



Archibald, D. (2017) Team Loach and Sixteen Films: authorship, collaboration, leadership (and football). In: Mazierska, E. and Kristensen, L. (eds.) *Contemporary Cinema and Ideology: Neoliberal Capitalism and Its Alternatives in Filmmaking*. Routledge: New York and London, pp. 25-41. ISBN 9781138235731.

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/142632/>

Deposited on: 01 August 2017

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Chapter 1

Team Loach and Sixteen Films: Authorship, Collaboration, Leadership (and Football)¹

David Archibald

For over five decades, Ken Loach has directed film and television programmes, which challenge the orthodoxies of contemporary capitalism and champion the struggles of oppressed groups. Working initially with the British Broadcasting Corporation, he negotiated the constraints of public sector broadcasting to direct ground-breaking television films such as *Up the Junction* (1965) and *Cathy Come Home* (1966). Fifty years after the success of *Cathy*, Loach received the Palm D'Or at the 2016 Cannes Film Festival for *I, Daniel Blake* (2016), which was produced by Sixteen Films, the company Loach established with producer Rebecca O'Brien in 2002. Loach, then, has created work and achieved notable success (although not always consistently) both within the confines of a state broadcasting institution governed by a Keynesian model, and with production companies working within the economic and ideological constraints of neoliberalism. This chapter sets out to explore the working practices of a socialist filmmaker who has, on the whole, successfully negotiated a pathway to produce films which contain an overt critique of capitalism whilst simultaneously operating within it.

Reflecting on receiving the Palm d'Or for *I, Daniel Blake*, Loach comments: 'The first thought is for all the people who helped you make it. If you were a football team winning the championship, everybody would get a medal but in films, the director has to go up. Obviously, it is for the whole team.' (quoted in Macnab 2016) In foregrounding filmmaking's collaborative nature and comparing its production to that of a working class sport, Loach's observations contrast sharply with cinephilia's rarified auteurist discourses.² I explore this contrast below through analysis of four imbricated areas; debates on authorship in Film and Television Studies, the functioning of leadership and teams in the production of films directed by Loach, how this production context is represented publically by Sixteen Films, and how leadership and teams feature in Loach's work throughout his career. My analysis is informed by

research conducted into the making of *The Angels' Share* (Loach, 2012), which involved extensive participant observation of the production process. I spent approximately twenty days on set during the shoot, visited the cutting room during the editing process, attended a private screening of a rough cut, attended the Cannes premiere and press conference, and received access to Sixteen Films' documentation pertaining to the film. Observations from this research are supplemented by interviews with Loach and key production staff, subsequent analysis of material from the British Film Institute Loach archive, and textual analysis of Loach's film and television *oeuvre*.

Loach's work has received considerable academic attention: most notably, the four-part television series, *Days of Hope* (BBC, 1975), provoked a discipline-defining debate on the politics of form in *Screen* and subsequent years have witnessed book-length studies on Loach's wider output; George McKnight's edited collection *Agent of Challenge and Defiance: Films of Ken Loach* (1997), Jacob Leigh's *The Cinema of Ken Loach: Art in the Service of the People* (2002), and John Hill's *Ken Loach: The Politics of Film and Television* (2011). In keeping with Film and Television Studies' text-based origins, these critical appraisals concentrate on formal qualities and thematic concerns with detailed discussion of production notably absent. While popular commentaries on film production more widely do exist, for instance, journalist Lillian Ross' *Picture*, an account of the making of *The Red Badge of Courage* (Ford, 1952) and Wim Wenders' *My Time With Antonioni* (1983), production studies of single films by Film Studies scholars are rare. Moreover, although there has been the development of Production Studies as a sub-field of Film and Television Studies, research on the nature of creative teams in film production remains extremely limited. In research conducted by Steve Presence and Andrew Spicer on RED Production Company and Warp Films, the authors note that 'Production companies are not only invisible to the general public, they are also, it appears, invisible to media scholars who continue to be preoccupied with individual writers and directors such as Paul Abbott or Shane Meadows without an understanding of these companies' production cultures to their creativity' (2016: 26). Dorota Ostrowska speculates on the reasons for the lack of research into production cultures more generally, positing that different methodologies are required to conduct this type of research, and noting that it requires a conceptual shift away from traditional screen analysis (2010: 1). If we factor in the challenges of participant

observation-based studies, not least that access is difficult to secure, it is considerably time-consuming, and writing about actually existing people requires more delicacy than writing about completed films, then it is not difficult to identify some of the reasons why research of this nature is scarce. I contend, nevertheless, that Film Studies would benefit from a broader and deeper engagement with Production Studies, which, as John Caldwell argues ‘can provide rich insights that speculative theorizing misses.’ (2013: 162) I seek here, then, to partially fill the lacuna in the critical literature surrounding Loach: that he has worked in both film and television in multifarious production contexts over a lengthy career makes his work a particularly rich case study. In so doing, I seek to illustrate how this type of research can benefit our understanding of the film production processes, but also feed into textual analysis, thereby impacting Film and Television Studies more broadly. My aim is not to elevate the study of practice above the practice of theory; but to illustrate how the latter might benefit from insights gleaned from the former. Of course, Loach is not the only socialist filmmaker making explicitly anti-capitalist or anti-neoliberal films; he is, however, perhaps the most successful, which makes the study of his production process of particular interest.

Theories of authorship

Film Studies’ critical orthodoxy tended initially to conceptualise cinema as a vehicle for the personal expression of the director in a framework inherited from Enlightenment thought, a perspective outlined by Alexander Astruc in 1948:

the cinema is quite simply becoming a means of expression, just as all the arts have been before it, and in particular painting and the novel. After having been successfully a fairground attraction, an amusement analogous to boulevard theatre, or a means of preserving the images of an era, it is gradually becoming a language. By language, I mean a form in which and by which an artist can express his thoughts, however abstract they may be, or translate his obsessions exactly as he does in the new contemporary essay or novel. That is why I would like to call this new age of cinema the age of *caméra-stylo*.
(quoted in Caughie 1981: 9)

The inclusion of Roland Barthes' 1967 essay 'The Death of the Author' in John Caughie's influential edited collection, *Theories of Authorship* (1981), was indicative of Film Studies' structuralist/post-structuralist impulse to consign the auteur to the grave. Returning to these debates in 2007, however, Caughie notes that although auteurism was no longer a hotly-contested topic in the discipline, the grave to which the auteur had been consigned was largely empty (2007: 408). For Caughie, a recognition of the way that specific groups championed seemingly representative auteurs was evident, alongside the emergence of a more tempered and nuanced director-centred criticism, which had replaced those on offer in the pioneering days of auteurism. Other work has highlighted auteurism's ongoing appeal; for instance, Steve Neale (1981), Tim Corrigan (1990) and Catherine Grant (2000, 2008) have illustrated how auteurist discourses feature heavily in the marketing and consumption of cinema. One could add to the list the manner in which film scholars continue to conduct and publish auteurist-based research, exemplified by the titles of a range of monographs on specific filmmakers, from Elizabeth Ezra's *Georges Méliès: The Birth of the Auteur*, to work on more contemporary filmmakers in Brian Michael Goss' *Global Auteurs: Politics in the Films of Almodóvar, von Trier, and Winterbottom*. It is not all one way traffic, however. In *Authoring Hal Ashby: The Myth of the New Hollywood Auteur*, Aaron Hunter points to Ashby's collaborative working practices, arguing that this was more widespread in the New Hollywood Cinema than is generally understood and highlighting ongoing conflicting trends in Film Studies' debates over authorship.

John Hill highlights that films directed by Loach are exhibited and distributed in an auteurist context (2011: 5). On the international film festival circuit, which is governed predominantly on auteurist lines, Loach has had significant success with, for instance, more films screened in competition at Cannes than any other filmmaker.³ 'Ken Loach' is also deployed as brand in the distribution of his work, exemplified by the DVD box sets' titles, *The Ken Loach Collection (Sixteen Films, 2007)* and *Ken Loach at the BBC (Sixteen Films/BFI/BBC, 2011)*. Loach rejects the auteur label, repeatedly highlighting cinema's collaborative nature; but also stressing the centrality of the writer in both film *and* television.⁴ Although Loach has garnered significant success in cinema, it was his early television work with which he first achieved both critical acclaim and public recognition. Andy Willis notes that many of the major

figures identified with British television drama's so-called 'Golden Age' were writers (2009, 300). Consequently, in contrast to auteurism's focus on the director in cinema, the discourse around authorship in British television often centred on the writer. The subject of Willis' article is Jim Allen, who met Loach in the late sixties. Prior to their encounter, Loach's output was broadly leftist in content; however, Allen's Trotskyist politics influenced Loach significantly. This emerges clearly in their first collaborative project *The Big Flame* (BBC, 1969) in which a Liverpool dockers' strike culminates in the declaration of a Soviet. An engagement with Trotskyism is more explicit in their second television play, *The Rank and File* (BBC, 1971), a dramatised account of the 1970 Pilkingtons glass factory strike. Towards the film's conclusion, Eddie, a local union leader, reflects on the dispute: 'Surely to God we've seen the futility of rank and fileism; that blind militancy will get us nowhere. The only question is one of political leadership and a foundation or the forming of a party that will lead the workers to power.' Over a montage of monochrome photographs of young children, Eddie continues, 'I go along with Trotsky. Life is beautiful. Let the future generation cleanse it of all the oppression, violence and evil and enjoy it to the full.' I quote from Eddie's speech at length here as it contains two connected threads which mark Loach's future work, and the manner in which he discusses it: the influence of Trotskyism, and the importance of leadership.⁵ These threads are evident, albeit to varying degrees, in subsequent projects between Allen and Loach: *Save the Children Fund Film*, aka *In Black and White*, (1971), *Days of Hope*, *Hidden Agenda* (1990), *Raining Stones* (1993), *Tierra y Libertad/Land and Freedom* (1995), and the controversial Holocaust play, *Perdition* (1987).⁶ Of this work, *Days of Hope* and *Land and Freedom* deal explicitly with what we could define as a 'Lessons of Defeat' trope; *Days of Hope* is fiercely critical of the Trades Union Congress leadership's role in the defeated 1926 General Strike, and *Land and Freedom* critiques Stalinism's contribution to the crushing of the Spanish revolution. This pre-occupation with leadership in the worker's movement continues in Loach's output, even when not working directly with Allen, as evidenced in the television documentaries, *A Question of Leadership* (ATV, 1981), which deals with a UK steelworker's strike, and *Questions of Leadership* (Channel 4, 1983), a four-part series on contemporary British trades unions.

Factoring the long-term impact of Allen's contribution into Loach's work significantly disrupts Film Studies' *auteurist* discourses. John Caughie notes that in

traditional French film criticism, the term *auteur* was utilized to refer to the script writer or to the ‘artist who created the film’ (1981: 9). Writing more recently, Richard Corliss contends that the writer should be credited with *auteur* status because, as he puts it, ‘Auteur criticism is essentially theme criticism; and themes – as expressed through plot, characterization, and dialogue – belong primarily to the writer’ (2008: 143). It is possible to discern a noticeable difference in thematic concerns and formal qualities when analysing Loach’s work with different writers. For instance, although *Fatherland* (1986), scripted by Trevor Griffiths, is politically and thematically consistent with Loach’s output, its modernist, monochrome dreamscapes are strikingly dissimilar to the predominantly social realist aesthetic of the other work. In more recent films with Paul Laverty, who has scripted every full fictional feature bar *Navigators* (2000) since *Carla’s Song* (1996), an overt, didactic commitment to revolutionary socialist politics is absent. There are times when socialist politics are evident, exemplified by the prominence given to the ideas of the Scottish Marxist, James Connolly, in *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* (2006); however, the Lessons of Defeat trope evident in the Allen scripts is less prominent. Laverty’s scripts, moreover, contain more experimental features than one might expect from the pen of Allen, perhaps best exemplified by the fantasy sequences in *Looking for Eric* (2009), or the more caperish, playful tone of *The Angels’ Share*. A fuller examination of the involvement of the other writers with which Loach has worked, including Barry Hines, Rona Munro and James O’Connor, would tease out further thematic and formal differences, highlighting the manner in which Loach’s output is shaped significantly by the influence of the writer he is collaborating with.

In addition to the writers’ influence, one could also point to the long-term influence of other early Loach collaborators. For instance, producer, Tony Garnett, played a central role in the majority of the early films, from *Cathy Come Home* to *Black Jack* (1979), which were often identified as Loach-Garnett productions. Notably, in his book-length study on Garnett, Stephen Lacey suggests that his work is characterized by an ‘authorial signature’, one which is ‘intimately connected to a realist politics and aesthetics’, thereby illustrating how film and television can be narrativised around producer-as-auteur discourses (2012: 5). Indeed, in Hortense Powdermaker’s anthropological study of 1940s Hollywood she identifies executives and the producers as having, as she puts it, ‘the greatest power to stamp the movies with their personal daydreams and fantasies’ (1951: 100).⁷ Further to this, in Thomas

Schatz's research on Hollywood, he highlights that directors such as John Ford, Howard Hawks, Frank Capra, and Alfred Hitchcock, who had, as he puts it, 'an unusual degree of authority and a certain style', were awarded this on the basis of their status as producers rather than directors (1988: 5/6). Schatz suggests, moreover, that commercial success was the basis for this authority.⁸ It is not the producer's potential commercial power which accounts for Garnett's influence, however; rather, it is a recognition of the creative role of the producer figure within the context of the production of British television drama of the period.⁹ Loach also cites the significant influence of cinematographer, Chris Menges, who shot his debut feature, *Poor Cow* (1967) and with whom he worked on many subsequent films.¹⁰ Loach stresses that it was through Menges' influence that his directorial approach in the shooting of *Kes* (1969) 'became about observation rather than chasing' and that it 'set the pattern for later work.'¹¹ The long-term influence of Allen, Garnett and Menges problematizes the notion of auteurist discourse and highlights that there are a number of ways in which to narrative the role of individuals in the production process. More recent scholarship on auteurism in television studies has focused on the figure of the producer, the writer, and even the showrunner; the notion of negotiated, collective or multiple authorship has also been championed. (Gaut, 1997; Mayer, Banks and Thornton Caldwell, 2009; Hunter, 2016; Sellors, 2007, 2010; Thornton Caldwell, 2008) Whilst this advances thinking about authorship across both film and television studies, one wonders whether it might not be time to dispense with the notion of auteurism completely. That Film Studies emerged in the Arts and Humanities helped foster an Enlightenment focus on individual creativity; however, it has been at the expense of other perspectives. Loach's comments about football are worth factoring in here. Like cinema, football is a collaborative project with leading roles played by specific individuals: we could trade club owners, managers, trainers and players, for producers, directors, writers and actors (or players). There is a recognition, however, that at its heart, it is a team game. A cursory reading of the popular literature on football, including ex-Manchester United Football Club manager Alex Ferguson's *Leading* and ex-A. C. Milan and Real Madrid manager Carlo Ancelotti's *Quiet Leadership: winning hearts, minds and matches*, illustrates that this discourse foregrounds football's collaborative nature.¹² Individuals are important, of course, but there is always a focus on teams, or more precisely, on the dialectical relationship between individuals and teams, a discourse that is largely absent in the academic

study of film and television. I contend that film and television scholars could learn from the manner in which football is discussed in the sport's popular literature.

Team Loach

In partially rectifying this trend, in this part of the chapter I explore how teams and leadership function in the production of, and the discourse surrounding, Loach's more recent films. It is important first, however, to highlight some background to Sixteen Films. For over fifty years, Loach has created work in numerous production contexts, often negotiating the demands of corporations and institutions, as well as the demands of the marketplace. Pierre Bourdieu's work on fields of cultural production highlights that 'The literary or artistic field is a field of forces, but it is also a field of struggles tending to transform or conserve this field of forces' (1993: 30). It is with Bourdieu's concept in mind that we can better understand the structural factors, or field of forces influencing the work Loach and his collaborators have created whilst negotiating this field of struggles. Although Loach has achieved considerable success, it has not been an unproblematic process. In television, cuts have been required of work created for the BBC, the *Save the Children Film* was consigned to a vault in the BFI archive for 40 years, documentaries have had delayed broadcasts, and, in the case of *Questions of Leadership*, was never broadcast. Loach's cinematic output has also not been constant; rather, in keeping with the fragile nature of the British film industry there have been fallow periods. Paradoxically, money from television, initially with the development of Channel Four in the eighties, enabled Loach to move back into film production following a difficult period in television. It is notable, however, that production was never on a solid footing: for instance, files in the British Film Institute Loach archive indicate the perilous state of the financing of *Fatherland*.¹³ Since the release of *Hidden Agenda* (1990), however, Loach's output has been increasingly regular. Initially this was through the cooperative production company, Parallax Pictures, which produced the films *Riff-Raff* (1991) to *The Navigators* (2000). Sixteen Films was subsequently established by Loach and O'Brien with Lavery involved as Associate Director and covers the films from *Sweet Sixteen* (2002) to the present. It is with Sixteen Films that Loach has achieved his most consistent cinematic output, which includes nine full-length fictional features and one documentary in a period spanning fifteen years, and significant success as signified by a host of international

awards, not least two Palme d'Ors for *The Wind that Shakes the Barley* and *I, Daniel Blake*.¹⁴

Another paradox emerges here. Neo-liberalism was concomitant with a period of capitalist globalization, which, while further attacking the living conditions of the working class and oppressed groups, also created new possibilities for Loach to operate on a transnational plane. Huw Jones (2016: 369) suggests that Loach's prolific output since the nineties is connected to successful co-productions. Jones notes, however, that earlier co-productions, including *Black Jack* and *Fatherland* involved significant interference from their co-producing partners (2016: 374-5). To add to Jones study, research at the BFI Loach archive reveals the extent to which Loach faced direct interventions from the German co-producers of *Fatherland* who attempted to force changes to the film's final version.¹⁵ The archive also indicates the perilous state of the company's finances during the production.¹⁶ Jones outlines that Loach had more successful experiences with Tornasol (Spain) and Road Movies (Germany), which were involved on a finance-only basis on a number of films from the mid-nineties to the mid-noughties. It was during this period that Sixteen Films made a significant step forward via collaborations with the French company, Why Not Productions, and European sales company, Wild Bunch, who have both acted as co-producers on all films since *Looking For Eric*. In turn, Sixteen Films has acted as co-producer on, *Les Bien-aimés/The Beloved*, (Honoré, 2011), which was led by Why Not, thereby developing the connection between the companies. In short, with Sixteen Films operating on a transnational basis, Loach has developed a solid production base for his cinematic output, one which is unparalleled in his career. As the company has moved onto a more stable financial basis, this has prevented interference from co-producers over content and acted as a positive factor in terms of exhibition.¹⁷

Presence and Spicer (2016: 6) note that in Edgar Schein's *Organisational Culture and Leadership* he suggests that analyzing organisations involves comprehending three fields, 'artefacts, espoused beliefs and underlying assumptions'. For the purposes of this study, I take artefacts to be Sixteen Film's website and promotional material, espoused beliefs to be the production narratives surrounding their work, and underlying assumptions to be the manner (often unspoken) in which the company operates during the production process. In relation to artefacts, the importance of the team to the production process is evident in various aspects of Sixteen Films' public profile. The company's website lists eight individuals in a

'Team Album.'¹⁸ In addition to Laverty, Loach and O'Brien, these are Camilla Bray, producer of two Sixteen Films productions not directed by Ken Loach, *Summer* (Glenann, 2008) and *Oranges and Sunshine* (Jim Loach, 2009), accountant, Habib Rhaman, Jack Thomas-O'Brien, whose credits include Assistant Producer on *Spirit of '45*, Eimear McMahon, who has fulfilled various production roles since 2007, and Ann Cattrall, Loach's PA. That the individuals are positioned in a non-hierarchical formation is consistent with the espoused beliefs or the discourse of collaboration that the company promotes. For instance, when 'Sixteen Films & Friends (AKA Team Loach)' received The Special Jury Prize at the 2013 British Independent Film Awards, O'Brien furthered this discourse of collaboration: 'There are so many people behind the camera on Ken's films and so often they go unrecognized. And Ken would be the first person to acknowledge that.'¹⁹ She continues by stressing the importance of teams: 'I think that there's something to be said for the sort of films that we've been able to make because we've worked with a team.'²⁰ O'Brien, who co-produced *Hidden Agenda* and has produced all of Loach's films since *The Flickering Flame: A Story of Contemporary Morality* (BBC, 1996), has been central in ensuring the run of films since the mid-nineties, in terms of quantity of product, but also critical and commercial success. O'Brien suggests that 'casting the crew is as crucial as casting the actors.'²¹ Notably, and mirroring the 'Team Album', the company works regularly with many of the same production crew. As indicated previously, an almost ever-present part of the 'team' has been Paul Laverty. Reflecting the central creative position the company places on the writer, in recent marketing materials, equal billing is allocated to Laverty and Loach.²² In relation to cinematography, although since the late sixties Loach worked primarily with Chris Menges and Barry Ackroyd, Robbie Ryan has shot *The Angels' Share*, *Jimmy's Hall*, and *I, Daniel Blake*. George Fenton has provided the music for all feature-length films since *Ladybird*, *Ladybird* (1994). Jonathan Morris has edited every feature-length film since *Fatherland*. Ray Beckett, Sound Mixer/Recordist, has worked on every film since *Raining Stones*. Designer, Martin Johnson, worked on *Days of Hope*, then *Black Jack* and all major productions until *Ae Fond Kiss*. Following Johnson's death in 2003, Fergus Clegg, who had previously worked as Art Director on the seven films between *Raining Stones* and *Ae Fond Kiss*, was tasked with Production Design and has worked in that capacity on seven features since, from *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* to *I, Daniel Blake*. This is not an exhaustive list, but is indicative of the fact that there is a team of regular staff

involved in the production process behind the camera, as well as in the production office.²³ Moreover, the existence of the team of individuals who regularly return to work together, contributes to a shared, and often unarticulated, understanding of their creative practice, or, following Schein, the underlying assumptions about their working methodologies.

During the course of my participant observation and interviews, it became apparent that there was a strong team ethos on set, one which is established from the top, that is, primarily from Loach and O'Brien. This set of underlying assumptions is characterized by respect for each other's work, a sense that each of the individuals is working to create something which is greater than their own specific contribution, and a sense that the team combined is working on a project of considerable importance and value, aesthetically and politically. In addition, there was an expectation that it would have significant profile, and that it would have a healthy shelf-life. Notably, not all of Loach's collaborators voiced support for Loach's politics; rather, it was support for the end product (the film) and the opportunity to be involved in the production process, which were the dominant drivers. Burns (1978: 19) suggests that successful leaders are able to build a relationship with their collaborators (he deploys the term followers) based on developing a shared sense of wants and needs. This emerges during interview as Loach's collaborators expressed the view that, although they were working to create a shared project, their own specific contribution was considered to be of significant value. Therefore, the team as a whole expressed the view that there was a meeting of individual and collective needs. What also emerged from my observations is that, although there is a discourse of teamwork and collaboration, reflecting a togetherness, intercorporeality or even solidarity, Loach as an individual is intimately involved in a leadership role in all aspects of the creative process. Moreover, it also emerged through interview that Loach has a strong idea of what he wants from each of the individual team members. For instance, cinematographer Robbie Ryan rather modestly downplays his own role to suggest that the director almost always knows what set up to use when positioning the camera and so on. Ryan adds, 'He's very adept at knowing what is needed. He's kind of got a cameraman's mind. All I'm helping do is realise that vision.'²⁴ Ryan's comments are typical of the comments I received from the crew who speak with a quite remarkable level of respect for Loach as a filmmaker, as an employer, but also as an individual. For instance, Johnathan Morris, states, 'this is the plum job that we all want – to work

with Ken'.²⁵ When asked to expand on why this is the case, he points to Loach's personal qualities and states 'first and foremost it's him.'²⁶ Interviewing Why Not's Pascal Caucheteux on his desire to collaborate with Sixteen Films and Loach, he casts his response in auteurist terms, describing Loach as a 'Master' and points to their shared interest in cinema.²⁷ An example of what Mette Hjort might term 'auteurist transnationalism' (2010), Caucheteux stresses that the motivating factor behind his desire to work with Loach - who he described as pro-Palestinian and with Claude Lanzmann (director of *Shoah*, 1985) who he described as pro-Israeli - was their status as 'Masters', not their politics. He also stresses, however, aspects of Loach's character, notably, humility and honesty, and their shared love of football, pointing to their involvement with *Looking For Eric* as the starting point for their relationship.²⁸

John Thornton Caldwell notes that academics 'fortunate enough to be embedded in a media company' should carefully negotiate 'managed top-down explanations of production' (2013: 162-4). I approached this research fully aware of such concerns and I am fully cognizant of the pitfalls of uncritically replicating production narratives offered by these interviewees who are, after all, talking about their employer or business partner; however, it is notable that there was a marked consistency in the responses that I encountered. Moreover, the extent of my participant observation and the ongoing informal discussions I had with the members of the production team enables me to present research findings which go beyond what one might learn in interview alone. To corroborate my own observations, commenting on the interviews he conducted with Loach's collaborators, Hayward comments, that they 'talked of him [Loach] in such hallowed tones that I often wondered whether I was writing about a saint.' (2004: 2) In his work on leadership Max Weber argues that there are three sources of personal authority - traditional, legal-rational and charismatic. Of the latter, Weber suggests that it relates to 'an extraordinary quality of a person, regardless of whether this quality is actual, alleged or presumed.' (1948: 295) Repeatedly in interview, Loach's collaborators outlined that they regarded him as having extraordinary qualities as a filmmaker, but also as an individual. These qualities were critical in ensuring the interviewees' continuing involvement with Sixteen Films. So, although I am arguing for a rejection of the term 'auteur', I am not arguing for the rejection of the contribution of individuals to the filmmaking process: Loach as an individual, as a filmmaker, and as a leader, is pivotal to the success of Team Loach.

It is interesting to contrast my research findings with Powdermaker's. She suggests that while there is a general recognition in Hollywood, the home of capitalist cinema *par excellence*, that filmmaking is a collaborative enterprise, individuals and groups jostle constantly for domination. As she argues, 'The overt verbal behavior in all these relationships is that of love and friendship. Warm words of endearment and great cordiality set the tone. But underneath is hostility amounting frequently to hatred, and, even more important, a lack of respect for each other's work' (1951: 29). This position is also endorsed in Schatz's study of Hollywood when he notes that 'studio filmmaking was less a process of collaboration than of negotiation and struggle – occasionally approaching armed conflict' (1988: 12). Powdermaker suggests that Hollywood is marked by, on the whole, 'a striking and complete lack of mutual respect as well as trust. The *esprit de corps* of the industry is exceedingly low' (1951: 295/6). Although I did witness the occasional minor conflict between individuals, which is perhaps inevitable in any workplace, the *esprit de corps* on the set of *The Angels' Share* was high, even though there was recognition of the power dynamics on the set. For instance, in interview, one regular member of the production team described Loach, affectionately, as the leader of a 'collective autocracy'.²⁹ When I put this to Loach he rejected the phrase, suggesting that it contains 'the whiff of the jackboot'; but he also states "You can't do it without leadership otherwise it would just disintegrate. The unit's got to work with a common voice and that's what the director has got to find. It's got to be a voice that everybody feels is their own, but equally it's got to be unified so that the trick really is to try and get both.'³⁰ In casting leadership here not in terms of vision, but as a form of polyphonic unification, Loach's response, and his directorial approach in general, brings to mind the words of Bill Shankly when discussing the success of Glasgow Celtic Football Club's legendary manager, Jock Stein: 'If he's got useful players, and he trains them the right way and he gets them all to do what they can do well. The little things that they can do, and he merges them all together, it's a form of socialism you know, without the politics, of course.'³¹ In highlighting Stein's leadership qualities, Shankly's comments suggest that there can be a politics embedded in the mode of production, which finds expression in the concept of teams, but teams which are led. There is a parallel, then, with the mode of production of Loach's work, and the recurring theme of leadership in the films, as outlined above; however, this is also the case in relation to teams.

Teams in the Films

Given Sixteen Films 'artefacts, espoused beliefs and underlying assumptions', it is appropriate that football teams and supporters feature regularly in Loach's output, including *The Golden Vision* (1968), *Kes*, *My Name is Joe* (1998), *Tickets* (2005), *Ae Fond Kiss*, *It's a Free World ...* and *Looking for Eric*. This is indicative of a wider interest in teams: although a number of films in Loach's oeuvre centre on individual characters, as is indicated often by the titles - *Cathy Come Home*, *Carla's Song* and *My Name is Joe* - the importance of the collective is a constant. For instance, we have the criminal gang in *A Tap on the Shoulder* (BBC, 1965) and the drug-dealing, pizza-delivery gang in *Sweet Sixteen*. Indicative of their increased marginalization and effective emasculation, trade unions have featured significantly less in Loach's work since the eighties; however we still have groups of workers suffering the effects of weakened trade union organisation in *Riff-Raff* (1991), *Bread and Roses* (2000), *The Navigators* and *It's a Free World ...*, with revolutionary militias featuring in *Land and Freedom* and *The Wind that Shakes the Barley*. Collectivism is not fetishised, however: in contrast to the groups of organized trade unionists who assemble to discuss their working conditions in *The Big Flame* and *The Rank and File*, *Navigators* reveals how discourses on teams have been co-opted under neoliberal capitalism. In one scene, a group of rail workers are called to a meeting, not to discuss union organisation, rather, management have assembled them to watch a company promotional video during which the managing director states 'there are no limits to what this team can achieve together.' That *Navigators* concludes with the death of one of their number both critiques the privatisation of the railways that forms the film's background and the neo-liberal appropriation of discourses on collaboration and collectivism. Overall, however, teams are represented as forces for progressive change and spaces for social and political solidarity. In *Looking for Eric*, Eric the postal worker asks his namesake, Eric Cantona, what was the 'sweetest moment' of his footballing career, expecting it to be one of the Frenchman's numerous celebrated goals for Manchester United. 'It was a pass,' Cantona responds, before the film cuts to show an exquisite clipped pass from Cantona which sets up Denis Irwin to score against Spurs. 'What if he had missed?' asks the postal worker. When Cantona replies, 'you have to trust your teammates, always. If not we are lost', it furthers this team discourse, but also highlights the dialectical interaction between talented individuals and teams.

Conclusion

The term 'Team Loach' clearly flags that filmmaking is a collaborative enterprise whilst simultaneously reinforcing the centrality of Loach in the production process. Although auteurist discourses can be cognizant of the collaborative nature of filmmaking, clearly, one of its downsides has been a tendency to erase the labour and artistic input of other film production workers. What I have attempted to do here is illustrate the contribution of a number of creative individuals, but more importantly their status as part of a creative team in the production of Loach's more recent output. Reflecting on Film Studies' engagement with auteurism in 2007, John Caughie writes, 'The work of theory is still contestatory, moving forward dialectically, rather like Walter Benjamin's Angel of History, continually looking backwards to pick up any fragments which may have been lost in the rubble of earlier encounters. The questions of art and authorship, creativity and imagination, may still prove an irritant in our attempts to come to terms with our complex engagements with cinema.' (2007: 421) In striving to come to terms with the work of Ken Loach and Sixteen Films, we can add leadership, collaboration, and football to the mix. I realise that there may appear to be an apparent contradiction between arguing that the auteur figure is a hindrance rather than a help in understanding film and television, whilst, simultaneously, arguing for an engagement with the work of specific creative individuals and how they work with teams in the production process; nevertheless, if we are to have a fuller understanding of the processes by which film and television comes into actual existence then it seems vital. Moreover, if we are to understand how an explicitly anti-capitalist cinema can be forged in a neoliberal world, then Loach and Sixteen Films are exemplary.

Bibliography

- Ancelotti, Carlo. (2016) *Quiet Leadership: winning hearts, minds and matches*. London: Penguin.
- Archibald, David. (2012). 'The Angels' Share at the 2012 Cannes Film Festival', *NECSUS: European Journal of Media Studies*, Volume 1, Number 2, Autumn 2012, pp. 299-305.

- Archibald, David. (2011). 'Reeling From Injustice', *Financial Times*. 26 August 2011.
- Bordwell, David, Staiger, Janet and Thompson, Kristin. (1985). *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, Polity Press: Cambridge
- Brandt, George W. (1981). *British Television Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, James M. (1978). *Leadership*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Caughie, John. (2007) 'Authors and auteurs: the uses of theory' in Donald, J. and Renov, M. (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Film Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 408-423.
- Caughie, John. (ed.) (1981). *Theories of Authorship*. London: Routledge.
- Corliss, Richard. (2008). 'Notes on a Screenwriter's Theory, 1973' in *auteurs and authorship: a film reader*, Malden: Blackwell, pp. 140-147.
- Corrigan, Timothy. (1990). 'The Commerce of Auteurism: A Voice without Authority' in *New German Critique*, Winter 1990, pp. 43-57.
- Cowan, Philip. (2012). 'Authorship and the Director of Photography: A Case Study of Gregg Toland and *Citizen Kane*' in *Networking Knowledge*, 5 (1), pp. 231-245.
- Ezra, Elizabeth. (2000), *Georges Méliès: The Birth of the Auteur*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Ferguson, Alex. (2015). *Leading*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Fuller, George. (1998). *Loach on Loach*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Garnett, Tony. (2016). *The Day the Music Died: A Memoir*. London: Constable.
- Gaut, Berys. (1997). 'Film Authorship and Collaboration', in *Film Theory and Philosophy*, Richard Allen, R. and Smith. M. (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goss, Brian Michael. (2009). *Global Auteurs: Politics in the Films of Almodóvar, von Trier, and Winterbottom*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Grant, Catherine. (2000). 'www.auteur.com?' in *Screen*, 41 (1), pp. 101-108.
- Grant, Catherine. (2008). 'Auteur machines? Auteurism and the DVD', in Bennett, James and Brown, Tom (eds) *Film and Television After DVD*. London: Routledge, pp. 101-15.
- Hayward, Anthony. (2004). *Which Side Are You On? Ken Loach and His Films*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Hill John. (2011). *Ken Loach: The Politics of Film and Television*. Palgrave/BFI: London.
- Hjort, Mette. (2010) 'On the plurality of cinematic transnationalism', *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, Newman, K. E. and Durovicová, N., New York & London, Routledge, pp. 13-33.
- Hunter, Aarron. (2016). *Authoring Hal Ashby: The Myth of the New Hollywood Auteur*, Bloomsbury: London
- Jones, Huw. D. (2016). 'UK/European Co-productions: The Case of Ken Loach' in *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, Volume 13 Issue 3, pp. 368-389.
- Keith Grant, B. (2008). *auteurs and authorship: a film reader*, Blackwell: Malden.
- Lacey, Stephen. (2012). *Tony Garnett*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Leigh, Jacob. (2002). *The Cinema of Ken Loach: Art in the Service of the People*. London: Wallflower.
- Mayer, Vicki, Banks, Miranda J. and Thornton Caldwell, John. (2009). *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*, New York and London: Routledge.
- McKnight, George. (1997). *Agent of Challenge and Defiance: The Films of Ken Loach*. Trowbridge: Flicks Books
- Macnab, George. (2016). 'Ken Loach: keeper of the flame' in *Screen Daily*, 13 June 2016.
- Neale, Stephen. (1981). 'Art Cinema as Institution', in *Screen* 22 (1), pp. 11-39.
- Ostrowska, Dorota. (2010). 'Magic, Emotions And Film Producers: Unlocking The "Black-Box" Of Film Production', *Wide Screen*, Vol 2, Issue 2, pp. 1-9.
- Powdermaker, Hortense. (1951). *Hollywood The Dream Factory: An Anthropologist looks at the Movies*, London: Secker and Warburg.
- Presence, Steve and Spicer, Andrew H. (2016). 'Autonomy and dependency in two successful film and television companies: An analysis of RED Production Company and warp Films', *Film Studies*, 14 (1). pp. 5-31.
- Rosten, Leo. (1941). *Hollywood, the Movie Colony, the Movie Makers*, New York: Harcourt.
- Sellors, C. Paul. (2010). *Film Authorship: Auteurs and Other Myths*. London: Wallflower.
- Sellors, C. Paul. (2007). 'Collective Authorship in Film', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. Volume 65, Issue 3, Summer 2007, pp. 263–271.

Schatz, Thomas. (1988). *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era*. New York: Pantheon

Thornton Caldwell, John. (2013). 'Para-Industry: Researching Hollywood's Blackwaters' in *Cinema Journal* 52 (3), Spring 2013, pp. 157-164.

Thornton Caldwell, John. (2008). *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Weber, Max. (1948). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. Translated and edited by Gerth, Hans and Mills, Charles Wright. New York and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Willis, Andy. (2009). 'Jim Allen: Radical Drama Beyond *Days of Hope*', in *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 5 (2), pp. 300-317.

¹ This chapter is part of a larger study into Loach's production practices. The research has been funded by the University of Glasgow's John Robertson Bequest, The Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland and the Royal Society of Edinburgh. I am grateful to Ken Loach, Rebecca O'Brien, Paul Laverty, all at Sixteen Films, and Pascal Caucheteux at Why Not for their assistance in facilitating this research.

² I employ the term 'filmmaking' to refer to the production of both film and television outputs.

³ For a fuller account of Loach's record at Cannes see David Archibald, '*The Angels' Share* at the 2012 Cannes Film Festival'.

⁴ Interview with the author. Partially published as 'Reeling From Injustice' in *Financial Times*, 26 August 2011.

⁵ Loach had been a Labour Party member since the early sixties although his membership lapsed in the mid-1990s. The demand for a new left-of-centre political formation was raised once more in 2013, this time beyond the world of cinema, when he co-founded Left Unity. Following Jeremy Corbyn's election as Leader of the Labour Party in 2015, Loach directed *In Conversation with Jeremy Corbyn* (Loach, 2016), a sympathetic documentary account of Corbyn's leadership. In more recent years Loach has refused the label 'Marxist', arguing that it gets in the way of the ideas, although at the 2012 Cannes Film Festival press conference of *The Angels' Share*, Loach argued, in classical Marxist terms, that 'workers are the agents of change' but added, 'we need movements not leaders.'

⁶ *Perdition* was due to be performed at the Royal Court Theatre in 1987 but was pulled by the theatre's Artistic Director, Max Stafford Clark, amidst accusations that the play was anti-Semitic. Loach and Allen vigorously contest these accusations.

⁷ For further early work in this area, see also Leo Rosten, *Hollywood, the Movie Colony, the Movie Makers*.

⁸ In *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*, David Bordwell, Kristin Thompson and Janet Staiger also downplay the director's significance in the studio system.

⁹ See Stephen Lacy's *Tony Garnett*, particularly chapter one, 'From actor to producer: into the driving seat', pp. 11-33.

¹⁰ Interview with the author. Partially published as 'Reeling From Injustice' in *Financial Times*, 26 August 2011. Menges had worked as assistant to the Czech cinematographer Miroslav Ondříček on *If ...*, (Lindsay Anderson, 1968). Loach cites the Czech New Wave as an important influence and *Ostře sledované vlaky/Closely Observed Trains* (Menzel, 1966) as a favourite film.

¹¹ For an account of the cinematographer as auteur see Philip Cowan's 'Authorship and the Director of Photography: A Case Study of Gregg Toland and *Citizen Kane*'

¹² Ferguson suggests in football leadership the task 'was to make everyone understand that the impossible was possible' (2015: 239). In offering a 'leader as visionary' position it would be possible

to contrast football's leader/manager dichotomy with cinema's *auteur/metteur en scène* division with the latter, for Bazin, a director, lacking a 'truly personal style' (quoted in Caughie, 1981: 23).

¹³ BFI Loach Archive. File KCL-19

¹⁴ For a variety of reasons, Loach's output from the late sixties to the late eighties was intermittent. See Hill (2011) for the most comprehensive account of his work until *Route Irish* (2010).

¹⁵ BFI Loach Archive. File KCL-19

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ In contrast to the censorship problems Loach encountered with his documentary work in the eighties, *The Spirit of '45* received widespread cinematic distribution, emblematic of Sixteen Film's international success

¹⁸ <http://www.sixteenfilms.co.uk/people/> [last accessed 24 December 2016]

¹⁹ This interview is available to view at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TZ3Q8gmhuH0> [last accessed 20 December 2016].

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Interview with author on the set of *The Angels' Share*.

²² This is evident, for instance, on the publicity posters for *Jimmy's Hall*.

²³ Space precludes a study of actors to this process, although, with a few minor exceptions, Loach does not use the same actors on a regular basis.

²⁴ Interview with author on set of *The Angels' Share*

²⁵ Interview with author during the edit of *The Angels' Share*.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Interview with author in Paris, August, 2015.

²⁸ Why Not do have an involvement in Sixteen Films' production process. For instance, during my research they visited *The Angel's Share* set in Glasgow and attended a rough cut of the screening in London. According to Caucheteux, however, their involvement is light-touch: although they can comment on draft scripts and rough cuts, he states, 'we are not going to give Ken Loach a lesson in filmmaking' [Interview with author in Paris].

²⁹ Interview with author on set of *The Angels' Share*

³⁰ Interview with the author. Partially published as 'Reeling From Injustice' in *Financial Times*, 26 August 2011.

³¹ Available to view at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XnsQw5gG3Nk> [last accessed 3 January 2017]