971. In 'A Letter from the Chairman' dated November 1975 it is stated 'At that time relations between the British Film Institute and SEFT were not at their best and the appearance on the scene of another body of film teachers seemed not altogether unwelcome in some quarters' National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BH/ME/PL/132/1
- ⁶³ Alvarado interview (2003) op cit
- ⁶⁴ Manuel Alvarado in interview with the author 11 July 2005
- ⁶⁵ Jim Hillier in interview with the author 25 April 2005
- ⁶⁶ David Lusted in interview with the author 16 May 2005
- ⁶⁷ *Screen* Vol 16 Nos 1 and 2
- ⁶⁸ *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/76 p 125
- ⁶⁹ *Screen* Vol 17 No 2 Summer 1976 p 113
- ⁷⁰ These issues have of course been taken up by women writers subsequently, including Mulvey herself. See in particular 'Afterthoughts on "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" inspired by King Vidor's *Duel in the Sun* (1946)' in Laura Mulvey *Visual and Other Pleasures* Basingstoke Palgrave 1989.
- ⁷¹ Ibid pp 107-108

- ⁷² Geraghty interview op cit
- ⁷³ Collins interview op cit
- ⁷⁴ Manuel Alvarado, Richard Collins Editorial *Screen Education* No 14 Spring 1975 pp 2-3
- ⁷⁵ Ibid p 2
- ⁷⁶ Manuel Alvarado, Cary Bazalgette, Jim Hillier Editorial *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975 pp 1-2
- ⁷⁷ *Screen Education* op cit Andrew Bethell 'Classroom Practice: Observations and Proposals' pp 19-24; Cary Bazalgette, Neil Galbraith and Danny Padmore 'You saw all the sweat' pp 25-42
- ⁷⁸ Manuel Alvarado, Jim Cook, Geoff Goldstein, Chris Mottershead 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 16 Autumn 1975 pp 1-3
- ⁷⁹ Richard Collins, Jim Grealley Editorial 'The Education Cuts' *Screen Education* op cit pp 41-46
- ⁸⁰ Ibid p 46
- ⁸¹ Manuel Alvarado, Richard Collins Editorial *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 p 1
- ⁸² Manuel Alvarado, Cary Bazalgette, Felicity Grant Editorial *Screen Education* No 18 Spring 1976 p 1
- ⁸³ See previous chapter
- ⁸⁴ Susan Bennett 'Mass Media Education – Defining the Subject' *Screen Education* op cit pp 15-21
- ⁸⁵ Ibid p 17
- ⁸⁶ Ibid p 20
- ⁸⁷ Bob Ferguson, Robert Stephens 'Media Studies and Media Usage in an Institute of Education' in *Screen Education* No 21 Winter 1976/77 pp 20-31
- ⁸⁸ Bennett op cit p 21
- ⁸⁹ Manuel Alvarado, Richard Collins, Jim Cook, Roy Stafford 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 p 1
- ⁹⁰ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BH/ME/PL 133 (2) 'Screen Education Statement to the SEFT Executive' March 1976
- ⁹¹ National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BH/ME/PL 133 (2) 'Screen Education Policy Statement from the Editorial Board' May 1976
- ⁹² Jim Grealley 'Notes on Popular Culture' in *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 pp 5-11
- ⁹³ Ibid p 11
- ⁹⁴ Geoffrey Nowell-Smith 'Gramsci and the National Popular' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 12-15
- ⁹⁵ Ibid p 15
- ⁹⁶ Colin Sparks 'The Evolution of Cultural Studies...' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 16-30
- ⁹⁷ Richard Collins 'Re-evaluating Leavis' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 39-47
- ⁹⁸ Ibid p 37
- ⁹⁹ Statement in *Screen Education* No 21 Winter 1976/77 p 86
- ¹⁰⁰ John Caughie 'Glasgow SEFT Group' in *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 p 76
- ¹⁰¹ Anthony Easthope, Rob Lapsley 'Manchester SEFT Group' in *Screen Education* No 23 Summer 1977 pp 71-72
- ¹⁰² John Thompson 'Report - SEFT Glasgow Group Weekend School "Television and the Real World"' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 69-70
- ¹⁰³ Advertisement in *Screen Education* op cit p 68
- ¹⁰⁴ Alvarado recalls that there was also a short-lived French SEFT group based in Amiens
- ¹⁰⁵ Richard Exton, Christine Geraghty, Ian Gilman, Harry Lyons, Stephanie McKnight, Chris Mottershead, Christopher Williams 'Statement: *Screen Education* and *The Sweeney*' in *Screen Education* op cit pp 59-64
- ¹⁰⁶ Exton, Geraghty and Mottershead had been re-elected. Gilman, and Lyons had failed to be re-elected. McKnight and Williams had failed to be elected.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Screen Education* op cit p 60
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid p 62
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid p 63
- ¹¹¹ Phillip Drummond 'Reply to Critics of *Screen Education* 20 *The Sweeney*' *Screen Education* op cit pp 65-68
- ¹¹² Ibid p 68
- ¹¹³ Manuel Alvarado, Felicity Grant 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 24 Autumn 1977 pp 1-3
- ¹¹⁴ Alvarado left after editing *Screen Education* 27. However he had commissioned articles for the next two issues. He remembers that the first issue to be completely the work of Donald was *Screen Education* 31.
- ¹¹⁵ Edward Buscombe *Making Legend of the Werewolf* London BFI/EAS 1976
- ¹¹⁶ Manuel Alvarado and Edward Buscombe *Hazell – the Making of a TV Series* London BFI in association with Latimer 1978

- ¹¹⁷ George Foster 'Review of *Making Legend of the Werewolf*' *Screen Education* No 24 Autumn 1977 pp 57-60
- ¹¹⁸ Alvarado and Buscombe op cit p 9
- ¹¹⁹ Francis Mulhern *The Moment of Scrutiny* London New Left Books 1979
- ¹²⁰ It has been shown that film study was established in certain teacher training colleges eg Bede and Bulmershe, but these were not then considered university level.
- ¹²¹ Mulhern op cit p 32
- ¹²² Such a lineage could result in marked policy shifts in the SEFT journal's trajectory, as happened in 1969 when *Screen* replaced the first version of *Screen Education*. There were other shifts. In 1971 *Screen* turned emphatically toward the development of theory and then in 1979 under Mark Nash a more journalistic approach was undertaken.
- ¹²³ *The Use of English*, originally *English in Schools*, was started in 1939 and edited by Denys Thompson. It continued into the 1960s.
- ¹²⁴ *Screen* Vol 10 No 2 pp 42-55 and Vol 10 No 3 pp 35-48.
- ¹²⁵ A decade later Britton, attempting to demolish 'Fortress *Screen*' *Movie* No 26 (See Chapter 7), uses Leavis on several occasions as a fixed point of reference.
- ¹²⁶ The six who joined the Editorial Board in 1976 following the resignations of Buscombe, Gledhill, Lovell and Williams were in 2003 professors of film, as indeed were the then Editor, the Editorial Assistant and the surviving members of the board that they joined.
- ¹²⁷ Alvarado interview (2003) op cit
- ¹²⁸ Mulhern op cit p 33
- ¹²⁹ Francis Mulhern 'Notes on Culture and Cultural Struggle' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 p 32
- ¹³⁰ Alvarado interview (2003) op cit
- ¹³¹ Stephen Crofts, Phillip Drummond, Jimmy Grealy, Claire Johnstone, Mark Nash, Steve Neale, James Pettifer, Peter Wollen *Provisional Policy Document for the S.E.F.T.* Undated but circulated before the 1976 SEFT AGM. [Author's collection]
- ¹³² National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BH/ME/PL 132 (2) Minutes of the Twenty Fifth Annual General Meeting of the Society for Education in Film and Television held on Saturday 6th November 1976
- ¹³³ Ibid as revealed in the voting pattern of the various elections
- ¹³⁴ Ibid
- ¹³⁵ Crofts et al op cit p 4
- ¹³⁶ Willemen interview op cit
- ¹³⁷ Minutes op cit Item 4
- ¹³⁸ Mottershead interview op cit
- ¹³⁹ Foster interview op cit
- ¹⁴⁰ Geraghty interview op cit
- ¹⁴¹ Williams interview op cit
- ¹⁴² Steve Neale *Discussion Document for SEFT Policy Statement* Undated [Author's collection]
- ¹⁴³ Minutes op cit Item 4 (continued)
- ¹⁴⁴ Colin MacCabe in interview with the author 11 December 2006

CHAPTER SIX

- ¹ BFI Special Collections May 2005 Education Department File Douglas Lowndes *The SEFT Provisional Policy Paper and the Policy Situation in EAS – A Personal Statement by Head of EAS 9th November 1976* p 1
- ² Ibid p 2
- ³ Ibid p 2
- ⁴ Ibid p 3
- ⁵ Ibid p 3
- ⁶ Ibid p 3
- ⁷ Ibid p 6
- ⁸ Ibid p 8
- ⁹ Ibid p 8
- ¹⁰ BFI Governors Minutes 24 January 1978 BFI Confidential Governors' Paper 'Grant-in-Aid Bodies' G463/4.77 13 December 1977
- ¹¹ Minutes of the BFI Governors Meeting 24 January 1978 Section 5936

- ¹² G463/4.77 op cit Section A 'Society for Education in Film and Television'
- ¹³ Ibid
- ¹⁴ Douglas Lowndes in interview with the author 5 June 2003
- ¹⁵ Letter from Lucas 10 June 1977 inviting BFI contacts to attend seminars in BFI Special Collections May 2005 BFI Education File
- ¹⁶ Ibid
- ¹⁷ BFI Special Collections May 2005 BFI Education File List of participants in Secondary and Further Education Review Seminar 12 July 1977
- ¹⁸ BFI Special Collections May 2005 BFI Education File Keith Lucas 'Educational Advisory Service Review Seminars' Section 6.4 September 1977
- ¹⁹ Letter from Lucas op cit
- ²⁰ Jim Hillier in interview with the author 25 April 2005
- ²¹ Graham Baines 'The National Association for Film Education' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 30-31
- ²² Ibid p 31
- ²³ Chris Mottershead and Tricia Jenkins (Eds) *Children Moving Images* London BFI 1992 p 1
- ²⁴ Archive of the Institute of Education University of London *Institute of Education Teachers' Centre Short Courses 1959*
- ²⁵ Archive of the Institute of Education University of London *Institute of Education Programme of Courses for Practising Teachers Spring 1968* p 4
- ²⁶ Leaflet from University of London Institute of Education: *Master of Arts Degree 'Film and Television Studies for Education'* 1981 [Author's collection]
- ²⁷ The Certificate/ Diploma offered by the London University Extra-Mural Department had expanded with the setting up of a parallel course offer at Goldsmiths College. The Slade School now offered its tiny postgraduate intake in film the opportunity to acquire an M Phil.
- ²⁸ Archive of the Institute of Education University of London University of London MA Examination September 1982 'Film and Television Studies for Education Paper 3'
- ²⁹ Archive of the Institute of Education University of London University of London MA Examination September 1982 'Film and Television Studies for Education Paper 2'
- ³⁰ James Donald 'Examinations and Strategies' *Screen Education* No 26 Spring 1978 pp 3-11
- ³¹ Manuel Alvarado, Cary Bazalgette, Edward Buscombe Editorial in *Screen Education* No 26 p 1
- ³² Donald op cit p 11
- ³³ Ibid
- ³⁴ Ibid
- ³⁵ Tony Stevens 'Reading the Realist Film' *Screen Education* No 26 pp 13-34
- ³⁶ Ibid p 34
- ³⁷ Ibid p 34
- ³⁸ Manuel Alvarado, Elizabeth Cowie, Roy Stafford Editorial *Screen Education* No 27 Summer 1978 p 1
- ³⁹ Ibid p 1
- ⁴⁰ Alvarado in conversation with the author 8 March 2007
- ⁴¹ James Donald, Manuel Alvarado, Richard Collins, Bob Ferguson 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 28 p 1
- ⁴² 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 29 Winter 1978/79 p 1
- ⁴³ James Donald in interview with the author 4 January 2006
- ⁴⁴ Stuart Hall in interview with the author 17 March 2005
- ⁴⁵ Ibid
- ⁴⁶ Rosalind Coward 'Class, "Culture" and the Social Formation' *Screen* Vol 18 No 1 Spring 1977 pp 75-105; Iain Chambers, John Clarke, Ian Connell, Lidia Curti, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson 'Marxism and Culture' *Screen* Vol 18 No 4 Winter 1977/78 pp 109 - 119
- ⁴⁷ Geoffrey Nowell-Smith Editorial *Screen* Vol 18 No 1 p 6
- ⁴⁸ Iain Chambers et al op cit p 109
- ⁴⁹ John Ellis in interview with the author 4 July 2003
- ⁵⁰ Hall interview op cit
- ⁵¹ Ibid
- ⁵² Ibid
- ⁵³ Ibid
- ⁵⁴ Ibid
- ⁵⁵ Ibid
- ⁵⁶ 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 30 Spring 1979 p 1
- ⁵⁷ Ibid
- ⁵⁸ Ibid

- 59 James Donald 'Green Paper: Noise of Crisis' *Screen Education* No 30 pp 13-49
- 60 Ibid p 48
- 61 Ibid
- 62 See Bob Long 'Photo Practice 1' in *Screen Education* No 34 pp 106-112
- 63 Ibid p 3
- 64 Ibid p 2
- 65 Francis Mulhern *The Moment of Scrutiny* London New Left Books 1979
- 66 Ibid p 2
- 67 Ibid
- 68 Ibid
- 69 Film & Media Studies in Higher Education Conference 1979 Listing of Seminar Groups (8/9 June)
[Author's collection]
- 70 Advertisement in *Screen Education* No 30 Spring 1979 p 50
- 71 Philip Simpson Appendix I Film and Media Studies in Higher Education 1977-79 in Christine Gledhill (Ed) *Film & Media Studies in Higher Education Conference Papers* London BFI Education September 1981 pp 153-160
- 72 Philip Simpson op cit p 159
- 73 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 32/33 Autumn/Winter 1979/80 p 1
- 74 Ibid p 2
- 75 Ibid p 1
- 76 Ibid p 4
- 77 Ibid p 3
- 78 Claude Bailblé 'Programming the Look' *Screen Education* No 32/33 pp 99-131
- 79 An Advertisement for SEFT Weekend School in *Screen Education* No 32/33 p 134 'Culture and Politics' London February 9-10 1980
- 80 Francis Mulhern in conversation with the author 15 March 2007
- 81 Francis Mulhern 'Notes on Culture and Cultural Struggle' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 31-35
- 82 Stuart Hall 'The Williams Interviews' pp 94-104 and Ernesto Laclau 'Populist Rupture and Discourse' pp 87-93 *Screen Education* op cit
- 83 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 34 p 1
- 84 Richard Johnson 'Cultural Studies and Educational Practice' *Screen Education* op cit pp 5-16; Tony Bennett 'Popular Culture: A Teaching Object' *Screen Education* op cit pp 17-29
- 85 Richard Johnson op cit p 16
- 86 Hazel Carby 'Multi-Culture' *Screen Education* op cit p 69
- 87 The listing was compiled by Ian MacDonald, the BFI's Television Information Officer.
- 88 Vincent Porter 'Video Recording and the Teacher' *Screen Education* No 35 Summer 1980 pp 87-90
- 89 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 35 p 2
- 90 *Screen Education* No 36 Autumn 1980
- 91 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 36 Autumn 1980 p 1
- 92 Ibid
- 93 Ibid
- 94 Figures from SEFT Annual Report for 1978/79 written by Phillip Drummond for the AGM 26 January 1980
- 95 Colin Mercer 'After Gramsci' pp 5-15 and Iain Chambers 'Rethinking Popular Culture' pp 113-117 *Screen Education* No 36
- 96 Mark Nash in interview with the author 21 April 2005
- 97 Michel Foucault 'What is an Author?' *Screen* Vol 20 No 1 Spring 1979 pp 13-29
- 98 Translation by Donald F Bouchard, Cornell University 1977
- 99 *Screen* Vol 20 No 2 Summer 1979 p 10
- 100 *Screen* Vol 20 No 3/4 p 7
- 101 Ibid
- 102 Ibid p 8
- 103 Ibid
- 104 Ibid
- 105 Ibid
- 106 John Ellis interview op cit
- 107 BFI Governors Minutes 22 January 1980 Section 6117
- 108 *Screen* op cit p 9
- 109 See Chapter Five.

- 110 *Screen* op cit p 11
- 111 Ibid
- 112 Ibid
- 113 Ibid p 12
- 114 Andrew Britton 'The Ideology of *Screen*' *Movie* No 26 Winter 1978/79 pp 2-28; Kevin Robins 'Althusserian Marxism and media studies: the case of *Screen*' *Media, Culture and Society* 1979 No 1 pp 355-370
- 115 Victor Perkins in interview with the author 19 April 2005
- 116 Ibid
- 117 *Screen* op cit
- 118 Colin MacCabe in interview with the author 11 December 2006
- 119 Nash interview op cit
- 120 MacCabe interview op cit
- 121 There was a Weekend School on Feminism in 1976
- 122 Claire Johnston *Notes on Women's Cinema – Screen Pamphlet 2* London SEFT 1973
- 123 Laura Mulvey 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' *Screen* Vol 16 No 3 Autumn 1975 pp 6-18
- 124 Linda Williams 'Hiroshima and Marienbad – Metaphor and Metonymy' *Screen* Vol 17 No 1 Spring 1976
- 125 Paul Willemen in interview with the author 18 August 2005
- 126 Claire Pajaczkowska in interview with the author 31 March 2007
- 127 *The Sexual Subject A Screen Reader in Sexuality* London Routledge 1992
- 128 For a useful summary of the 1970s' cinema journals see Paul Willemen 'Introduction' in Paul Willemen and Jim Pines (Eds) *The Essential Framework* London Epigraph Publications Limited 1988 pp 1-11
- 129 This is the view of Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Editor of *Screen* 1976-77) in interview with the author 30 June 2003
- 130 Paul Willemen 'Remarks on *Screen* A Spiralling Trajectory' in *Southern Review* Vol 16 No 2 July 1983. The references given here are to a typescript version of the article distributed by Willemen to students on the BFI MA course in the early 1990s.
- 131 Willemen (1983) op cit
- 132 Paul Willemen interview op cit
- 133 Ibid
- 134 Willemen (1983) op cit p 9
- 135 Ibid p 8
- 136 Ibid p 20
- 137 Willemen interview op cit
- 138 James Donald in interview with the author 4 January 2006
- 139 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 37 Winter 1980/91 p 2
- 140 Minutes of the Meeting of BFI Governors 24 February 1981 Item 6227 Grant-Aided Bodies p 3
- 141 Colin McArthur 'BFI Funding and the Grant-in-Aid Bodies' G486/7.80 24 June 1980
- 142 Minutes of the 26th SEFT AGM 21 January 1978
- 143 SEFT Annual Report for 1978/79
- 144 George Foster in interview with the author 18 November 2003
- 145 SEFT Interim Report April – December 1980
- 146 SEFT Chairperson's Report for 1979/80
- 147 SEFT Interim Report op cit
- 148 Ibid
- 149 Ibid
- 150 Minutes of the 29th SEFT AGM 31 January 1981
- 151 Report to SEFT Emergency General Meeting June 1981
- 152 Ibid
- 153 Myra Connell and Michael O'Shaughnessy 'Report' in *Media Education Conference 1981* London BFI Education 1982 p 7
- 154 Philip Simpson 'Introduction' in *Media Education Conference 1981* op cit p 1
- 155 Ibid
- 156 Ibid p 2
- 157 Connell and O'Shaughnessy op cit p 10
- 158 Ibid
- 159 David Lusted 'Media Education and the Secondary/FE Curriculum' in Connell and O'Shaughnessy op cit pp 13-26
- 160 Len Masterman in interview with the author 15 September 2006

- ¹⁶¹ Connell and O'Shaughnessy op cit Appendix 1 pp 57 - 60
¹⁶² Connell and O'Shaughnessy op cit p 6
¹⁶³ Len Masterman *Teaching about Television* London Macmillan Press 1980
¹⁶⁴ Josephine Langham *Teachers and Television: The IBA Educational Fellowship Scheme* London John Libbey & Company Ltd 1990
¹⁶⁵ Ibid p 220
¹⁶⁶ Mandy Merck in interview with the author 16 June 2004
¹⁶⁷ Sean Cubitt in e-mail interview with the author 14 January 2006

CONCLUSION

- ¹ *Screen* Vol 30 No 3 Summer 1989 was the first to be published by the University of Glasgow
² The Media Education Association was founded in June 2006
³ The original *Horizons West* by Jim Kitses London Thames & Hudson 1969 had no bibliography. The Second Edition (BFI Publishing 2004) has a six page Selective Bibliography
⁴ Representatives of NAFE were present at the SEFT Annual Conference on 23 October 1971 Report in *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1971 p 28
⁵ Geoffrey Nowell-Smith in interview with the author 30 June 2003
⁶ Victor Perkins in interview with the author 19 April 2005
⁷ See Education Group Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies *Unpopular Education* London Hutchinson 1981 pp 200-207
⁸ BFI Special Collections Box 104 Chairperson's Interim Report April 1 – November 14 1983 p 6 at SEFT AGM 10 December 1983
⁹ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1984 Attachment to Agenda of Special General Meeting of SEFT 23 June 1984 Condensed version of letter sent to BFI 7 February 1984 p 2
¹⁰ For a full account of BFI involvement see *TV and Schooling* edited by David Lusted and Phillip Drummond BFI Education Department and London University Institute of Education 1985
¹¹ Philip Simpson in interview with the author 4 September 2006
¹² *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1984 SEFT Limited 'National Organiser – Job Description' March 1984 p 2
¹³ Ibid
¹⁴ Barry Curtis in interview with the author 22 August 2005
¹⁵ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1985 Minutes of the Special General Meeting of SEFT 23 June 1984 p 3
¹⁶ *Initiatives* 6 p 26
¹⁷ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1987 Sean Cubitt 'The Saga of *Initiatives* 7' Undated confidential report to the SEFT Education Board
¹⁸ Ian Wall in interview with the author 12 January 2004
¹⁹ Jenny Grahame in telephone conversation with the author 6 July 2007
²⁰ Cary Bazalgette (Ed) *Primary Media Education A Curriculum Statement* London BFI January 1989; Julian Bowker (Ed) *Secondary Media Education A Curriculum Statement* London BFI March 1991
²¹ Christine Geraghty in interview with the author 2 August 2005
²² *Society for Education in Film and Television – A Review* London Comedia September 1988
²³ Mandy Merck in interview with the author 14 February 2006
²⁴ See *Screen* Vol 27 No 5 September – October 1986
²⁵ Mandy Merck in interview with the author 16 June 2004
²⁶ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1984 SEFT Limited 'National Organiser – Job Description' March 1984 p 2
²⁷ *Papers from the Bradford Media Education Conference* London SEFT 1986
²⁸ BFI Special Collections Box 104 Minutes of the Special General Meeting of SEFT 7 June 1986 and *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 11 1987 Chairperson's Annual Report to the SEFT AGM 1987
²⁹ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 2 Letter from Irene Whitehead to Caroline Taylor 8 July 1988
³⁰ *Comedia Review* op cit
³¹ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 2 Letter from Mandy Merck to Caroline Taylor and George Foster 18 October 1988
³² Mandy Merck interview 2006 op cit
³³ *Comedia Review* op cit p 17

³⁴ Ibid p 2

³⁵ Ibid p 23

³⁶ Ibid p 23

³⁷ Sources: Membership Breakdown 17 May 1984 [Author's collection] and *Screen Education Yearbook* 1962 London SEFT 1961. The balance is redressed somewhat in that in that in 1961 there were only 62 overseas members. In 1984 it was 186.

³⁸ Ibid

³⁹ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 2 Letter from Ginette Vincendeau to Charles Landry at Comedia 21 October 1988

⁴⁰ Ibid p 23

⁴¹ Ibid p 24

⁴² National Arts Education Archive Bretton Hall BFI/MEA/ 33-4 Memo from David Lusted to Wilf Stevenson 22 November 1988 p 1

⁴³ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 2 'SEFT Review A memorandum from the Education Department' 22 November 1988 p 1

⁴⁴ *Screen* Archive University of Glasgow Box 5 1986 Report of the Working Party on a Media Teachers' Association 5 December 1988

⁴⁵ David Buckingham 'Lessons from SEFT' *Initiatives 11* Autumn 1989 pp 3-5

⁴⁶ Ibid p 3

⁴⁷ David Buckingham in interview with the author 24 November 2005

⁴⁸ Buckingham op cit p 5

⁴⁹ SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1965-1966

⁵⁰ SEFT Annual Report and Accounts 1987-1988

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Items listed in this bibliography are generally to be found in either the BFI National Library or the British Library. The location of documents in specialist archives is indicated in the appropriate endnote. Where a document is part of the author's collection this is also indicated in the relevant endnote.

- Abrams, Mark *The Teenage Consumer* London Press Exchange Ltd July 1959
- Aldgate, Anthony and Richards, Jeffrey *Best of British – Cinema and Society from 1930 to the present* London I B Taurus 2002
- Alexander, S G P 'Forming the Society of Film Teachers' *Screen Education* No 28 March/April 1968 pp 33-40
- Alexander, S G P 'From SFT to SEFT' *Screen Education* No 29 May/June 1965 pp 59-67
- Alexander, S G P 'Not so much a philosophy ... more a way of life' *Screen Education* No 27 January/February 1965 pp 6-11
- Alexander, S G P 'SEFT onwards' *Screen Education* No 30 July/August 1965 pp 66-73
- Alexander, S G P 'We've Come a Long Way' *Screen Education* No 31 September/October 1965 pp 53-62
- Alexander, S G P *100 Films for Juniors* London SEFT 1964
- Alloway, Lawrence 'Personal Statement' *Ark 19* Spring 1957
- Alloway, Lawrence 'The Iconography of the Movies' *Movie* No 7 February and March 1963 pp 4-6
- Alloway, Lawrence Transcript of Extract from the programme 'Comment' transmitted 15 December 1960 on the BBC Third Programme.
- Alloway, Lawrence *Violent America: The Movies 1946-1954* New York Museum of Modern Art 1971
- Alvarado, Manuel 'Media Education in the United Kingdom' in *Studies in Media Education* UNESCO Paris 1977
- Alvarado, Manuel 'The Development of Film and Television Studies' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 25-26
- Alvarado, Manuel and Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (Eds) *Media Education: An Introduction* London BFI/Open University 1992
- Alvarado, Manuel and Buscombe, Edward *Hazell – the Making of a TV Series* London BFI in association with Latimer 1978
- Alvarado, Manuel and Collins, Richard 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 14 Spring 1975 pp 2-3
- Alvarado, Manuel and Collins, Richard 'The Viewpoint Controversy' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 pp 74-81
- Alvarado, Manuel and Ferguson, Bob 'The Curriculum, Media Studies and Discursivity' *Screen* Vol 24 No 3 p 28
- Alvarado, Manuel and Thompson, John O (Eds) *The Media Reader* London British Film Institute 1990
- Alvarado, Manuel; Bazalgette, Cary; Buscombe, Edward 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 26 p 1
- Alvarado, Manuel; Bazalgette, Cary; Grant, Felicity 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 18 Spring 1976 p 1
- Alvarado, Manuel; Bazalgette, Cary; Hillier, Jim 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975 pp 1-2

- Alvarado, Manuel; Buscombe, Edward; Collins, Richard (Eds) *A Screen Education Reader* London Macmillan 1993
- Alvarado, Manuel; Buscombe, Edward; Collins, Richard (Eds) *Representation and Photography: A Screen Education Reader* Basingstoke Palgrave 2001
- Alvarado, Manuel; Collins, Richard 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 p 1
- Alvarado, Manuel; Cook, Jim; Goldstein, Geoff; Mottershead, Chris 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 16 Autumn 1975 pp 1-3
- Alvarado, Manuel; Cowie, Elizabeth; Stafford, Roy 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 27 Summer 1978 p 1
- Alvarado, Manuel; Grant, Felicity 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 24 Autumn 1977 pp 1-3
- Alvarado, Manuel; Gutch, Robin; Wollen, Tana *Learning the Media* London Macmillan Education 1987
- Anderson, Lindsay 'Stand Up! Stand Up!' *Sight and Sound* Vol 26 No 2 Autumn 1956 pp 63-69
- Anderson, Lindsay 'The Faculty at the Films' *Sequence* No 2 Winter 1947 p 26
- Anderson, Lindsay 'The Manvell Approach' *Sequence* No 2 Winter 1947 p 34
- Anderson, Perry 'Components of the National Culture' in A Cockburn and R Blackburn *Student Power* Harmondsworth Penguin 1969 pp 214-284
- Andrew, J Dudley *The Major Film Theories – An Introduction* London Oxford University Press 1976
- Appleyard, Brian *The Pleasures of Peace Art and Imagination in Post-war Britain* London Faber & Faber 1989
- Armes, Roy 'A Polemic' *Screen* Vol 10 No 6 pp 75-79
- Armes, Roy 'Duplicated Materials' *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 pp 105-106
- Armitage, Peter 'The War' *Motion* No 1 Summer 1961 pp 4-6
- Arnheim, Rudolf *Film* London Faber and Faber 1933
- Arnheim, Rudolf, *Film as Art* London Faber and Faber 1957
- Arts Enquiry *Interim Draft of the Factual Film in Great Britain* London The Arts Enquiry 1944
- Arts Enquiry *The Factual Film* Oxford Oxford University Press 1947
- Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education/ British Film Institute *Film and Television in Education For Teaching* A Report of the Joint Working Party of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education and the British Film Institute London BFI 1960
- Bailblé, Claude 'Programming the Look' *Screen Education* No 32/33 pp 99-131
- Baines, Graham 'The National Association for Film in Education' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 30-31
- Baker, A J 'One Approach to Film Appreciation in the Secondary Modern' *Film Teacher* No 1 April 1955 pp 4-6
- Baker, Allan J 'Opening Shots' *The Film Teacher* Spring 1954 pp 6-9
- Barker, Francis et al (Eds) *The Politics of Theory* Colchester University of Essex 1983
- Barker, Martin *A Haunt of Fears* London Pluto Press 1984
- Barnes, T R 'Art and Ketchup' *The Journal of Education* Vol 90 February 1958 p 61
- Barr, Charles 'A Letter from Charles Barr' *Velvet Light Trap* No 17 Summer 1985 p
- Barr, Charles 'Critics' *Granta* Vol LXIV No 1204 26 November 1960 pp 19-22
- Bawden, L-A 'Film and the Historian' *University Vision* No 2 October 1968 pp 32-36
- Bawden, L-A 'Film Studies in the University' *University Vision* No 4 November 1969 pp 25-35

- Bazalgette, Cary (Ed) *Primary Media Education A Curriculum Statement* London BFI January 1989
- Bazalgette, Cary 'An Open Letter to Len Masterman' May 1972
- Bazalgette, Cary 'Making Sense for Whom?' *Screen* Vol 27 No 5 September /October 1986 pp 30-36
- Bazalgette, Cary; Galbraith, Neil; Padmore, Danny 'You saw all the sweat' *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975 pp 25-42
- Bazalgette, Cary; Cook, Jim; Corbett, Jane; Gledhill, Christine; Hillier, Jim; Mottershead, Chris; Simons, Mike 'Inner London Education Authority Film Study Course for Sixth Form Students' *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1972 No 5 pp 12-18
- Bell, Oliver *Memorandum on the promotion of film appreciation in Great Britain* London BFI 1938
- Bennett, Susan 'Mass Media Education – Defining the Subject' *Screen Education* No 18 Spring 1976 pp 15-21
- Bennett, Tony 'Popular Culture: A Teaching Object' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 17-29
- Bennett, Tony; Boyd-Bowman, Susan; Mercer, Colin; Woollacott, Janet (Eds) *Popular Television and Film* London British Film Institute 1981
- Bergstrom, Janet (Ed) *Endless Night Cinema and Psychoanalysis, Parallel Histories* Berkeley University of California Press 1999
- Bernard, E G 'Children and the Cinema' *Visual Education* Vol 1 No 6 June 1950
- Bethell, Andrew 'Classroom Practice: Observations and Proposals' *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975 pp 19-2
- BFI 'Editorial' 'BFI Summer School' *Sight and Sound* Vol 3 No 12 Winter 1934/35 p 185
- BFI 'Editorial' 'Film School for Teachers' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 21 Spring 1937 p 16
- BFI 'Editorial' 'Films for Children' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 23 Autumn 1937 p 117
- BFI 'Editorial' 'London Film School' *Sight and Sound* Vol 5 No 17 Spring 1936 p 9
- BFI 'Editorial' 'Optical Aids in Schools' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 29 Spring 1939 p 39
- BFI 'Editorial' 'Projectors for the Schools' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 22 Summer 1937 pp 94-95
- BFI 'Editorial' 'The Cinema in Education' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 23 Autumn 1937 pp 152-155
- BFI Education Department *Newsom on Film* Education Department BFI London 1963
- BFI *Film Appreciation and Visual Education* London BFI 1944
- BFI 'Editorial' 'The Film and the Public' *Sight and Sound* Vol 3 No 9 Spring 1934 pp 1-2
- BFI Members' Action Committee 'A New Screenplay for the BFI' *Screen* Vol 12 No 3 Autumn 1971 p 44-50
- BFI *Report of an Educational Campaign organised by the British Film Institute* May 1941-April 1942 London BFI July 1942
- BFI *Report of an Educational Film Campaign* London BFI March/July 1940
- BFI *Report of the Conference on Films for Children November 20th and 21st 1936* London British Film Institute 1936
- BFI *The Film in National Life*, Conference Report, London BFI 1943
- BFI/National Council of Women *Children and the Cinema* April 9 1946 Conference Report London BFI June 1946
- BFI/SEFT *Film, Television and the Child* October 1958 Conference Report BFI/SEFT London

- Blackham, H J; Britton, James; Young, Dennis (Eds) *A Consideration of Humanity, Technology and Education in Our Time 22-27 April 1957* Conference Report London Joint Council for Education through Art 1958
- Blanchard, Tim 'The Centralisation of Education' *Papers from the Bradford Media Education Conference* London SEFT 1986 pp 32-41
- Board of Education *Handbook of Suggestions* London HMSO 1937
- Board of Education *Report of the Committee to Consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders* [McNair Report] London, HMSO, 1944
- Board of Education *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools* London HMSO 1938
- Board of Education *The Youth Service after the War* London HMSO 1943
- Bolas, Terry 'Afraid of the Dark' *Screen Education* No 42 January/February 1968 pp 6-9
- Bolas, Terry 'Developments in Film Education' *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 [May/June 1970] pp 96-101
- Bolas, Terry 'Film and the School' *Screen Education Yearbook* 1967 London SEFT November 1966
- Bolas, Terry 'SEFT/Ilea Film Teaching Experiment' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 87-92
- Bolas, Terry *Projecting Screen* Unpublished MA Dissertation Middlesex University 2003
- Booker, Christopher *The Neophiliacs* London Collins 1969
- Bordwell, David and Carroll, Noel (Eds) *Post-Theory Reconstructing Film Studies* Madison University of Wisconsin Press 1996
- Bower, The Honourable Mrs Robert *Children in the Cinema* Newport R H Johns Ltd 1950
- UNESCO *The Influence of the Cinema on Children and Adolescents: An annotated international bibliography* Paris Reports and Papers on Mass Communication No 31 1961
- Children's Film Foundation *Saturday Morning Cinema* London CFF 1967
- Bowker, Julian (Ed) *Secondary Media Education A Curriculum Statement* London BFI March 1991
- Box, Kathleen *The Cinema and the Public* London The Social Survey DS 34865/1 1946
- Brandt, George W '...and at Bristol' *Motion* No 1 Summer 1961 pp 23-25
- Brewster, Ben 'Structuralism in Film Criticism' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 49 – 58
- British Board of Film Censors Cinema Consultative Committee *The Teaching of Film A Report and Some Recommendations* London July 1958
- British Film Institute *British Film Institute Library Catalogue* London British Film Institute September 1948
- British Film Institute *British Film Institute: The First Twenty-Five Years* London 1958
- British Film Institute Education Department *Film Study Materials* London BFI 1962
- British Film Institute *British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service Documents* 1973
- British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service *Screen Education in Britain* September 1972
- British Film Institute *Film Appreciation in Youth Clubs: some suggested approaches* Second Edition London British Film Institute 1955
- British Film Institute *Films and Youth Organisations* London British Film Institute June 1944 and April 1948
- British Film Institute *Policy Report* London British Film Institute 1971

- British Film Institute *Proposals from the British Film Institute to the Ministry of Education for the formation of a visual education committee* London British Film Institute August 1945
- British Film Institute Summer School 1944 *Film Appreciation and Visual Education* London British Film Institute 1944
- British Film Institute *The Film In National Life Conference* London British Film Institute 1943
- Britton, Andrew 'The Ideology of Screen' *Movie* No 26 Winter 1978/79 pp 2-28
- Brock, Eileen *et al* 'Open Letter to the Staff of the British Film Institute' *Screen* Vol 12 No 3 Autumn 1971 pp 2-8
- Brown, John 'Film Appreciation in Scotland' *Visual Education* April 1977 p 31
- Brumer, Karen; Hagen, Mike; McDonough, Josie; Scurlock, Will and Simpson, Philip 'Report of the NUT/SEFT Easter School "Approaches to the Teaching of Film Studies" York, 1975' in *Screen Education* No 15 Summer 1975
- Brunsdon, Charlotte and Morley, David *Everyday Television: Nationwide* Television Monograph No 10 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1978
- Buchanan, Andrew 'Film Appreciation 1 – The Right Approach to the Screen' *Contemporary Cinema* Vol 2 No 3 March 1948 pp 106-110
- Buchanan, Andrew *Focus Film Course* London The Catholic Film Institute 1951
- Buchanan, Andrew *Going to the Cinema* London Phoenix House 1947
- Buchanan, Andrew *The Film in Education* London Phoenix House 1951
- Buckingham, David (Ed) *Teaching Popular Culture - Beyond Radical Pedagogy* London University College Press 1998
- Buckingham, David 'Against Demystification – Teaching the Media' *Screen* Vol 27 No 5 September /October 1986 pp 80-95
- Buckingham, David 'Lessons from SEFT' *Initiatives 11* Autumn 1989 pp 3-5
- Buckingham, David 'The Technology of Control' *Papers from the Bradford Media Education Conference* London SEFT 1986 pp 50
- Buckingham, David *Media Education* London Polity Press 2003
- Buckingham, David and Sefton-Green, Julian *Cultural Studies goes to School* London Taylor and Francis 1994
- BUFC 'Ernest Lindgren OBE Obituary' *University Vision* No 11 April 1974 pp 6-7
- BUFC 'The British Universities Film Council - Past, Present and Future' *University Vision* No 11 April 1974 pp 8-15
- Burke, Father John 'Film Morality and Film Taste' *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 16-17.
- Burnett R G and Martell E D *The Devil's Camera - Menace of a film-ridden world* London The Epworth Press 1932
- Buscombe, Ed (Ed) *Football on Television* Television Monograph No 4 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1975
- Buscombe, Ed *Films on TV* London SEFT 1971
- Buscombe, Edward (Ed) *Football on Television* 1975.
- Buscombe, Edward 'The Idea of Genre in American Cinema' *Screen* Vol 11 No 2 March/April 1970 pp 33-45
- Buscombe, Edward *Making Legend of the Werewolf* London BFI/EAS 1976
- Buscombe, Edward; Gledhill, Christine; Lovell, Alan and Williams, Christopher 'Statement: Psychoanalysis and Film' *Screen* Vol 16 No 4 Winter 1975/6 pp 119-130

- Buscombe, Edward; Gledhill, Christine; Lovell, Alan and Williams, Christopher
 'Statement: Why We Have Resigned from the Board of *Screen*' *Screen* Vol 17 No 2
 Summer 1976 pp 106-109
- Butler, Ivan *To Encourage the Art of the Film* London Robert Hale 1971
- Cain C and Vannoey R C 'Mutatis Mutandis' *The Film Teacher's Handbook 1959/60* p 3
- Cameron A C 'The Case for a National Film Institute' *Sight and Sound* Vol.1 No 1 pp 8-9
- Cameron, A C 'Films and the School' *Sight and Sound* Vol. 3 No 11 Autumn 1934 pp
 124-125
- Cameron, Ian 'All Together Now' *Film 25* September/October 1960 p 12
- Cameron, Ian 'Films' *Oxford Opinion* No 38 April 30 1960 p 36
- Cameron, Ian 'Purely for Kicks' *Screen Education* No 7 March-April 1961 pp 31-33
- Cameron, Ian 'What's the Use?' *Film 28* March/April 1961 pp 10-11
- Cameron, Ian; Shivas, Mark and Perkins, V F 'Correspondence – Oxford Opinion' *Sight
 and Sound* Vol 30 No 2 Spring 1961 p 100
- Carby, Hazel 'Multi-Culture' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 62-70
- Carr, J F *Teachers' film groups and their contribution to the educational service* London
 British Film Institute January 1946
- Carroll, Noel *Theorising the Moving Image* Cambridge Cambridge University Press 1996
- Casetti, Francesco *Theories of Cinema 1945-1995* Austin University of Texas Press 1999
- Caughie, John 'Glasgow SEFT Group' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 p 76
- Caughie, John *Television: Ideology and Exchange* Television Monograph No 9 London
 British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1978
- Caute, David *Sixty Eight - The Year of the Barricades* London Hamish Hamilton 1988
- Central Advisory Council for Education (England) *Half Our Future* (The Newsom
 Report) London HMSO 1963
- Central Advisory Council for Education *Fifteen to Eighteen* (The Crowther Report)
 London, HMSO 1959
- Chambers, Iain 'Rethinking Popular Culture' pp 113-117 *Screen Education* No 36
 Autumn 1980
- Chambers, Iain; Clarke, John; Connell, Ian; Curti, Lidia; Hall, Stuart; Jefferson, Tony
 'Marxism and Culture' *Screen* Vol 18 No 4 Winter 1977/78 pp 109-119
- Children's Film Foundation *Saturday Morning Cinema* London CFF 1969
- Chun, Lin *The British New Left* Edinburgh Edinburgh University Press 1993
- Church, Michael 'Film Education: a neglected, misunderstood art' *The Teacher* 20
 December 1968 p 10
- Clarke, C H *The Elements of Film Criticism* London BFI 1944
- Clarke, Mike *Teaching Popular Television* London Heineman Educational Books 1987
- Clough, D 'American Cinema: a Film Course at Aberystwyth' *University Vision* No 9
 November 1972 pp 39-43
- Cockburn, A and Blackburn, R *Student Power* Harmondsworth Penguin 1969
- Cockerham, H 'A Film Study Course in a French Department' *University Vision* No 8
 January 1972 pp 19-25
- Coldstream, Sir William 'Film Lectureship' *Sight and Sound* Vol 29 No 1 Winter 1959-60
- Collins, Richard 'A Diploma Course in Film Study at the Polytechnic of Central London'
Screen Education Notes Winter 1973/74 No 9 p 11
- Collins, Richard 'Genre: A Reply to Ed Buscombe' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 66-75
- Collins, Richard 'Media studies: alternative or oppositional practice? in Whitty G &
 Young M (Eds) *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge* pp 166-178
- Collins, Richard 'Re-evaluating Leavis' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 pp 39-47

- Collins, Richard *Television News* Television Monograph No 5 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1976
- Collins, Richard; Grealy, Jim 'Editorial' 'The Education Cuts' *Screen Education* No 16 Autumn 1975 pp 41-46
- Comedia *Society for Education in Film and Television – A Review* London Comedia September 1988
- Commission on Educational and Cultural Films *The Film in National Life* London George Allen & Unwin 1932
- Comolli, Jean-Luc and Narboni, Paul 'Cinema/Ideology/Criticism' (translated by Susan Bennett) *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 27-36
- Connell, Myra and O'Shaughnessy, Michael Report *Media Education Conference 1981* London BFI Education and Goldsmiths College 1982 pp 5-12
- Cook, Jim 'Film in English Teaching' 'Review Two' *Screen Education Notes* No 6 Spring 1973 pp 29-35
- Cook, Jim 'Teaching the Industry' *Screen Education* No 16 Autumn 1975 pp 4-18
- Cook, Jim and Hillier, Jim *The Growth of Film and Television Studies 1960-1975* London BFI Education 1976, reissued March 1982
- Cook, Jim and North, Nicky *BFI Summer Schools 71-79* London BFI Education Department April 1981
- Cook, Pam (Ed) *The Cinema Book* London BFI 1985.
- Cook, Pam and Bernink, Mieke (Eds) *The Cinema Book* Second Edition London British Film Institute 1999
- Cousins, R F 'Film and French Studies' *University Vision* No 15 December 1976 pp 14-23
- Coward, Rosalind 'Class, "Culture" and the Social Formation' *Screen* Vol 18 No 1 Spring 1977 pp 75-105
- Coward, Rosalind and Ellis, John *Language and Materialism Developments in Semiology and the Theory of the Subject* London Routledge & Kegan Paul 1977
- Crofts, Stephen 'Debate – Psychoanalysis and Film' *Framework* Vol II No 4 pp 15-16
- Crofts, Stephen 'Film Education in England and Wales' *Screen* Vol 11 No 6 November/December 1970 pp 3-22
- Davies, Derek '3D and TV' *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 2-3
- De Lauretis, Teresa and Heath, Stephen (Eds) *The Cinematic Apparatus* London Macmillan 1980
- Debes, John L and Williams, Clarence M *Visual Literacy, Linguaging and Learning* Visual Literacy Center 1978
- Denholme, A A *The Cinema in Education* London, British Film Institute, 1937
Department of Education and Science *Popular TV and Schoolchildren The report of a group of teachers* London Department of Education and Science April 1983
- Dickinson, Thorold 'Some Practical Problems of Film Study' *University Vision* No 12 December 1974 pp 5-8
- Dickinson, Thorold *Should Britain have a film school?* London University College March 1963
- Donald, James 'Examinations and Strategies' *Screen Education* No 26 Spring 1978 pp 3-11
- Donald, James 'Green Paper: Noise of Crisis' *Screen Education* No 30 pp 13-49
- Donald, James; Alvarado, Manuel; Collins, Richard; Ferguson, Bob 'Editorial' *Screen Education* No 28 p 1
- Drummond, Phillip 'Beginning Film and Television Studies' *Times Educational Supplement* 6 January 1978 pp 27-28

- Drummond, Phillip 'Reply to Critics of *Screen Education 20 The Sweeney*' *Screen Education* No 23 Summer 1977 pp 65-68
- Durgnat, Raymond 'Standing up for Jesus' *Motion* No 6 Autumn 1963 pp 25-28 and 38-42
- Durgnat, Raymond 'The Impotence of being Ernest' *Views* No 8 Summer 1965 pp 76-80
- Durgnat, Raymond 'The Mass Media – A Highbrow Illiteracy?' *Views* No 4 Spring 1964 pp 49-59
- Dyer, Ernest 'Training Film Taste' *Sight and Sound* Vol 3 No 11 Autumn 1934 pp 134-136
- Dyer, Peter John 'Counter Attack' *Film 26* November/December 1960 p 8
- Dyer, Richard 'Film Studies at the University of Keele' *Screen Education* No 19 Spring 1976 pp 54-57
- Dyer, Richard *Light Entertainment* Television Monograph No 2 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1973
- Dyer, Richard; Geraghty, Christine; Jordan, Marion; Lovell, Terry; Paterson, Richard; Stewart, John *Coronation Street* Television Monograph No 13 London British Film Institute Publishing 1981
- Eagleton, Terry *The Function of Criticism: From The Spectator to Post-Structuralism* London Verso 1984
- Easthope, Anthony 'The Trajectory of *Screen*, 1971-1979' in *The Politics of Theory* Ed Barker, Francis *et al* Colchester University of Essex 1983 pp 121-133
- Easthope, Anthony *British Post-Structuralism* London Routledge 1988 pp 43-59
- Easthope, Anthony; Lapsley, Rob 'Manchester SEFT Group' *Screen Education* No 23 Summer 1977 pp 71-72
- Easthope, Antony *Literary into Cultural Studies* London Routledge 1991
- Eaton, Mick and Neale, Steve (Eds) *Screen Reader 2 Cinema and Semiotics* London SEFT 1981
- Edgar Dale 'How to Evaluate the Mass Media' *Film Teacher 8* March 1957 pp 14-18
- Edgar Dale *How to Appreciate Motion Pictures* New York The Macmillan Co 1933
- Education Group at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies *Unpopular Education* London Hutchinson 1981
- Ellis, Jack 'Film at North Western University' *Film Teacher 15* December 1958 pp 19-25
- Ellis, Jack 'Film Societies and Film Education in the USA' *Film Teacher 13* pp 15-19
- Ellis, John (Ed) *Screen Reader 1: Cinema/ideology/Politics* London SEFT 1977
- Ellis, John 'Art, Culture and Quality' *Screen* Vol 19 No 3 Autumn 1978 pp 9-49
- Ellis, John 'The Quality Film Adventure: British Critics and the Cinema 1942-48' in Higson, Andrew (Ed) *Dissolving Views* London Cassell 1996
- Else, Eric *The Back of Beyond* London Longmans Green & Co Ltd 1968
- English New Education Fellowship *The Impact of the Cinema on the Child* March 1949 Conference Report, English New Education Fellowship Bulletin No 55 April 1949
- Evans, Frederic 'The Silent Film in Schools' *Sight and Sound* Vol. 7 No 28 Winter 1938-39 pp 175-176
- Evans, Frederic 'What Can Be Done' *Sight and Sound* Vol.7 No 25 Spring 1938 p 38-39
- Evernden, S C and Holloway, R G *English for Citizens* Book IV *Our Own Language* Leeds E J Arnold & Sons 1950
- Exton, Richard; Geraghty, Christine; Gilman, Ian; Lyons, Harry; McKnight, Stephanie; Mottershead, Chris; Williams, Christopher 'Statement: Screen Education and *The Sweeney*' in *Screen Education* No 23 Summer 1977 pp 59-64
- Ferguson, Bob; Stephens, Robert 'Media Studies and Media Usage in an Institute of Education' *Screen Education* No 21 Winter 1976/77 pp 20-31

- Ferguson, Marjorie and Golding, Peter *Cultural Studies in Question* London Sage Publications 1997
- Field, Mary 'The Child Audience' *British Film Academy Journal* Summer 1955 p 3
- Field, Mary 'The Children's Film Foundation' in *The Film Teacher* Winter 1952 pp 1-5
- Film 27* 'The Current Picture' January/February 1961 p 6-7
- Film 28* 'The Current Picture' March/April 1961 p 4-5
- Film Education Working Group *Making Movies Matter* London British Film Institute 1999
- Film Guide* was produced by the BFI Film Appreciation Department between January 1954 and September 1959. Renamed *Screen Guide* in October 1959 it was then produced jointly by BFI and SEFT until April 1961.
- Film Teacher* 'Editorial' 'Every Schoolmarm a Critic' *Film Teacher 5* September 1956 p 2
- Film Teacher* 'Editorial' 'Film Teachers and Television' *Film Teacher 13* June 1958 p 2-3
- Film Teacher* 'Editorial' 'Help Yourself' *Film Teacher 6* November 1956 p 9-16
- Film Teacher* 'Editorial' 'Hi Kwai or Die: Some thoughts on the Future of British Cinema' *Film Teacher 12* March 1958 pp 2-3
- Film Teacher* 'Editorial' 'Internationally Speaking' *Film Teacher 8* March 1957 p 2
- Fitchett, C E 'Film Teaching – A Training College View' *Film Teacher 7* January 1957 pp 4-6
- Fleming, C M *The Social Psychology of Education* London Routledge & Kegan Paul 1944
- Fletcher, John 'The Film and the Novel' *University Vision* No 5 July 1970 pp 5-10
- Ford, Richard *Children in the Cinema* London George Allen and Unwin 1939
- Forman, Denis 'The Work of the British Film Institute' *Quarterly Journal of Film, Radio and Television* Vol IX Winter 1954 pp 147-158
- Forman, Denis *Films 1945-1950* London Longmans Green & Co 1952
- Foster, George 'Review of *Making Legend of the Werewolf*' *Screen Education* No 24 Autumn 1977 pp 57-60
- Foucault, Michel 'What is an Author?' *Screen* Vol 20 No 1 Spring 1979 pp 13-29, translation by Donald F Bouchard, Cornell University 1977
- Fruchter, Norman 'Two Hours a Week' *Sight and Sound* Vol 31 No 4 Autumn 1962 pp 198-200
- Garnham, Nicholas *Structures of Television* Television Monograph No 1 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1973 Revised edition 1978
- George W H *The Cinema in School* London Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons 1935
- Gidley, M 'Some American Studies Films at Sussex' *University Vision* No 6 January 1971 pp 4-12
- Gillett, B E *Appraising Educational Films* London British Film Institute December 1946
- Gladwell, David 'Editing Anderson's *If*' *Screen* Vol 10 No 1 January/February 1969 pp 24-33
- Gledhill, Christine (Ed) *Film & Media Studies in Higher Education Conference Papers* London BFI Education September 1981
- Gledhill, Christine and Williams, Linda *Reinventing Film Studies* London Arnold 2000
- Gould, Julius *The Attack on Higher Education: Marxist and Radical Penetration* London Institute for the Study of Conflict September 1977
- Grayson, Dorothy *Films and Youth Organisations* London BFI 1944
- Grealy, Jim 'Notes on Popular Culture' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 pp 5-11
- Greiner, Grace 'Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility' *Education for Teaching* No 54 February 1961 pp 23-26

- Greiner, Grace *Teaching Film* London BFI 1954
- Grierson, John 'Art and the Analysts' *Sight and Sound* Vol. 4 No 16 Winter 1935-36 pp 157-159
- Groombridge, Brian and Whannel, Paddy 'Pop, Posh and Pedagogue' in *Times Educational Supplement* 5 January 1950 p 217
- Groombridge, Brian *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility A Study Outline* London National Union of Teachers May 1961
- Groombridge, Brian *Television and the People* Harmondsworth Penguin 1972
- Hall, Stuart 'Impact of Film on the University' *University Vision* No 2 October 1968 pp 28-31
- Hall, Stuart 'Recent Developments in Theories of Language and Ideology: A Critical Note' *Culture, Media, Language Working Papers in Cultural Studies* London Hutchinson 1980
- Hall, Stuart 'The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis in the Humanities' *October* No 53 Summer 1990 pp 11-23
- Hall, Stuart 'The Williams Interviews' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 94-104
- Hall, Stuart and Whannel, Paddy *The Popular Arts* London Hutchinson Educational 1964
- Halloran, James D and Jones, Marsha *Learning about the Media: Communication and Society* Paris UNESCO 1986 pp 55-60
- Halloran, James D *Mass Media and Society* Leicester Leicester University Press 1974
- Harcourt, Peter 'Towards Higher Education' *Screen Education* No 26 September/October 1964 pp 20-30
- Harcourt, Peter and Theobald, Peter (Eds) *Film Making in Schools and Colleges* London BFI Education Department 1966
- Harman, Jympson *Good Films and How to Appreciate Them* London Daily Mail School Aid Department 1947
- Hartnoll, Gillian *Reading lists for Screen: Film History* Vol 10 No 4/5 pp 187-191; *British Cinema* Vol 10 No 6 pp 108-109; *Theory of Film* Vol 11 No 1 pp 101-102; *Reference Books Part I* Vol 11 No 2 pp 96-98; *Reference Books Part II* Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 133-136
- Hazell, Frank 'Don't be so ashamed of your school reports now' *Film Teacher* 2 June 1955 pp 8-12
- Heath, Stephen 'Narrative Space' *Screen* Vol 17 No 3 Autumn 1976
- Heath, Stephen; MacCabe, Colin and Prendergast, Christopher *Signs of the Times – Introductory Readings in Textual Semiotics* Reprint London BFI 1978
- Heddle, E W M 'Film Appreciation at the University Level – A General Survey' *Film Teacher* 7 January 1957 pp 11-14
- Hedling, Erik 'Lindsay Anderson: *Sequence* and the Rise of auteurism in 1950s' Britain' in MacKillop and Sinyard *British Cinema of the 1950s: A Celebration* pp 23-31
- Heller, Caroline *Broadcasting and Accountability* Television Monograph No 7 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1978
- Hewison, Robert *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics since 1940* London Methuen 1995 p 105
- Hewison, Robert *In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945-60* London Methuen 1988
- Heywood, C L 'The Challenge of Television' *The Film Teacher's Handbook 1958/59* pp 23-26
- Heywood, L 'Film in the School Curriculum' *Film Teacher* 7 January 1957 pp 17-20
- Higgins, A P 'Television: Meeting the Challenge' *The Film Teacher's Handbook 1958/59* pp 27-29.
- Higgins, A P *Talking about Television* London BFI Education Department 1966

- Higgins, Tony; Whannel, Paddy; Williams, Raymond 'Television Supplement' in *New Left Review* 7 January- February 1961 pp 30-48
- Higson, Andrew (Ed) *Dissolving Views* London Cassell 1996
- Hill, John and Church Gibson, Pamela (Eds) *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies* Oxford Oxford University Press 1998
- Hillier, Jim and McTaggart, Andrew 'Film in the Humanities Curriculum Project' *Screen* Vol 11 No 2 March/April 1970 pp 46-51
- Hills, Janet *Are They Safe at the Cinema? A considered answer to critics of the cinema* London BFI 1953
- Hills, Janet *Films and Children The Positive Approach* London BFI 1951
- Hills, Janet *Fragments Janet Hills 1919-1956* published posthumously and privately by her family in 1956.
- Himmelweit, Hilde *Television and the Child* Oxford Oxford University Press 1958
- Hodgkinson, A W 'Films about Films' *Society of Film Teachers Bulletin* Vol 1 No 1 December 1950 p 12
- Hodgkinson, A W *Teaching the screen language: a basic method* Worcester Mass Clark University 1980
- Hodgkinson, A W 'Amsterdam and the Virtual World' *Film Teacher* 12 March 1958
- Hodgkinson, A W 'Teaching the Art of Film' *Athene* Vol 7 No 4 June 1956
- Hodgkinson, A W 'The Continental Scene' *Film Teacher* 6 November 1956 p 12-13
- Hodgkinson, A W *Screen Education* Paris UNESCO 1964
- Hodgkinson, A W; Huntley, John; Mills, E Francis; Smith, Jack *School Film Appreciation* London BFI 1950
- Hodgkinson, Tony 'Children's Films and Screen Education' *Film Comment* Vol 2 No 2 1964 pp 14-18
- Hodgkinson, Tony 'The British Film Institute' *Film Comment* Vol 2 No 4 Fall 1964 pp 31-34
- Hoggart, Richard 'The Quality of Cultural Life in Mass Society' Congress for Cultural Freedom Conference in Berlin 1960
- Hoggart, Richard *The Uses of Literacy* London Chatto and Windus 1957
- Houston, Penelope 'Critic's Notebook' *Sight and Sound* Vol 30 No 2 Spring 1961 p 62
- Houston, Penelope 'Enthusiasm for What?' *Definition* 3 p 8
- Houston, Penelope 'The Critical Question' *Sight and Sound* Autumn 1960 Vol 29 No 4 pp 160-165
- Hunter, William 'Review of *Film* (Arnheim)' *Scrutiny* Vol II No 2 September 1933 pp 211-212
- Hunter, William 'The Art-Form of Democracy' *Scrutiny* Vol 1 No 1 May 1932 p 62
- Hunter, William *Scrutiny of Cinema* London Wishart & Co 1932
- Independent Television Authority *Parents, Children and Television* London HMSO 1958
- Instituut Film en Jeugd *Film Education of Youth* 22-24 November 1957 International Conference Report Amsterdam
- Isaacs, J 'Review of *Scrutiny of Cinema* (Hunter)' *Scrutiny* Vol I No 4 March 1933 pp 414-416
- Johnson, Ian and Durgnat, Raymond 'Puritans Anonymous' *Motion* No 6 Autumn 1963 p 1
- Johnson, Ian Editorial *Motion* No 1 Summer 1961 p 1
- Johnson, Ian Editorial *Motion* No 2 Winter 1961-2 p 1
- Johnson, Richard 'Cultural Studies and Educational Practice' in *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 5-16

- Johnston, Claire 'Film Journals: Britain and France' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 39-46
- Johnston, Claire and Willemen, Paul (Eds) *Frank Tashlin* Edinburgh Film Festival in association with *Screen* 1973
- Johnston, Claire *Notes on Women's Cinema – Screen Pamphlet 2* London SEFT 1973
- Jones, Ceinwen and Pardoe, F E 'Film Study' in *Sight and Sound* Vol 18 No 70 Summer 1949 pp 91-93
- Jones, Ceinwen and Pardoe, F E *A First Course in Film Appreciation* London BFI 1946
- Jones, Stephen G *The British Labour Movement and Film 1918-1939* London Routledge & Kegan Paul 1987
- Jones, Stephen G *Workers at Play – A social and economic history of leisure 1918-1939* London Routledge & Kegan Paul 1986
- Journal of Education* 'Editorial' 'A Negative Light' *The Journal of Education* Vol 90 February 1958 p 43
- Kaplan, E Ann (Ed) 'From Plato's Cave to Freud's Screen' *Psychoanalysis and Cinema* New York Routledge 1990
- Kitses, Jim 'Young filmmakers: some words in their defence' *The Teacher* July 21 1967 p 5
- Kitses, Jim *Film and General Studies* London BFI Education Department 1966
- Kitses, Jim *Horizons West* London Thames & Hudson 1969
- Kitses, Jim *Horizons West* Second Edition BFI Publishing 2004
- Kitses, Jim with Mercer, Ann *Talking about the Cinema* London BFI Education Department 1966
- Knight, Roy (Ed) *Film in English Teaching* London Hutchinson Educational November 1972
- Knights, L C 'Will Training Colleges Bear Scrutiny?' *Scrutiny* Vol 1 No 3 December 1932 p 259
- Kubey, Robert W 'Why US media education lags behind the rest of the English-speaking world' *Television and New Media* Vol 4 No 4 November 2003 pp 351-370
- Kuhn, Annette and Stacey, Jackie (Eds) *Screen Histories A Screen Reader* Oxford Oxford University Press 1998
- Laclau, Ernesto 'Populist Rupture and Discourse' pp 87- 93 *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980
- Laing, Stuart *Representation of Working Class Life 1957-1964* London MacMillan 1986
- Lamb, Stephen 'The place of film in a German Studies course' *University Vision* No 14 March 1976 pp 5-14
- Lambert, R S 'How to Get the Films You Want' *Sight and Sound* Vol.3 No 9 Spring 1934 pp 5-9
- Langham, Josephine *Teachers and Television: The IBA Educational Fellowship Scheme* London John Libbey & Company Ltd 1990
- Lapsley, Robert and Westlake, Michael *Film Theory An Introduction* Manchester Manchester University Press 1988
- Laurence, Margaret *Citizenship through English* Edinburgh Oliver and Boyd 1946
- Lauwerys, J A *The Film and the School* London Christophers 1935
- Laws Frederick (Ed) *Made for Millions* London Contact Publications 1947
- League of Nations Advisory Committee on Social Questions *The Recreational Cinema and the Young* Geneva League of Nations 1938
- Leahy, James 'Post-graduate Diploma at the Slade School of Fine Art' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 23-25

- Learmonth, James 'Organisation and Aftermath' in Lusted, David & Drummond, Phillip (Eds) *TV and Schooling* London BFI Education Department 1985 pp 19-23
- Learmonth, James and Sayer, Mollie *A Review of Good Practice in Media Education* London British Film Institute 1996
- Leavis F R *Education and the University* London Chatto and Windus 1948
- Leavis, F R and Thompson, Denys *Culture and Environment* London Chatto and Windus 1934
- Lewis A Maxwell 'The School Film Society' *Sight and Sound* Vol.3 No 10 Summer 1934 pp 75-78
- Lewis, A Maxwell 'Training Young Critics' *Sight and Sound* Vol. 4 No 14 Summer 1935 pp 81-83
- Lindgren, Ernest 'The selection of films as historical records in the National Film Archive' *University Vision* No 6 January 1971 pp 13-23
- Lindgren, Ernest *Film Appreciation for Discussion Groups and Schools* London BFI 1942
- Lindgren, Ernest H 'Nostalgia' *Sight and Sound* Vol. 9 No 35 Autumn 1940 pp 49-50
- Lindgren, Ernest *The Art of the Film* London Allen & Unwin 1963
- Lindgren, Ernest *The Cinema* London English Universities Press 1944
- Lingstrom, Freda 'BBC Children's Television' *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 4-6
- Linton, James M 'Values...Theory...Action! Integrating Film Studies' *University Vision* No 12 December 1974 pp 9-26
- Lloyd of Hampstead, Lord *A Policy for the Arts* London HMSO February 1965
- London County Council *School Children and the Cinema* London LCC 1932
- Long, Bob 'Photo Practice 1' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 106-112
- Look and Listen 'Editorial' 'A Sensible Attitude to the Cinema - Hertfordshire schools co-operate in evolving a more critical approach' *Look and Listen* April 1950 Vol 4 No 4 pp 76-77
- Lovell, Alan (Ed) *British Film Institute Production Board* London British Film Institute 1976
- Lovell, Alan "Editorial" *Screen* Vol 13 No 4 Winter 1972/3 pp 2-3
- Lovell, Alan 'Epic Theater and Counter Cinema' *Jump Cut* 1982 Part 1 in No 27 and Part 2 in No 28
- Lovell, Alan 'Robin Wood - A Dissenting View' *Screen* March/April 1969 Volume 10 No 2 pp 42-55
- Lovell, Alan 'Robin Wood's Criticism' *Screen* Vol 10 No 2 March/April 1969 pp 42-55
- Lovell, Alan 'The Aims of Film Education' BFI seminar paper 15 February 1968
- Lovell, Alan 'The Best We've Got' *Definition* 2 p 3
- Lovell, Alan 'The Common Pursuit of True Judgment' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 pp 76-88
- Lovell, Alan 'The Western' *Screen Education* No 41 pp 92-103.
- Lovell, Alan *Anarchist Cinema* London Peace News 1962
- Lovell, Alan and Hillier, Jim *Studies in Documentary* London Secker & Warburg 1972
- Lowndes, Douglas 'Film Making at Hornsey College of Art' - all day Film Workshop at the National Film Theatre organized by BFI Education Department January 1966
- Lowndes, Douglas *Film Making in Schools* London Batsford 1968
- Lusted, David (Ed) *The Media Studies Book* London Routledge 1991
- Lusted, David 'A History of Suspicion: Educational Attitudes to Television' in Lusted, David and Drummond, Phillip *TV and Schooling* BFI Education Department and London University Institute of Education 1985 pp 11-18

- Lusted, David 'Feeding the Panic and Breaking the Cycle' *Popular TV and Schoolchildren* **Screen** Vol 24 No 6 November/December 1983
- Lusted, David 'Introduction- Why Pedagogy?' in **Screen** Vol 27 No 5 September /October 1986 pp 2-14
- Lusted, David 'Media Education and the Secondary/FE Curriculum' in **Media Education Conference 1981 A Report** London BFI Education and Goldsmiths College 1982 pp 13-26
- Lusted, David and Drummond, Phillip **TV and Schooling** BFI Education Department and London University Institute of Education 1985
- MacCabe Colin and Petrie, Duncan **New Scholarship from British Film Institute Research** London British Film Institute 1996
- MacCabe, Colin 'Theory and Film: Principles of Realism and Pleasure' **Screen** Vol 17 No 3 Autumn 1976
- MacCabe, Colin **Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature** Manchester Manchester University Press 1985
- MacKendrick, Alexander 'As I See It' **The Film Teacher** Spring 1953 pp 8-12
- MacKillop, Ian and Sinyard, Neil **British Cinema of the 1950s: A Celebration** Manchester University Press 2003
- Mainds, Roger 'Editorial' **Screen Education Yearbook 1969** p 5
- Mainds, Roger 'The Teenscreen Story' in **Screen Education** No 18 March/April 1963 pp 53-54
- Manvell, Roger **A Seat at the Cinema** London Evans Brothers 1951
- Manvell, Roger **The Cinema and the Public** London Army Bureau of Current Affairs 1944
- Marshall, Richard 'Film Education' **Initiatives** Summer 1988 p 25
- Mashedier, Mildred; Holme, Anthea and Higgins, Anthony **Family Viewing – a study of early evening television** London Council for Children's Welfare November 1960
- Masterman, Len 'A Reply to Buckingham, David' in **Screen** Vol 27 No 5 September/October 1986 pp 96-100
- Masterman, Len 'Film and the Raising of the School Leaving Age' **Screen Education Notes** Spring 1973 No 6 p 21
- Masterman, Len 'Film in English Teaching' 'Review One' **Screen Education Notes** Spring 1973 no 6 pp 29-35
- Masterman, Len **Down Cemetery Road** Wirral Alpha Media 2002
- Masterman, Len **School Knowledge, Media Knowledge: Media Literacy in Teacher Training and Student Learning** Nottingham University May 1983
- Masterman, Len **Teaching about Television** London Macmillan Press 1980
- Masterman, Len **Teaching the Media** London Comedia 1985
- Masterman, Len **The Development of Media Education in Europe in the 1980s** Strasbourg Council of Europe May 1988
- Mayer, J P **Sociology of Film Studies** London Faber and Faber 1946
- McArthur, Colin 'Two steps forward, one step back - Cultural struggle in the British Film Institute' **Journal of Popular British Cinema** No 4 2001 pp 112-127
- McArthur, Colin **Television and History** Television Monograph No 8 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1978
- McArthur, Colin **The Big Heat** London British Film Institute 1992
- McArthur, Colin **Underworld USA** London Secker & Warburg 1972
- McTaggart, Andrew 'Signs and Meaning in the Cinema' **Screen** Vol 10 No 6 pp 67-75
- Mercer, Colin 'After Gramsci' pp 5-15 **Screen Education** No 36 Autumn 1980

- Merck, Mandy (Ed) *The Sexual Subject A Screen Reader on Sexuality* London Routledge 1992
- Meredith, G Patrick *Visual Education and the New Teacher* London Daily Mail 1946
- Mills, E F 'The Classroom Film' *Sight and Sound* Vol 5 No 18 Summer 1936 pp 39-42
- Mills, E. Francis 'The Film Lesson' *Sight and Sound* Vol 5 No 17 Spring 1936 p 33
- Ministry of Education *Half Our Future* A Report of the Central Advisory Committee (England) London HMSO 1963
- Ministry of Education *The Purpose and Content of the Youth Service* HMSO 1945
- Moley, Raymond *Are we movie made?* New York Mary-Massins 1938
- Morey, Anne *Hollywood Outsiders The Adaptation of the Film Industry 1913-1934* Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press 2003
- Morley, David *The Nationwide Audience: Structure and Decoding* Television Monograph No 11 London British Film Institute 1980
- Morley, John (Ed) *Art, Science and Education* Whitsun 1958 Conference Report Joint Council for Education through Art London 1958
- Moss, Louis and Box, Kathleen *The Cinema Audience* London Wartime Social Survey No 37b June/July 1943
- Mottershead, Chris 'Teachers' Introduction to Teachers' Guide to Narrative' in *ilea/ bfi 6th form film study course 1983-1984* London Inner London Education Authority 1983
- Mottershead, Chris and Jenkins, Tricia *Children Moving Images* London British Film Institute 1992
- Mulhern, Francis 'Notes on Culture and Cultural Struggle' *Screen Education* No 34 Spring 1980 pp 31-35
- Mulhern, Francis *The Moment of Scrutiny* London New Left Books 1979
- Mulvey, Laura 'Interview with Peter Wollen' (c 2002) Proof copy *From Cinephilia to Cinema Studies* to be published 2007 by Duke University Press
- Mulvey, Laura 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' *Screen* Vol 16 No 3 Autumn 1975 pp 6-18
- Mulvey, Laura *A short history of the British Film Institute Education Department* London British Film Institute 1994
- Mulvey, Laura *Visual and Other Pleasures* Basingstoke Palgrave 1989
- Murdock, Graham and Phelps, Guy *Mass Media and the Secondary School* London Macmillan 1973
- Murphy, Robert 'Raymond Durnat and *A Mirror for England*' in MacKillop and Sinyard *British Cinema of the 1950s: A Celebration* pp 1-22
- Nash, Mark *Screen Theory and Film Culture 1977-1987* Unpublished PhD thesis Middlesex University September 2003
- National Council of Public Morals *The Cinema: Its present position and future possibilities* London Williams and Northgate 1917
- National Film Theatre *Fifty Famous Films 1915-1945* London BFI 1960
- Noble, Peter (Ed) *British Film Year Book* London Skelton Robinson 1947
- Norris, Terry 'Courses and Creativity at Little Ilford' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 29-30
- Northern Counties Children's Cinema Council *Film Appreciation in the School* London BFI 1939
- Northern Counties Children's Cinema Council *Northern Counties Children's Cinema Council* Newcastle NCCCC 1938
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey 'Gramsci and the National Popular' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 pp 12 -15

- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey 'The Crisis in the British Film Institute 1970-71' Copy of a paper delivered at the 2005 Glasgow *Screen* Conference
- NUT 'Will the judges' choice have a bad effect on future productions?' *The Teacher* June 30 1967 p 7
- NUT *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility Conference Programme* October 1960
- NUT *Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility Verbatim Report* London NUT 1961
- NUT press release: *Announcing the National Children's Film Awards 1961* London National Union of Teachers 1961
- Oliver, Elizabeth 'The BUFC: Approaches to the Study of Film' *Visual Education* April 1977 p 19
- Orrom, Michael and Williams, Raymond *Preface to Film* London Film Drama Limited 1954
- Otley, D Charles *The Cinema in Education* London George Routledge & Sons 1935
- Palmer, J Wood 'Film judgment and appreciation' *The Cinema* pp 19-31
- Parnaby, Mary C and Woodhouse, Maurice *Children's Cinema Clubs – A Report* London British Film Institute March 1947
- Pateman, Trevor *Television and the February 1974 General Election* Television Monograph No 3 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1974
- Paterson, Richard 'Review of EAS publications' *Screen Education* No19 Summer 1976 pp 45-50
- Pearson, George *The Film as a Visual Art* London BFI 1945
- Perkins, V F *Film as Film – Understanding and Judging Movies* Harmondsworth Penguin 1972
- Perkins, Victor 'A Reply to Sam Rohdie' *Screen* Vol 13 No 4 Winter 1972/3 pp 146-151
- Perkins, Victor 'Fifty Famous Films 1915-1945' in *Oxford Opinion* No 38 April 30 1960 p 36
- Peters, J M L *Teaching about the Film* Paris UNESCO 1961
- Pointon, E M 'Beginners All' in *Film Teacher* No 3 August 1955 pp 6-10
- Porter, Vincent 'Video Recording and the Teacher' *Screen Education* No 35 Summer 1980 pp 87-90
- Powell, Dilys 'Film in Educational and Social Life' *Documentary Film News* Vol 8 No 71 January 1949 pp 2-4 and 12
- Powell, Dilys *Films Since 1939* London Longman Green 1949
- Pronay, Nicholas and Spring D W (Eds) *Propaganda, Politics and Film, 1918-1945* London Macmillan 1982
- Pungente, John J 'Len Masterman: the AML Interview' *Media Education Journal* 1994
- QCA *Media Matters: A Review of Media Studies in Schools and Colleges* London Qualifications and Curriculum Authority 2005
- Quigly, Isabel 'Being a reviewer in the 1950s' in MacKillop and Sinyard *British Cinema of the 1950s: A Celebration* pp 213-220
- Quinn, James *The Film and Television as an Aspect of European Culture* Leyden Netherlands A W Sijthoff 1968
- Radcliffe, Sir Cyril J *Report of the Committee on the British Film Institute* Cmd. 7361 London HMSO April 1948
- Rand, Helen and Lewis, Richard *Film and School* New York D Appleton – Century Company 1937
- Read, Herbert 'Towards a Film Aesthetic' *Cinema Quarterly* Vol 1 No 1 Autumn 1932 pp 7-11

- Read, Herbert *Education through Art* London Faber and Faber 1943
- Reed, Bryan H *Eighty Thousand Adolescents* London Allen & Unwin 1950
- Reed, Stanley 'Appreciating the Film' in *The Photographic Journal* August 1950 pp 285-291
- Reed, Stanley 'Film and Child' *Visual Education* Vol 1 Nos 9-12 (September/December) 1950
- Reed, Stanley 'Film Appreciation in the School' *Society of Film Teachers Bulletin* Vol 1 No 1 December 1950 pp 3-6
- Reed, Stanley 'Teaching Film Appreciation in the Classroom' *Sub-Standard Film* December 15 1949 p 122
- Reed, Stanley *A Guide to Good Viewing* London Educational Supply Association 1961
- Reed, Stanley *Critics' Choice* British Film Institute (ran from No 1 April 1952 to the final issue in February 1956)
- Rees, Sidney and Waters, Don 'Film Making in Schools' *The Film Teacher's Handbook 1956/7* London SEFT 1956 pp 11-19.
- Rees, Sidney and Waters, Don *Film Making in School* London SEFT 1960
- Rees, Sidney and Waters, Don *Young Film Makers* London SEFT 1963
- Report of the Committee on Broadcasting* (Pilkington Report) London HMSO 1962 Cmdr 1753
- Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema* (Wheare Report) London HMSO 1950 Cmdr 1945
- Richards, Jeffrey (Ed) *The Unknown 1930s An alternative history of the British Cinema 1929-1939* London I B Taurus 1998
- Richards, Jeffrey 'Thorold Dickinson and the British Cinema' Lanham The Scarecrow Press Inc 1997
- Richards, Jeffrey *The Age of the Dream Palace – Cinema and Society in Britain 1930-1939* London Routledge 1989
- Richardson, Alex 'Postscript to the screen education references in the Newsom Report' *Screen Education* No 22 pp 9-10.
- Richardson, Alex 'Talking to John Heyer' *Film Society News 9* Summer 1961 pp 3-6 and *Film Society News 10* Winter 1961 pp 4-6
- Richardson, Alex *Screen Education for Schools* London Schoolmaster Publishing Company Ltd 1967
- Richardson, Alex; Vannoey, R C and Waters, Don *A Handbook for Screen Education* London SEFT 1963
- Ridge, Christine 'Reflections on the ILEA 6th Form Film Course' *Screen Education Notes* No 8 Autumn 1973 p 11
- Roberts, I E 'Diploma Course Work' *The Film Teacher* Spring 1954 pp 2-4
- Roberts, J Morgan 'Cinema Behaviour Problems' *Screen Education* No 9 July/August 1961 pp 42-43
- Robins, David (Ed) *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty* Cambridge Massachusetts The MIT Press 1990
- Robins, Kevin 'Althusserian Marxism and media studies: the case of Screen' *Media, Culture and Society* 1979 No 1 pp 355-370
- Robinson, David 'A Report on the Methods of Higher Education in Professional and Research Subjects related to the Cinema' London British Film Institute 1958
- Robinson, David 'Building a Cinema' *Sight and Sound* Vol 26 No 3 Winter 1956-57 pp 137-139

- Rodowick, David *The Crisis of Political Modernism* first published by the University of Illinois in 1988 and reprinted by the University of California Press Berkeley 1994
- Rogers, Rick (Ed) *Television and the Family* London University of London Extra Mural Department 1980
- Rohdie, Sam 'Editorial' *Screen* Vol 13 No 3 Autumn 1972 pp 2-3
- Rohdie, Sam 'Education and Criticism - Notes on work to be done' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 pp 9-13
- Rohdie, Sam 'Foreword' in *Screen* Vol 12 No 4 Winter 1971/2
- Rohdie, Sam 'Review: *Movie Reader, Film as Film*' *Screen* Vol 13 No 4 Winter 1972/3 pp 135-145
- Rosen, Philip *The Concept of Ideology and Contemporary Film Criticism: A Study of the Journal Screen in the Context of the Marxist Theoretical Tradition* Unpublished PhD thesis University of Iowa 1978
- Rotha, Paul *Documentary Film* Boston American Photographic Publishing Co 1936
- Rotha, Paul Review 'How to Appreciate Motion Pictures' *Sight and Sound* Vol 3 No 10 Summer 1934 p 81
- Rowe, Alan 'As an O level Subject' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 26-29
- Ryall, Tom "Editorial" *Screen Education Notes* Autumn 1972 No 4 p 2
- Ryall, Tom 'SEFT Annual Conference' *Screen Education Notes* Winter 1971 p 28-31
- Schrire, David 'The Psychology of Film Audiences' *Sight and Sound* Vol.2 No 8 Winter 1934 p 122-123
- Sedgwick, John 'Cinema-going preferences in Britain in the 1930s' in Richards, Jeffrey (Ed) *The Unknown 1930s* 1998 pp 1-21
- SEFT *Papers from the Bradford Media Education Conference* London SEFT 1986
- SEFT 'Soviet Film 1920s' *Screen* Vol 12 No 4 Winter 1971/72 pp 25-160
- SEFT 'The Pilkington Committee A summary of evidence submitted by the Society to the Committee on Broadcasting' *Screen Education* No 8 May-June 1961 pp 4-5
- SEFT Nineteenth Annual Report 1969-70 *Screen* Vol 11 No 3 p 102
- SEFT working party 'What Every 16 Year Old Should Know about the Mass Media' in *Screen* Vol 24 No 2 March/April 1983 pp 91-95
- SFT 'Editorial' *Society of Film Teachers Newsletter* No 2 December 1954 p 2
- SFT 'Editorial' *Society of Film Teachers Newsletter* No 3 February 1955 p 2
- SFT 'Policy Statement of the Society of Film Teachers' *The Film Teacher's Handbook 1958/59* pp 61-66
- SFT Brains Trust Report *Look and Listen* Vol 5 No 8 August 1951 p 170
- SFT Festival Exhibition 'The Teacher in School and Out' *The Mini Cinema* Vol 5 No 11 August 1951 p 31
- Shivas, Mark 'The Commercial Cinema: a few basic principles' *Oxford Opinion* No 38 April 30 1960 pp 38-40
- Simpson, Philip (Ed) *Television and the Family* London Comedia 1987
- Simpson, Philip 'Film and TV Studies in Secondary Education Report of the BFI/SEFT York Conference 1976' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 p 35
- Simpson, Philip 'Appendix I Film and Media Studies in Higher Education 1977-79' in Gledhill, Christine (Ed) *Film & Media Studies in Higher Education Conference Papers* London BFI Education September 1981 pp 153-160
- Simpson, Philip 'Introduction' *Media Education Conference 1981* London BFI Education 1982 p 7
- Simpson, Philip; Skirrow, Gillian; Watney, Simon 'Editorial' *Screen* Vol 24 No 3 May/June 1983 p 3

- Smith, A H; Platnauer, Maurice; Keeley, T C; Coghill, Nevill H *Report of the Oxford Drama Commission* May 1945
- Smith, Brian 'The Next Step' *Sight and Sound* Vol 9 No 36 Winter 1940-41 pp 69-70
- Smith, Buckland G 'Brentwood School Shows the Way' *Sight and Sound* Vol 6 No 21 Spring 1937 p 38-39
- Smith, G Buckland 'Wanted – A Sympathetic Understanding' *Sight and Sound* Vol 8 No 30 Summer 1939 pp 85-86
- Smith, Jack 'from the Secretary' *The Film Teacher* Summer 1952 p 27
- Smith, Jack 'The Challenge of Television' *Society of Film Teachers Newsletter* No 3 pp 3-5
- Smith, Jack 'The teacher and the cinema' *Look and Listen* Vol 7 No 1 January 1953 p 21-22
- Smith, Paul 'Historians and Film: A Progress Report' *University Vision* No 4 November 1969 pp 36-39
- Sparks, Colin 'The Evolution of Cultural Studies...' *Screen Education* No 22 Spring 1977 pp 16-30
- Spencer D A and Waley H D *The Cinema Today* London Oxford University Press Second Edition 1956
- Spottiswoode, Raymond 'Festival Telekinema' *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 3-4
- Spottiswoode, Raymond *A Grammar of the Film* London Faber and Faber 1935 Second edition 1955
- Sproxton, Vernon *Watching Films* London SCM Press 1948
- Stead, Peter 'The People and the Pictures: the British working class and film in the 1930s' in Pronay and Spring (Eds) *Propaganda Politics and Film* 1982 pp 77-97
- Steele, Tom *The Emergence of Cultural Studies 1945-65* London Lawrence & Wishart 1997
- Stevens, Tony 'Reading the Realist Film' *Screen Education* No 26 pp 13-34
- Stone, Margaret '5 years...and then?' *Motion* Summer 1961 pp 21-22 and 25
- Strong, L A G *English for Pleasure* London Methuen & Co Ltd 1941
- Swanson, Gillian 'Rethinking Representation' *Screen* Vol 27 No 5 September /October 1986 pp 16 -28
- The British Film Institute Act* London HMSO 31 May 1949
- The Schoolmaster's Own Correspondents* 'Reports on the NUT Conference "Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility"' *The Schoolmaster* November 4 1960 pp 941-948
- The Teacher* Letters to the Editor 'Young film makers: some words in their defence' *The Teacher* July 21 1967 p 5
- TES* 'Editorial' *Times Educational Supplement* 8 January 1960 p 25
- Thames Television *Viewpoint* Teachers' Notes London Thames Television 1975
- Thompson, Denys (Ed) *Discrimination and Popular Culture* Harmondsworth Penguin 1964
- Thompson, Denys *The Use of English*, originally *English in Schools*, was started in 1939 and continued into the 1960s.
- Thompson, John 'Report - SEFT Glasgow Group Weekend School "Television and the Real World"' in *Screen Education* No 23 Summer 1977 pp 69-70
- Thompson, Victor 'Story into Screenplay' *Film Teacher* No 2 June 1955 pp 4-7
- Tredell, Nicolas (Ed) *Cinemas of the Mind A Critical History of Film Theory* Cambridge Icon Books 2002
- Trevelyan, John 'The Consultative Committee' *The Film Teacher* Autumn 1953 pp 8-11
- Tucker, Nicholas 'Are They Safe in front of the Screen?' *The Teacher* 7 July 1967 p 3

- Tucker, Nicholas *Understanding the Mass Media* Cambridge Cambridge University Press 1966
- Turner, Graeme *British Cultural Studies – An Introduction* London Routledge 1990
- Tyrer, Frank 'The development of *Film Guide* in Liverpool' *Look and Listen* Vol 4 No 9 September 1950
- UNESCO *The Influence of the Cinema on Children and Adolescents* An annotated international bibliography Paris UNESCO 1961
- V, F H 'Book Review *Film*' *Sight and Sound* Vol 2 No 6 Summer 1933 p 61
- Vannoey, R C (Ed) *A Film Society Handbook* London SEFT 1965
- Vannoey, R C 'Ten Years On' *Screen Education Year Book 1960-61* London SEFT October 1960
- Vaughan, Dai 'A Seat for the Tenth Muse' *Film Teacher* 15 December 1958 pp 16-19
- Vaughan, Dai 'Films of Innocence' *Film Teacher* 17 May 1959 pp 25-27
- Vaughan, Dai 'Letters from the trenches' *Film* 27 January /February 1961 pp 9-10
- Vaughan, Dai 'The Critical Question - correspondence' *Sight and Sound* Vol 30 No 1 Winter 1960-61 p 48
- Vaughan, Dai 'The Poem as Film' *Film Teacher* 12 March 1956 pp 4-8
- Vaughan, Dai 'What is Free Cinema?' *Film Teacher* 14 September 1958 pp 11-17
- Vaughan, Dai 'A Brief Reply to Ian Cameron' *Screen Education* 9 July-August 1961 p 50
- Vaughan, Dai *Television Documentary Usage* Television Monograph No 6 London British Film Institute Educational Advisory Service 1976
- Vogt, Leiken 'Film Teaching in Norway' *Film Teacher* No 4 July 1956 pp 8-14
- Walkerdine, Valerie 'Progressive Pedagogies' *Papers from the Bradford Media Education Conference* London SEFT 1986 pp 2-8
- Wall, W D 'The Adolescent and the Cinema' *Educational Review* Vol 1 1948-1949 pp 34-46 and 119-130
- Wall, W D and Simson, W A 'The Effects of Cinema Attendance on the Behaviour of Adolescents as seen by their Contemporaries' *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XIX, Part I February 1949 pp 53-61
- Wall, W D and Smith, E M 'Film Choices of Adolescents' *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XIX Part II June 1949 pp 121-136
- Ward, J C *Children and the Cinema* London Central Office of Information The Social Survey NS131 April 1949
- Waters, Don 'Newsom' and 'Newsom on the Screen Media' in *Screen Education* 22 January/February 1964 pp 7-9
- Waters, W *Visual Education* London BFI 1946
- Watkins, Roger 'Chairman's Foreword' *Screen* Vol 12 No 1 Spring 1971 pp 7-8
- Watkins, Roger *CSE Examinations in Film* London BFI/SEFT 1969
- Watney, Simon 'Canvassing *Screen*' *Screen* Vol 27 No 5 September /October 1986 pp 50-53
- Whannel, Paddy 'Film Education and Film Culture' *Screen* Vol 10 No 3 May/June 1969 p 49
- Whannel, Paddy 'Know a Good Film' *Times Educational Supplement* 29 June 1962 p 1329
- Whannel, Paddy 'Receiving the Message' *Definition* 3 p 14
- Whannel, Paddy 'Servicing the Film Teacher' *Screen* Vol 11 No 4/5 1970 p 48
- Whannel, Paddy 'The Problem of Film Availability' *Screen* Vol 10 No 1 January/February 1969 p 67-73

- Whannel, Paddy 'Towards a Positive Criticism of the Mass Media' *Film Teacher* 17 May 1959 pp 28-30
- Whannel, Paddy 'Where Do We Go From Here?' *Screen Education* 7 March-April 1961 p 7
- Whannel, Paddy and Harcourt, Peter (Eds) *Film Teaching* London BFI Education Department 1964 (Revised edition 1968)
- Whannel, Paddy and Jacobs, Alex (Eds) *Artist, Critic and Teacher* London Joint Council for Education through Art 1958
- Whannel, Paddy *The Work of the Education Department* London BFI 1963
- Whitty, Geoff and Young, Michael *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge* Driffield Nafferton Books 1976
- Wickham, Glynne (Ed) *The Relation between Universities and Films, Radio and Television* London, Butterworth 1956
- Willemen, Paul 'Introduction' in Willemen, Paul and Pines, Jim *The Essential Framework* London Epigraph Publications Limited 1988 pp 1-11
- Willemen, Paul 'Remarks on *Screen* A Spiralling Trajectory' in *Southern Review* Vol 16 No 2 July 1983. The references in the text are to a typescript version of the article distributed by Willemen to students on the BFI MA course in the early 1990s.
- Williams, Christopher 'Theory, Misadventure and Critical Choices' *Screen* 42:2 Summer 2001 pp 230-238
- Williams, Linda 'Hiroshima and Marienbad – Metaphor and Metonymy' *Screen* Vol 17 No 1 Spring 1976
- Williams, Raymond *Britain in the Sixties: Communications* Harmondsworth Penguin Books 1962
- Williams, Raymond *Culture and Society* Harmondsworth Penguin 1961
- Williams, Raymond *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* London Fontana 1974
- Wills, H R (Ed) *Young Film Makers Symposium* London SEFT 1964
- Wills, H R 'Concern for Children' *Screen Education* No 7 March/April 1961 pp 4-5
- Wills, H R 'Cuttings' *Film Teacher* 12 March 1958 pp 21-23
- Wollen, Peter (Ed) *Working papers on the cinema: sociology and semiology* London British Film Institute Education Department 1971
- Wollen, Peter 'Film Studies at the University of Essex' *Screen Education* No 19 Spring 1976 pp 57-60
- Wollen, Peter 'Towards a New Criticism?' *Screen Education* No 41 September/October 1967 pp 90-91
- Wollen, Peter *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* Expanded Edition London BFI 1998
- Wollen, Peter *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* London Secker & Warburg 1969
- Wollenberg, H H *Anatomy of the Film – an illustrated guide to film appreciation* London Marsland Publications Ltd 1947
- Wood, Robin 'An Answer to Alan Lovell' *Screen* Vol 10 No 3 May/June 1969 pp 35-48
- Wood, Robin 'Courses at Warwick University' *Visual Education* April 1977 pp 19-23
- Wood, Robin 'Film and television Studies in the UK' *Visual Education* April 1977 p 21
- Wood, Robin 'Film Studies at the University of Warwick' *Screen Education* No 19 Summer 1976 pp 51-54
- Wood, Robin 'Film Studies at Warwick' *University Vision* No 12 December 1974 pp 27-36
- Wood, Robin 'Ghostly Paradigm and HCF: An Answer to Alan Lovell' *Screen* May/June 1969 Vol 10 No 3 pp 35-48
- Wood, Robin 'New Criticism?' *Definition* 3 p 11

- Wood, Robin *Personal Views Explorations in Film* London Gordon Fraser 1976
- Woodhouse, M T 'Children's Film Judgments' *Researches and Studies* No 1 December 1949 pp 33-45
- Woodhouse, Maurice T *Film appreciation in the School* Unpublished PhD thesis Department of Education University of Leeds January 1952
- Wright, Ian 'National Film School' *Sight and Sound* Vol 36 No 4 Autumn 1967 pp 197-198
- Young Screen 1969* Entry form and information London NUT 1969
- Young, Colin 'National Film School' *Sight and Sound* Vol 41 No 1 Winter 1971/72 pp 5-8

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED FOR THIS INVESTIGATION

MANUEL ALVARADO	15 July 2003, 11 July 2005
CHARLES BARR	15 June 2005
CARY BAZALGETTE	24 November 2003
SUSAN BENNETT	5 June 2003
ANDREW BETHELL	11 May 2007
DAVID BUCKINGHAM	24 November 2005
ED BUSCOMBE	13 June 2003
RICHARD COLLINS	24 May 2004
JIM COOK	E-mails/telephone 10/11/13 January 2007
SEAN CUBITT	E-mail 14 January 2006
BARRY CURTIS	22 August 2005
ROSALIND DELMAR	30 June 2003
JAMES DONALD	4 January 2006
JOHN ELLIS	4 July 2003
BOB FERGUSON	5 May 2004
GEORGE FOSTER	18 November 2003
CHRISTINE GERAGHTY	2 August 2005
JENNY GRAHAME	13 June 2005
BRIAN GROOMBRIDGE	3 August 2004
STUART HALL	17 March 2004
GILLIAN HARTNOLL	26 May 2004
LESLIE HEYWOOD	Telephone 15 May 2003/30 May 2004
ANDREW HIGSON	15 June 2005
JIM HILLIER	25 April 2005
FRED JARVIS	15 July 2004
ALAN LOVELL	7 June 2005
DOUGLAS LOWNDES	5 June 2003
DAVID LUSTED	16 May 2005
COLIN MacCABE	11 December 2006
COLIN McARTHUR	28 June 2005
LEN MASTERMAN	15 September 2006
MANDY MERCK	16 June 2004/ 14 February 2006/ 25 April 2007
CHRIS MOTTERSHEAD	9 November 2005
LAURA MULVEY	24 July 2003
MARK NASH	21 April 2005
GEOFFREY NOWELL-SMITH	30 June 2003
CLAIRE PAJACZKOWSKA	31 March 2007
VICTOR PERKINS	19 April 2005
DAVID RODOWICK	9 June 2004
SAM ROHDIE	E-mail 2 October 2005
ROY SHAW	29 September 2004
MICHAEL SIMONS	Telephone 27 April 2007
PHILIP SIMPSON	4 September 2006
ROY STAFFORD	11 May 2005
GINETTE VINCEDEAU	25 April 2006
IAN WALL	12 January 2004
PAUL WILLEMEN	18 August 2005
CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS	28 April 2005, E-mail 21 March 2006
TANA WOLLEN	30 July 2004
MARY WOOD	25 July 2005

APPENDIX II

Much of the research in this volume has only been possible through access to material in specialist archives. Three in particular merit individual mention: BFI Special Collections, the National Arts Education Archive and the *Screen* Archive in the University of Glasgow. The endnotes to each chapter contain numerous references to documents included in each of these collections.

British Film Institute Special Collections

The relevant material in the BFI collection was being continuously supplemented as I engaged with my research. I am most grateful to Christophe Dupin of the AHRC funded BFI History Research Project for alerting me as relevant material was added to the permanent BFI Special Collection and to Janet Moat and her colleagues for providing congenial research facilities in Stephen Street. The references to the newly discovered folders that I quote are those current at the time of my submitting this document. In case some of the identifiers of these folders were only provisional, anyone seeking to follow up my references is alerted to this possibility.

National Arts Education Archive

This Archive - based at Bretton Hall near Wakefield - was formerly part of the University of Leeds, but is now operating independently though still on the Bretton Hall site. Leonard Bartle remains as Administrator of the Archive which includes SEFT material and the BFI Education Department Archive. Mr Bartle has been continuously supportive of my several research visits since 2003. I understand from a telephone conversation with him on 6 August that here is now a possibility of amalgamating the SEFT material with the *Screen* Archive in the University of Glasgow.

The *Screen* Archive

This Archive contains much material particularly from the 1980s which at the time of my inspection had received only a preliminary sorting. I was allowed special access by the Editors of *Screen*, for which I am most grateful. My thanks for her assistance go to Dr Emily Munro, who at the time of my researches was employed by *Screen*.