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ABSTRACT

This research explores the interactions and cooperation between public-sector, business-sector, and civil-society stakeholders in developing British film policy for educational and cultural purposes. In particular, it elucidates why and how governmental authorities, film-industry organisations, and educationalists collaborated to establish three key institutions: the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC) in the 1910s and the 1920s, the British Film Institute (BFI) in the 1920s and the 1930s, and the Children’s Film Foundation (CFF) in the 1940s and 1950s. By doing so, this thesis explores and theorises a new model of British film policy characterised by the state-market-civic partnerships, which is a topic that has been underexamined in the existing literature.

To analyse the interactions between these stakeholders, I employ the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), which offers an analytical approach to explain the creation of public policy by examining coalitions of individuals and organisations with shared beliefs. To examine coalition-making processes and the impacts of these coalitions, I collected and consulted relevant historical resources published by the aforementioned stakeholders, including unpublished archival materials regarding the governing boards and the advisory councils of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF.

The process of building advocacy coalitions began with initiatives by film-industry organisations and educationalists as policy entrepreneurs. Following these initiatives, policy brokers facilitated cooperation between these diverse actors by reconciling their initial tensions and helping them to create a consensus. The advocacy coalitions expanded further by involving public authorities, including the Home Office, the Board of Trade, and the Board of Education, who offered public aid and committed to these institutions’ governance. These advocacy coalitions brought about coherent national film censorship, greater support for educational and cultural films, and the increased production of and wider circulation for children’s films.

This thesis also identifies and articulates emerging themes in the history of British film policy. First, the balanced involvement of stakeholders was pivotal in forming effective advocacy coalitions and the development of key institutions. Such partnerships of public, business, and civic sector actors underpin the British style of cultural policy, conceptualised as the arm’s-length model. Second, from the 1910s to the 1950s, common beliefs about children and the cinema changed significantly, so the children’s films were conceptualised as a culturally significant category to promote. Finally, the thesis elucidates the contributions of private business to the development of film policy for educational and cultural purposes in Britain, including funding, consultancy, and active negotiation with public authorities and civic sector associations.
**List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBFC</td>
<td>British Board of Film Censors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI</td>
<td>British Film Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>Children’s Film Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>Children’s Entertainment Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFF</td>
<td>Children’s Film Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPM</td>
<td>National Council of Public Morals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>Kinematograph Renters’ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMA</td>
<td>Kinematograph Manufacturers Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This thesis adopts a historical perspective in analysing the cooperation and interactions between public-sector, business-sector, and civil-society stakeholders regarding the creation and implementation of British film policy for educational and cultural purposes (educational and cultural film policy). In particular, this thesis elucidates why and how governmental authorities, film-industry associations, and civil-sector actors, including educationalists, collaborated from the 1910s to the 1950s to institutionalise key organisations in the British film policy: the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC), the British Film Institute (BFI), and the Children’s Film Foundation (CFF). As a sub-theme, in the case studies, the thesis also explores the role of private business in formulating film policy for educational and cultural purposes. As an introduction, this chapter outlines the research questions, the central theme, and the sub-theme of the thesis. Other issues addressed in the introduction include the definitions of key terms regarding educational and cultural film policy, the comparative historical research approach employed in this thesis, the significance of the cases selected (the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF), and the structure and projected contributions of the research.

1.2 Research Questions

The research themes to be explored in this thesis are as follows:

- Main Theme: Why and how did public authorities, the film industry, educationalists and other civil-sector actors interact and cooperate in formulating cultural policy for British
film at three historical moments (the creation of the BBFC in the pre-war (WWI) period, the BFI in the interwar period, and the CFF in the post-war (WWII) period)?

- Sub-Theme: What roles did the film business play in formulating these film policies?

The main theme and sub-theme are closely related because investigating the interactions between the state, the market, and civil society contributes to understanding the roles of private business in these interactions. Moreover, an empirical study on the initiatives of the film business in the constructive development of the state-market-civic partnership in British film policy has rarely been explored by cultural-policy scholars. This thesis explores the above research themes by investigating the creation and the effects of coalitions of stakeholders in public, business and civic sectors (advocacy coalitions) in making of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. The thesis examines the following questions:

1. Who were the state, market, and civil society stakeholders that made advocacy coalitions for the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF from 1912 to 1952?
2. How were these stakeholders involved in the process of making the advocacy coalitions?
3. What were the effects of the advocacy coalitions involving these stakeholders and their cooperation?
4. How can the process of making advocacy coalitions and their effects involving these stakeholders can be compared the three periods in question?

This thesis aims to explore (1) the stakeholders, (2) the processes, (3) the impacts of the advocacy coalitions based on the state-market-civic partnerships, and discuss (4) the emerging themes identified in the comparison of the advocacy coalitions in the three historical moments. In this way,
this thesis not only discusses the making of the advocacy coalitions but also their impacts on educational and cultural film policies.

1.3 Terminology

The triangle model in the formation of media policy presented by Flew, Iosifidis, and Steemers (2016) provides a valuable starting point to map the relevant stakeholders and keywords and define the scope of the thesis. These authors conceptualised the three most prominent sectors in media policy: ‘the state (the core executive), the market (private and business actors including the media) and civil society (voluntary and community sector actors)’ (Flew, Iosifidis and Steemers 2016, p. 7). The division of stakeholders into these three categories has been applied in existing research on cultural policy in general and film policy in particular, both of which involve private businesses, policymakers, and non-commercial actors (e.g., Mingant and Tirtaine 2018).

While the public sector is comprised exclusively of political authorities, the private sector includes both the market and civil society (see Figure 1). In the field of film policy, civil society includes non-commercial organisations (e.g., groups of educationalists and film critics) and their activities, which are investigated in the scholarship on British film culture and British film history (e.g., Curran and Porter 1983; Gledhill 2003; Harper and Porter 2003; Low 1979a; Low 1979b, Low 1985; Napper 2009; Sexton 2002, Turvey 2022; Wasson 2002). Moreover, trade organisations, private companies, and individual filmmakers are key market actors that, in film-policy scholarship, are often synonymous with trade or business (e.g., Low 1979b; Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly 2015). Civil society refers to individuals and associations working in the private sector outside the state and market. It includes educationalists, other civil associations, and intellectuals who concern themselves with British film and its related policies.
In this thesis, the term **educationalists** refers to individuals and associations involved in school-based education or educational policy in general. Educationalists include individuals such as schoolteachers, university professors, and the governors of local education committees. The term also encompasses organisations such as the Headteachers’ Association, Local Education Committees, and the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films. It should be noted that the term educationalists refers not only to classroom teachers but also to those who discuss and shape educational policy, such as advisers and opinion leaders. **Educational film** refers to a category of film utilised for educational purposes. The genre includes both classroom films exclusively made for school projection (e.g., documentary films used in classroom curricula) and commercial films that are considered to possess educational value by the stakeholders (e.g., Saturday matinee programmes for children in commercial theatres). Chapters 4 and 5 of the thesis (case studies about
the BFI and the CFF) discuss policymakers’ focus on children’s films as a major policy target to be discussed as part of the emerging genre of educational film. Educational and cultural film policy refers to a series of film policies primarily concerned with the non-commercial, educational, and cultural impacts of film. This policy includes not only film policy exclusively directed toward academic education but also film policy whose targets and outcomes can be related to commercial film programmes. This is because these policies were discussed and developed to enhance the education, cultivation, and improvement of the audience. In this vein, all three case studies in this thesis (censorship, the national film institute, and children’s film production) are counted as examples of educational and cultural film policy because their advocates and policymakers are expected to utilise these organisations to achieve their educational and cultural missions.

The terms ‘educational’ and ‘cultural’ are combined to define this genre of film policy because these two concepts were closely intertwined with both each other and the film policy examined in this thesis. Education through film was expected to contribute to the improvement and sophistication of British film, and film policy for cultural purposes was conceptualised as educational activities initiated by public authorities or those with educational missions. The overlap between the educational and cultural spheres is evidenced by the name of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films, which was established in 1929 to launch the creation of the British Film Institute in the 1930s. In considering the nature of educational and film policy, this thesis also aims to demonstrate the cooperation from the film industry in realising these policies for non-commercial goals (a sub-theme of the thesis). Indeed, the findings of this study reveal that the film industry was more than an agent of the marketisation, privatisation, or commercialisation of film culture.
1.4 Research Approach: Comparative Historical Research

In this thesis, a comparative historical approach is employed in order to investigate and compare cases from different historical periods and places to shape generalised arguments. In analysing the history of British film policy, I explore multiple cases representing critical moments and examine their similarities and differences. Such a research methodology is therefore valuable for constructing a general theory of the interactions and cooperation between state, market, and civil society stakeholders. To justify the effectiveness of this research method, the following questions should be answered:

1. Why is historical research used to consider state-market-civil interactions in cultural policy?
2. Why is the comparative approach used to analyse different historical moments?

In answering the first question, Pickard (2019) presents a useful explanation of the rationale behind historical research:

My historical research strives to bring into focus a ‘history of the present’ to highlight the politics and discourses around media infrastructures that hold much contemporary relevance for debates ranging from net neutrality to the future of journalism. By retracing policy trajectories, ideas and discourses to a moment before received assumptions about media’s role in society took on an air of inevitability, we can historicize this ‘how did we get here’ question. This kind of project denaturalizes current media policies. It shows that the status quo was the result of conflict where certain interests, values and logics, won out over others. (Pickard 2019, p. 509)

Although Pickard presents his methodology within the context of media policy research and can also face the criticisms of presentism (i.e., applying present-day viewpoints to the past and assuming that the past is only interpretable from these viewpoints), his discussion is applicable to other fields, including cultural policy studies. His explanation illuminates two significant
contributions made by historiography. First, historical research can indicate the trajectory of current conditions. Because my thesis delineates the history of extant film-policy institutions such as the classification system and the BFI, it directly contributes to the further understanding of the context of contemporary film policy. This approach of understanding the policy by exploring institutional history has been developed as historical institutionalism in public policy studies (Bennett and Checkel 2015; Blyth, Helgadottir and Kring 2016; Hall 2016; Pearson 2016; Thelen and Conran 2016). Second, and more importantly, historical research can present divergent cases within different contexts. Considering the state-market-civic relations in cultural policy, the existing scholarship, concerned as it is with neoliberal cultural policy, tends to view private business as an agent of commodifying and marketising forces that undermine the public sector and civil society. However, historical research invites us to understand the role of private business in forming cultural policy as something more than just representing the interests of the market. Rather, it also reveals ways for public-, business-, and civic-sector stakeholders to engage more productively and beneficially with cultural policy. As such, historical research broadens our understanding of the public-private relationship in cultural policy.

In terms of the second question, the comparative approach is helpful in exploring the diverse practices and histories of cultural policy and developing more generalised arguments. By employing the comparative approach, I can address the long history of British film policy and form more generalised conclusions regarding the research questions. Furthermore, as Sewell (1967) claims by referring to Marc Bloch, the comparative approach helps scholars to identify vital causes and conditions that can be overlooked by a single case study. Of course, every case is deeply rooted in its historical context, and historians are somewhat reluctant to construct general arguments based on their historical research. However, it is still valuable to consider broader periods and
suggest a theoretical model to explain the long history of British cultural policy because of the insights that can be gleaned regarding the tradition of the state-market-civic partnership. The theories presented in the thesis should certainly be challenged and revised based on further historical research. Nevertheless, producing a conceptual model that incorporates history represents a significant milestone in the development of cultural-policy scholarship, which tends to focus almost exclusively on the contemporary debate.

1.5 The Case Selection

In order to implement the comparative historical research, this thesis consists of case studies concerning the creation and early development of three institutions: the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC) in the 1910s and 1920s, the British Film Institute (BFI) in the 1920s and 1930s, and the Children’s Film Foundation (CFF) in the 1940s and 1950s. These organisations formed a significant portion of Britain’s film policy infrastructure because they fostered and influenced the production, distribution, and exhibition of British film. They also addressed the preservation and promotion of the infrastructure’s commercial and educational variety (including school and children’s cinema). The institutionalisation of film censorship by the BBFC in 1912 was one of the earliest cases of government intervention in the film industry. The BBFC, which has since been renamed the British Board of Film Classification, classifies films based on their content. The BFI was established in 1933 to promote the educational and cultural merits of film. To achieve its goals, in the 1930s, the BFI principally contributed to the promotion of film for non-commercial uses (Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012; Paterson 2017). The CFF was formulated as a non-profit organisation in 1951 in reaction to a government report indicating the inadequate supply of films
suitable for young audiences. Until it was abolished in 1985, the CFF provided financial support for the production of short films for children.

I investigate the cases by focusing on the moments when these institutions were conceived, designed, and established because the complex interactions between the stakeholders in both public and private sectors were most clearly evident in these moments of institutionalisation. These stakeholders became actively involved in the policymaking process in order to develop new institutions that reflected their interests and goals. I cover approximately four years of each period, ranging from the initial proposals of the institutions to the point of their full establishment. Table 1 summarises the policymaking stakeholders and the historical sources analysed.

Table 1.1: Overview of the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>Key Historical Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The British Board of Film Censors (BBFC)</td>
<td>• The Home Office&lt;br&gt;• Film industry organisations (such as the Kinematograph Manufacturers Association, the Kinematograph Renters Society (KRS), and the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association (CEA))&lt;br&gt;• Educationalists calling for national censorship (such as associations of headmasters and headmistresses, directors of education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The British Film Institute (BFI)</td>
<td>• The Privy Council, the Board of Education&lt;br&gt;• Educationalists in the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films&lt;br&gt;• Film industry organisations (such as the KRS, and the CEA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Research Contributions

Drawing on historical findings from the selected case studies, this thesis contributes to broadening and substantiating our understanding of cultural policy by conceptualising a new model of British cultural policy underpinned by state-market-civic partnerships. Based on a binary understanding of the state versus market, existing research has yet to fully capture the interactions of relevant stakeholders in the public, business and civic sectors. On one hand, the preceding literature of traditional cultural policy has tended to illustrate British cultural policy as a non-interventionalist, arm’s length model, emphasising independence from the state authorities (Ridley 1987; Upchurch 2004, 2016). On the other, prior research has also described private business as an agent in commodifying and privatising culture (Alexander 2007, 2008, 2017, 2018; Gray 2000, 2007) or in promoting neoliberal ideology (Caust 2003; Hesmondhalgh, Nisbett, Oakley and Lee 2015a, 2015b; McGuigan 2003, 2004, 2005, 2016). These writings described how private business with market-oriented ideologies undermined the civic and public sectors, critically problematising the
dominance of these ideologies in cultural policymaking. In contrast, this thesis aims to delineate that the stakeholders in state, market and civil society closely interacted with each, and their cooperation characterised the constructive development of cultural policy in Britain. By doing so, this thesis reveals how autonomy from the public authorities in film policies was facilitated and realised by the commitment of private sector actors (both private business and educationalists) and offers a more nuanced understanding of the role of private business in developing cultural policy.

For that purpose, this thesis utilises a variety of historical materials and case studies that have been overlooked in existing research on British cultural policy. Historical research is a valuable methodological and intellectual approach, however, in contrast to the ample scholarship regarding contemporary cultural policy, few studies have examined historical issues (e.g., Hewison 1995; Minihan 1977; Upchurch 2011, 2013, 2016). For instance, Minihan’s book, The Nationalization of Culture (1977), made significant contributions to the field by exploring the history of public support for the arts in Britain from the beginning of the 19th century to the 1950s. Upchurch (2011, 2013, 2016) also described the largely overlooked history of British cultural policy by scrutinising interwar and post-war public records. However, beyond these publications, historical analysis has not been fully explored as a methodological approach in cultural policy studies, and many significant issues remain uninvestigated. This thesis, therefore, further develops the historical approach to cultural policy by addressing the history of educational and cultural film policy in Britain.

Furthermore, this thesis aims to contribute to scholarship on British film policy as well by employing new archival materials and closely examining overlooked stakeholders and their influences in shaping policy. As Chapter 2 comprehensively reviews, there are substantive volumes of existing scholarship on the history of British film and British film policy (e.g., Hill
(1996, 2004, 2012, 2016), Hunter, Porter and Smith eds. (2017), Low (1950, 1979a, 1979b, 1985), Murphy (1992), Street and Dickinson (1985) for the overview of the history of the British film policy; Brett (2017), Hunnings (1967), Kuhn (1988), Lamberti (2019), Mathews (1994), Robertson (1989), Rock (2017), and Trevelyan (1983) for the history of the BBFC; Butler (1971), Dupin (2006), Nowell-Smith and Dupin (2012), and Paterson (2017) for the BFI; Agajanian (1998), Brown (2017), Roberts (2017), Shail (2016), Smith (2005), and Staples (1997) for the history of the CFF). Adding to this scholarly investigation, this thesis explores the making of these institutions from a fresh perspective by applying the advocacy coalition framework. Particularly, it spotlights new stakeholders (e.g., the members of the Advisory Councils of the BFI and the CEF; the film-industry organisations in the BFI and CFF) and examines overlooked activities of these stakeholders contained in underexplored archival resources (e.g., the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre; the BFI Special Collection). In doing so, the thesis delineates the active cooperation between public, business and civic sector actors who formed the advocacy coalitions and contributed to making educational and cultural film policies between the 1910s and the 1950s.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is comprised of seven chapters. Following the introduction, Chapter 2 provides a focused literature review and describes the theoretical framework and research methods employed in the thesis. The literature review demonstrates how preceding scholarship has explored the history of British film policy based on the commerce-culture dichotomy and explains how my examination of the history of state-market-civic cooperation can enrich the discussion of educational and cultural film policy. To explore the cooperation between these diverse stakeholders, I introduce the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) as a theoretical structure to
map and conceptualise the roles of advocacy coalitions in formulating and implementing public policy. The final section of Chapter 2 explains my research methodology. This section details how historical materials concerning the public, business, and civic sectors were collected from the National Archives, the British Library, the BFI Special Collection, the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre, and the BBFC Archive against the background of unprecedented COVID-19 outbreaks and lockdowns during my PhD studies.

Chapter 3 explores the history of the formation and development of an advocacy coalition for Britain’s film censorship agency, the BBFC, in the 1910s and the 1920s. The BBFC was established in 1912 as an independent organisation that conducted the censorship and classification of commercial films in Britain. It started as a collective action by film-industry organisations representing the production, distribution, and exhibition sectors. The BBFC governors and the film industry then actively expanded the coalition advocating for the BBFC by involving governmental departments and educationalists. The stereotypical view of the commercial film industry’s dominance of censorship resulted in the formation of an opposing advocacy coalition calling for state censorship. Against this backdrop, advocates for the BBFC demonstrated the usefulness and independence of their favoured institution and succeeded in acquiring support for the film industry, the Home Office, and educational associations, establishing the BBFC as a common standard for censorship. The constructive partnership between these stakeholders resulted in the autonomy of the BBFC from both state control and the commercial interests of the industry. This independence brought about the effective implementation of censorship and the legitimisation of film as an appropriately supervised activity. Additionally, the establishment of the BBFC’s advocacy coalition conditioned the formation of the film industry organisations (the Kinematograph Manufacturers Association, the Kinematograph Renters Society, and the Cinematograph
Exhibitors Association) that both represented the industry’s diverse interests and were crucial to the formulation of British film policy.

In Chapter 4, I investigate the early history of the BFI in the 1920s and 1930s from the perspectives of its advocacy partnership and the dialogue between the public, business, and civic stakeholders. Beginning with a policy proposal advanced by a group of educationalists, the BFI was formulated as a public authority promoting the educational and cultural value of film. Its primary concerns were encouraging the use of film for educational purposes, the promotion of children’s film, and publishing periodicals and journals to disseminate information regarding educational film among schoolteachers and film producers. To implement these diverse actions, the BFI needed the support and participation of the film industry. Therefore, the BFI’s advocates formulated a coalition involving both the film industry and educationalists by overcoming their initial tensions, hostilities, and mutual misunderstandings. The BFI also succeeded in including government departments as administrative partners and formed a broader advocacy coalition for the cultural and educational use of cinema that covered actors from the state, market, and civil society. The BFI in the interwar period contributed to realising and enhancing the close communication and cooperation between educationalists and the film industry’s agents by including both in its governing board and advisory panels. Their cooperation reinforced a shared belief that commercial and educational/cultural interests can be reconciled, resulting in a variety of initiatives that included a conference aiming at promoting children’s cinema and the publication of a catalogue of recommended children’s films in Britain.

Chapter 5 examines the history of the CFF, an innovative organisation that produces and researches special film programmes for children. This chapter also investigates its predecessors, Rank’s Children’s Film Department (CFD) and Children’s Entertainment Films (CEF), which
were established in the 1940s and 1950s, respectively. The CFF was established with support from the majority of the film industry, the public authorities, and educational and civil associations. Originating from the Rank Organisation’s private enterprise, the CFF was established as a public organisation funded and supported by diverse film industry organisations and the British government. The growth of the CFF derived from an advocacy coalition including the film industry, public authorities, and educationalists, with the efforts of policy entrepreneurs in the Rank’s Organisation and the members of the Advisory Council of the CFD and CEF, which allowed it to communicate closely with diverse stakeholders. Through an analysis of records from the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre, I demonstrate that such practices and campaigns to mediate and communicate with diverse stakeholders provided a crucial condition for the success of the CFF. The impacts of the CFF advocacy coalition include the growth of children’s film production, efficient production and exhibition of children’s film based on the support of the film-industry organisations, and the development of the audience research methodology to empirically study children’s reactions and tastes to produce more entertaining films for children.

Chapter 6 presents a theoretical discussion summarising and examining the key findings of the three case studies from a comparative perspective. This chapter systematically explores who constituted the advocacy coalitions as stakeholders in the public, business, and civic sectors; how the advocacy coalitions for the three institutions were initiated, established, and expanded; what impacts these advocacy coalitions supported through state-market-civic collaborations; and implications and limitations of the ACF as an analytical framework. It also examines the historical connections between these case studies by investigating the cross-cutting themes identified coalition members in different periods while elucidating the rarely considered connections between the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. The conceptual and theoretical discussion in this chapter
offers new insights into how cooperation between the public sector, the film industry, and the educational sector can be conceptualised in the field of cultural policy.

The conclusion summarises the research questions, findings, and implications and suggests future directions in which to expand explorations of advocacy coalitions and state-market-civic collaborations on cultural policy.
Chapter 2

Literature Review, Theoretical Framework, and Research Methodology

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter introduced the primary goal of this thesis, which is to explore the interaction and cooperation between stakeholders in the state, market, and civil society within the history of film policy in Britain. By illuminating the process of how these stakeholders formulated the coalition to realise educational and cultural film policy, this thesis demonstrates the complex and divergent relationships between the public authorities, private business, and civil society. A sub-theme of the thesis also challenges conventional understandings of private business in cultural policy studies. The sub-theme contests the typical description in British film-policy scholarship of the film industry as an exploitative and profit-oriented agency. In order to articulate my approach to these research goals and contextualise them within ongoing scholarly debates, this chapter offers a literature review, explains the theoretical framework, and articulates the research methodology of this thesis.

This chapter is structured as follows. Section 2.2 offers a literature review comprising three research agendas: a literature review on film policy as a research field, an overview of the literature on British film policy, and a review of the existing research on the BBFC, BFI, and CFF. By reviewing the relevant literature on British film policy, this section aims to demonstrate how my thesis topic (i.e., exploring the state-business-civic relationship and the cooperation through the Advocacy Coalition Framework) can contribute to existing research and create a new research
agenda. In Section 2.3, I introduce the Advocacy Coalition Framework as an analytical framework to comprehensively map relevant stakeholders and examine their relationships and interactions in shaping public policy. Section 2.4 explains the research methodology employed in empirically studying the advocacy coalitions in the three selected case studies. The chapter unpacks the relevant archival resources and historical materials utilised in this thesis and details how I completed the archival research during the unprecedented crisis caused by the COVID-19 outbreak.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 Conceptual frameworks in film policy research

2.2.1.1 Between commerce and culture: The ambiguous status of film

The most significant characteristic of film-policy studies is the researchers’ consciousness of the ambiguous status of film as being located between commerce and culture. Moran (1996) concisely summarised film’s ‘dualism of materiality and meaning, commerce and culture’ (p. 1). The ambiguous status of film between economic commodity and cultural expression means that film policy has involved both stakeholders who are interested in the economic value created by the film business and those who are attracted to film’s cultural representations. Therefore, research on film policy offers an ideal opportunity to investigate the negotiations and collaborations between private businesses and the public sector. Indeed, *Reconceptualising Film Policies*, edited by Mingant and Tirtaine (2018), referred to a distinction between the economic and cultural aspects of film and used this as an analytical framework to categorise several genres of film policy. Figure 1, which is from Mingant and Tirtaine (2018, p. 14), clearly demonstrates that the division between economic and cultural directions has recently been applied to provide an overview of film-policy scholarship.
By recognising the complicated status of film, researchers of British film policy have also highlighted the distinction between culturally oriented and economically driven film policies. For instance, in one of the most recent books on British film policy, Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly (2015) identified tensions between the economic and cultural motives of film policy by emphasising that the ‘industrial or economic focus on film policy has often been in tension with a more cultural or educational dimension regarding the value and worth of film in society’ (p. 5). Based on the recognition of such tension, Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle, and Kelly (2015) categorised several types of film policy as either economic or cultural. The BFI notably exemplifies ‘cultural’ film policy in their overview. However, I argue that such a dichotomist understanding of commerce and culture tends to conceal significant interactions between the economic value private businesses have attributed to film and the cultural value that the public and civil sectors have
sought. Once policy initiatives are framed as being ‘cultural’ and concerned with the non-commercial aspects of film, the film trade’s engagement with the initiative is commonly overshadowed. This problematic tendency can be identified in the conventional narrative of several film policies that I investigate in this thesis.

### 2.2.1.2 Division between the state, the market and civil society

The second underlying framework in film policy research is the identification and categorisation of various stakeholders. In theorising key stakeholders in film policy, Mingant and Tirtaine (2018) referred to the triangle model, which consists of the state, the market, and civil society, as presented by Flew, Iosifidis and Steemers (2016). Although these three sectors have been commonly studied in film policy research, Mingant and Tirtaine (2018) illuminated the problematic tendency of scholarly debate: ‘the multiple actors and conflicting agendas, however, are rarely the subjects of the academic studies’ (p. 6). As a result, in analysing cases, existing research has tended to highlight only one or two aspects of the triangle model’s groups and focus on a single category of actors in each study. For instance, in research on educational film policy, authors have tended to highlight civil-society actors (e.g., educationalists and intellectuals) while largely excluding those in the private business sector from their analysis (e.g., Southern (2016)). However, since the nature of film policy involves multiple stakeholders with both economic and cultural interests, it is critically important to examine the interactions between stakeholders from the public, business, and civil sectors. In this manner, the dynamics of creating film policy can be fully understood. The present thesis contributes to achieving this goal by investigating and analysing the constructive collaboration in formulating educational and cultural film policies between the film industry and other stakeholders, such as public authorities and educationalists.
2.2.1.3 Variety of film-policy measures

As previously discussed, due to the complicated nature of film, film policy represents the gathering of a series of policy measures on film. The third tendency in existing film-policy research is that it tends to treat such measures as separate fields of policy, which is exemplified by Mingant and Tirtaine’s (2018) film-policy division (Figure 1). Notably, the term ‘film policy’ covers a wide range of political issues related to film. Mingant and Tirtaine (2018) outlined this range as follows:

‘Film policy’ will be defined as any type of state intervention in any of the following key areas regarding film: development (film agency grants, film festival workshops, etc.), production (shooting and working permits, tax incentives, script censorship, etc.), distribution (rating systems, quotas, copyright, etc.), exhibition (box-office taxes, ticket price regulation, safety measures, etc.), promotion (film festivals, export agencies, official reports, etc.), and training and education (film schools, academic Film Studies departments, etc.), as well as preservation (cinematheques, national film centres, archives, etc.). (pp. 5–6)

While not comprehensive, their list highlights the numerous fields and genres of policy that can be included within film policy. However, due to the potentially vast scope of film policy, the literature has tended to focus on narrow categories of policy issues and a certain set of actors. In most of the existing literature, economic policies—including film funding and taxation—have been featured as the core field of British film policy, with private business being attached to these economic policies (e.g., Dickinson and Street 1985; Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly, 2015). However, this thesis seeks to broaden the scope of film policy by examining a series of public policies and stakeholders that have been marginalised in the extant literature.

Thus far, I have noted that prior research has been explicitly or implicitly based on three conventional frameworks regarding the nature of film, policy stakeholders, and film policy categories. These analytical frameworks occasionally overshadow the intersections and dynamic
interactions between the state, business, and civil actors. My thesis makes unique contributions to film-policy scholarship by highlighting and closely investigating the roles and interactions of these stakeholders in the history of film policy in Britain. In particular, this thesis represents the first academic study to illustrate the constructive partnership between the film industry and public/civic-sector actors in shaping educational and cultural film policy.

2.2.2 Research on British film policy

In examining the interactions between private businesses as well as public and civic actors in policymaking, British film policy provides valuable case studies. This is because the relevant stakeholders (i.e., those working in the state, market, and civil society) have long acknowledged both the economic and cultural values of film and have interacted with each other to formulate film policies since the beginning of the 20th century. As such, the history of British film policy illustrates tensions and collaborations between the aforementioned stakeholders. Nevertheless, as the detailed literature review in the following sections demonstrates, the preceding literature has not thoroughly investigated the coalition and collaboration of these stakeholders in this regard. Instead, previous studies have tended to be based on restricted views concerning the partnership between the film industry and other stakeholders. Moreover, previous research has focused on analysing the influence of market actors on limited numbers of policies directly related to trade interests, such as the establishment of the UK Film Council and the introduction of film quotas (Dickinson and Street 1985; Dickinson and Harvey 2005a; Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly 2015). Meanwhile, scant attention has been paid to the film industry’s contributions to supporting and designing educational and cultural film policies (e.g., film archives, film education, and production funding for non-commercial films). In this context, private businesses have been
explicitly or implicitly understood as an external threat to the values of film culture (Low 1979b; Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012).

However, the history of British film policy reveals evidence of the broader activities of state-business-civic partnerships in cultural and educational policies related to film. For instance, the BFI’s publications have repeatedly acknowledged the support and understanding of private companies as a necessary condition for its activities, such as the creation of its film archives. Moreover, several key figures linked to film policy, such as Mary Field, the director of the CFF, were appointed and supported by the Rank Organisation, which was one of the most influential and representative film companies of the 1950s (Roberts 2017). More importantly, one of the most historic cultural policies—film censorship—was initiated in Britain by trade organisations such as the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association (Mathews 1994). These historical events imply that private companies and film industry organisations supported public projects encouraging the cultural and educational uses of cinema, which has not been fully accounted for in existing research.

2.2.2.1 Literature on the history of British film policy until 1979

The preceding historiography of British film policy provides important overviews and analyses of the history of British film policy. The first generation of research on film policy was published from 1945 to the 1980s (Butler 1971; Dickinson 1983; Dickinson and Street 1985; Hartog 1983; Low 1950, 1979a, 1979b, 1985) and aimed to provide an overview of film policy over a broad period and describe its long-term trends. The two most characteristic works of this era are Cinema and State: The British Film Industry and the British Government 1927–1984 by Margaret Dickinson and Sarah Street (1985) and The History of British Cinema series by Rachael Low (1950, 1979a, 1979b, 1985). In addition to these works, Ivan Butler (1971) published a monograph
focusing on the development of the BFI that highlighted the importance of scholarly attention to this organisation.

Notably, most of these historical works were based on a dichotomic understanding of the public/private sectors and the cultural/economic aspects of film. The approach and historiography of Dickinson and Street (1985) exemplified this tendency since they clarified that the policies they examined were confined to ‘the economic management and control of the film business’ (p. 1). Dickinson and Street (1985) clearly identified film’s ambiguous status in standing between the economic and cultural realms, noting that these two aspects co-exist in the practice of policymaking and the academic debate on film policy. However, they argued that governmental interventions in the economic and cultural aspects of film are distinct, with their research focusing on the former group of policies and defining the scope of their writing. As a consequence, they allocated the majority of Cinema and State to the investigation of explicitly economic and industrial policies, including the Cinematograph Films Acts and trade negotiations with the US. In examining the creation of these industrial policies, Dickinson and Street (1985) scrutinised the roles of private businesses (e.g., interest groups and individual filmmakers). It should be stressed that their investigation into industrial and economic film policies made a significant and unique contribution to the understanding of film policy in Britain; however, they did not investigate the series of film policies that focused on film’s cultural aspects. As a result, their research overlooked the interactions between stakeholders with commercial and cultural goals, which, in reality, were critical to constructing film policies that emphasised the cultural value of film.

This thesis aims to examine such neglected interactions between the film industry and public/civic actors in formulating film policies with cultural and educational goals. Conversely, as exemplified by the film trade’s affirmative reaction to—and support for—the BFI, the coalitions
involving both the film industry and other non-commercial actors have frequently played a significant role in developing non-commercial film culture through actively taking part in policymaking. Dickinson and Street explain the activities of private actors in creating these policies as simply profit-seeking measures to exploit non-commercial film culture. However, these private actors also attempted to influence the development of culturally oriented film policy, with their motivation being far more complex than this simple description of economic interest. As the re-examination of the BFI in the following section indicates, the maximisation of capital gains was not the film industry’s sole motivation; instead, it also attempted to enhance the cultural and artistic values of British film by supporting and involving itself in the development of policies concerning film’s cultural and educational elements. Therefore, the dichotomic understanding of economic and cultural values, as well as the public and private sectors, cannot fully cover the complicated goals and activities of private businesses in the film industry.

Researchers subsequently presented detailed examinations of British film policy by focusing on case studies of specific historical moments (Brett 2017; Drazin 2017; Fenwick 2017; Glancy 2000; Gruner 2012; McIntyre 1996; Porter 2001; Stubbs 2009). The publication of edited volumes such as *The Routledge Companion to British Cinema History* (Hunter, Porter and Smith 2017) and *The British Cinema Book* (Murphy 2009) represent significant milestones and cover a wide range of issues. Although these volumes allocated more pages to describing the film industry and film culture than to analysing film policy, they nevertheless provided further information concerning British film policies through detailed case studies. A key characteristic of this type of research is a focus on specific time periods and institutions, which contrasts starkly with preceding historiographies addressing broader periods and aiming to present the full history of British cinema. While exploring each institution and period in detail and revealing the unique activities of their
subjects, recent publications have tended to avoid describing the long-term trajectory of British film policy or conceptualising its common tendencies. Furthermore, these case studies neither challenged nor updated the established understandings of film’s polarised economic and cultural policies and the divergence between public and private sectors.

In the 2010s, a new group of researchers began to analyse historical materials from comparative perspectives (Caterer 2011; Hill 2016; Sithigh 2014), using historical cases as references to issues regarding contemporary film policy. For instance, by drawing on a comparative study of film production funding from the 1950s and the 1990s, Caterer (2011) explained the inefficiency and failure of film support schemes in different periods by comparing their divergent backgrounds and historical paths. One of the latest and most influential examples of a comparative historical approach is the long-term tracing of the legal definition of British film by Hill (2016), who summarised the goal and approach of his comparative history as follows:

By focusing on the changing legal definitions of a ‘British’ film, and the ways in which they have been implemented, this article also suggests how, from the 1920s onwards, there has been a degree of acceptance of the British film industry’s dependence upon Hollywood involvement and thus a degree of ambiguity in the way in which a ‘British’ film has been defined (and how ‘national’ film policies have been pursued) (p. 719).

Hill’s argument is a clear example of a comparative historical approach in which the long-term trends and hidden continuities of film policy are identified by tracing the similarities of key policies in different periods (a similar approach is also employed in Hill (1996)). By conceptualising the definition of the nationality of British film, the author discovered a common strategy of attracting Hollywood investment that has persisted throughout different periods of British film history. Hill’s approach to reviewing this long history and identifying the fundamental issues and themes underpinning British film policy inspired me to explore three case studies from the 1910s, 1930s,
and 1950s in this thesis. Additionally, the existing comparative historical research has tended to focus on the analysis of policy outcomes and their evaluations by treating policy as a finished product. However, such research has paid scant attention to the process of formulating policy—including the raising of policy ideas, agenda setting, policy debate, and the selection of policy options—and the negotiations among various actors during this process. Therefore, this thesis aims to closely investigate the policymaking process rather than its policy outcomes.

Table 2.1: Categorisation of film policy in the existing historical research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Economic policy for film</th>
<th>Cultural policy for film</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characterisation of film</td>
<td>Economic commodity</td>
<td>Cultural representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key actors highlighted in the research</td>
<td>The film business, industrial organisations, and the trade department (i.e., the Board of Trade)</td>
<td>Non-commercial actors, including educationalists, scientists, and film artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Cinematograph Films Acts (1927 and 1938); The National Film Finance Corporation (1949)</td>
<td>The BFI (1933–present); Film censorship (1912–present)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1 summarises the division between the two groups of historiographies in existing research. The first group studied the economic policies exemplified by the Cinematograph Film Acts. Further, in examining such legislations and policies, the researchers paid close attention to the film industry and the governmental organisations representing trade interests, such as the Board of Trade (e.g., Caterer 2011; Dickinson and Street 1985; Hill 1996). The researchers explained negotiations between the government and the film business in terms of an economic process while tending to regard the cultural arguments used to justify these policies as merely rhetorical. The
second group focused on studying the cultural policies regarding British film, which primarily involved describing the roles and activities of the public institutions themselves (e.g., Butler 1971; Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012). They tended to exhibit little interest in the role of the private sector—particularly that of the film industry. Indeed, even when the industry was mentioned, its activities were mostly characterised as hostile pressure from outside the cultural organisations. In the existing debate, the concept of negotiation and collaboration between the film industry and other stakeholders in the civil and public sectors has, therefore, not been fully explored. This thesis aims to fill this gap by investigating the collaborative relationship between the public and private sectors in constructing a series of film policies whose primary concerns were the educational and cultural value of film.

2.2.2.2 Literature on contemporary film policy (1980–present)

Researchers have explored contemporary film policy since the 1980s to explain how the current situation surrounding British cinema developed. They emphasised the fact that since the 1980s, British film policy has experienced a drastic shift triggered by the emergence of neoliberalism, which is defined as follows:

Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices (Harvey 2007, p. 2).

While this thesis mainly highlights and explores the constructive and cooperative relations of the stakeholders in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, the relationships of these stakeholders were occasionally confrontational or competitive, particularly when they discussed new policy ideas at the initial stage of the policymaking process. This thesis also covers tensions and confrontations among these stakeholders by closely investigating the policymaking processes. Nevertheless, the selected case studies reveal that these tensions and conflicts were dissolved by the interactive process of communication and coalition-building, resulting in the fruitful development of educational and cultural film policies.
Neoliberalism is commonly understood as the dominance of a market logic that vindicates the shrinking of the public sector. In Britain, concerns regarding neoliberalism have notably shaped the debate and implementation of film policy, if not cultural policy, broadly. Researchers have identified a radical shift in film policy since the 1980s and have investigated the market-driven policy measures taken by different governments to understand the rationales behind this ongoing shift. These researchers have investigated the film policies of Conservative governments in the 1980s and 1990s (Cater 2007; Hill 1993, 1996; McIntyre 1996; Praten and Dean 2000), the New Labour government (Caterer 2011; Dickinson and Harvey 2005a, 2005b; Garnham 2005; Hill 2004; Magor and Schlesinger 2009; Miller 2015), and the Conservative government in power since the 2010s (Hill 2012, 2016; Hill and Kawashima 2016; Newsinger 2012a, 2012b; Steele 2015), as well as specific institutions, such as the BFI (Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012) and the UK Film Council (Cateridge 2017; Doyle 2014; Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly 2015; Kelly 2016).

To summarise film policy in the 1980s, Dickinson and Harvey (2005b) described the drastic shift enacted by the Conservative government as follows:

"Until the 1980s, Britain followed the practice common to many states in Europe of operating parallel support mechanisms for film as industry and film as culture, justified by a mixture of economic and cultural arguments. … The slow but persistent process of public intervention was halted in 1985 when the Thatcher government dismantled the existing framework for supporting film as industry—abolishing the screen quota and the Levy and replacing the National Film Finance Corporation with a private company, British Screen. Another more recent aid to production—tax concession—was discontinued in 1986 (pp. 421–422)."

These authors contrasted the pre- and post-1980s policies by arguing that film policy until the 1970s included cultural goals. However, such policy frameworks have been dramatically
reconstructed since the 1980s through the abolition of existing institutions. Hill (1996) concisely summarised the reasons behind the shift:

This was not surprising of a government whose approach towards the arts in general involved cutbacks and the encouragement of business sponsorship and economic self-sufficiency. However, in the case of film, the new Conservative government was reluctant to conceive of it in artistic and cultural terms at all, with the result that its policies were almost entirely concerned with the commercial aspects of the industry. As such, film policy corresponded to the government’s more general economic attitude: in particular, an unflagging belief in the virtues of the free market, commitment to the minimisation of state intervention in the economy and a corresponding wish to reduce public expenditure and privatise public assets (p. 99).

Hill (1996) argued that Conservative film policies were implemented by identifying film as a commodity distributed in the market while ignoring its cultural value. Additionally, by abolishing the post-war film policy structure, including The Children’s Film and Television Foundation (which inherited the CFF in 1983), the emergence of neoliberalism prioritised the expansion of private business over the conventional public support of culture. In summary, existing research on the policy shift of the 1980s problematises the tendency to prioritise the economic value of film over its cultural significance.

The first two decades of the 21st century saw the blurring of boundaries between the economic and cultural imperatives of film (Catering 2017; Dickinson and Harvey 2005a, 2005b; Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle and Kelly 2015; Garnham 2005; Hesmondhalgh, Oakley, David and Nisbett 2015b; Hill 2004, 2012, 2016; Newsinger 2012a, 2012b; Kelly 2016). This trend was partially instigated by the features of creative-industry discourse during that period. In this context, both the New Labour and Conservative governments identified the film industry as a significant aspect of the creative industries. Since then, the distinction between economic and cultural policies identified in the historical debate has been blurred (Hill 2012). To explore the institutional and
discursive changes blurring commerce and culture, researchers such as Newsinger (2012a, 2012b) have drawn critical attention to film policy under the New Labour government (1997–2010). Although the government attempted to achieve culturally oriented goals (e.g., cultural access and participation as well as social inclusion), researchers have problematised the limitations of New Labour’s approach and elucidated the negative impacts of the economic interests underlying it. As Dickinson and Harvey (2005b) summarised, the New Labour government ‘has been clearer about the economic goals of film policy than the cultural ones. And film has increasingly been seen as part of the broader strategy for growing the cultural industries and promoting cultural exports’ (p. 423). While Dickinson and Harvey criticised the dominance of economic goals over cultural ones, Hill (2012) noted a process wherein the borders between the economic and cultural objectives themselves have become blurred:

While it has been common to comment upon the way in which cultural objectives were subordinated to economic ones during the ‘New Labour’ years, the actuality was rather more complicated. What might be said to have occurred is that the boundaries between the economic and cultural became increasingly blurred with the result that not only did ‘cultural’ policies increasingly come to rest upon economic justifications but also that ‘economic’ policies increasingly came to depend, both explicitly and implicitly, upon ‘cultural’ assumptions as well (p. 337).

In their research on the UK Film Council, Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle, and Kelly (2015) identified the same trend, indicating ‘how blurred the lines between “economics” and “culture” have now become within policy discourse’ (p. 352). These film scholars’ discursive framework contrasts starkly with those concerning film policy until the 1970s (characterised as the culture-economy dichotomy) or that of the 1980s (typified by the dominance of economic logic).

In the 2010s, film-policy scholarship continued to examine the film policies of the Coalition and Conservative governments. The turning point identified in the literature is the
abolition of the UK Film Council (UKFC) in 2010 by the Coalition government. To problematise the abolition of the UKFC, a number of writings have reflectively reviewed its achievements and limitations. Doyle, Schlesinger, Boyle, and Kelly (2015) problematised the underlying agenda of film policy even after the end of the New Labour government. They analysed the report published by the Department for Culture, Media, and Sport in 2012 (now the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) and, with regard to the creative-industries agenda, argued that ‘while the role that film plays in the cultural life of the UK is acknowledged and addressed in the review, the leading edge of the report focuses on the ongoing economic impact that film as part of the creative industries plays in the economy’ (p. 11). This may indicate that contemporary film policy has been distorted by mainstream political agendas to highlight and maximise the economic interests of the creative industries, prompting critical discussion on economic-centric film policy among film-policy scholars. As these writings about contemporary film policy point out, the boundary between economic and cultural film has been disappearing in the recent evolution of British film policy. This thesis aims to explore how such overlap can be identified in a more constructive and nuanced manner via historical case studies between the 1910s and the 1950s.

Thus far, this section has reviewed the existing scholarship on British film policy. Prior research has identified the fundamental characteristics of this film policy, which include film’s ambiguous status between commerce and culture, the distinction between the public and private sectors, and the divergent fields of public policy related to film. However, partly because of film policy’s vast scope, the preceding literature has tended to focus on specific aspects of policy, which has occasionally overshadowed the research themes bridging multiple issues. One vital issue that has not been thoroughly investigated is the involvement of private businesses in cultural and educational policy related to film. My thesis therefore makes an original contribution to British
film policy scholarship by studying the interactions between the business sector and public/civic actors in formulating film policy for non-commercial goals. In doing so, my research illustrates both the overlap and the dynamics between the commercial and cultural logic and reconceptualises state-market-civil relationships and the roles of private businesses in formulating culturally oriented film policies in the pre-war, interwar, and post-war periods.

2.2.2.3 Selected case studies: The BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF

In order to identify and explore the state-market-civic partnership and contribute to the scholarly debates on British film policy, this thesis draws on three case studies: the BBFC during the pre-war period from the 1910s to the 1920s, the BFI in the interwar period from the 1920s to the 1930s, and the CFF in the post-war period of the 1940s and 1950s. Prior research on these institutions had a propensity to rely on the culture/commerce dichotomy in describing the activities of the relevant stakeholders. For instance, the existing historiography of the BFI clearly demonstrates the prevalence of the dichotomist view. The BFI has been commonly understood as the key institution supporting the cultural aspects of film, and it was expected to function as an infrastructure for British film culture rather than for the economic support of the film business. Therefore, the first generation of researchers—including Rachael Low (1979b) and Ivan Butler (1971)—characterised the BFI as a cultural institution independent from trade issues. In Low’s historiography of British cinema, she described the film industry and the BFI in separate chapters. She even characterised the response of the film trade to the BFI as a confrontational approach. In Butler’s detailed survey of the BFI, he attended to the development of the Institute itself and made little mention of its relationship with the film trade. When analysing the relationship between the BFI and external actors, Butler focused on non-commercial actors, including educational, scientific, religious, and
cultural organisations. The research that followed (Dupin 2006; Dupin and Nowell-Smith 2012) shared the same tendency to contextualise the BFI within the cultural and non-commercial world. Similarly, Hartog (1983, p. 68) described the effect of the film trade on the establishment of the BFI as a ‘restriction’ and evaluated the relationship between them as hostile.

A significant update to the framework of understanding the BFI was presented by the latest work of Richard Paterson (2017), who identified the position of the BFI as being ‘between culture and industry’ as follows:

Throughout its history as a public body set up to engender a film culture in Britain, the BFI has been subject to pressures and counter-pressures from industry and the public. The changing roles of the BFI at different points in time have to be understood in terms of industry politics and economic interests, alongside the dynamics of cultural development in the UK, the changing political perceptions of the role of public bodies and intervention by the state, and the evolution of the medium both aesthetically and technologically (p. 242).

A new and vital aspect of Paterson’s argument is that he recognised the role of trade interests in shaping the BFI. However, while he simultaneously understood the relationship between the public and the film trade as confrontational, he did not explicitly investigate the collaborative and constructive aspects of the relationship between the film trade and the BFI. However, detailed research into the negotiation process demonstrates that the film trade also contributed to realising the public interest by actively participating in policymaking. The trade did not simply take advantage of the BFI for its own commercial interests. For instance, in the process of institutionalising the BFI and its cultural infrastructure, including the film library and archive, the film business provided financial support and technological resources for cultural and educational purposes. In this process, private businesses appreciated the intrinsic cultural values of film that cannot be directly translated into commercial interests. The early history of the BFI demonstrates
that the negotiations between diverse economic and cultural stakeholders were highly complex and that the finalised policies they cooperated in formulating were nuanced. Additionally, prior research tended to highlight policy outcomes rather than policy processes. The majority of research on key film-policy institutions in the UK provides rich illustrations of what these institutions achieved and offers detailed case studies regarding specific films. On the contrary, this thesis aims to highlight and explore the overlooked policymaking process. It traces and analyses how stakeholders representing public, business and civic sectors raised policy agendas, facilitated programmatic discussions, convinced sceptics and opponents, and formulated a firm advocacy coalition comprised of diverse stakeholders who shared beliefs concerning the values of film and film policy.

Within this context, the present thesis enriches existing research by comprehensively examining the activities of state, market, and civil stakeholders in the BBFC, BFI, and CFF. Prior studies investigated a limited number of participants per institution or had restricted views on the stakeholders outside of institutions. In the scholarship on the BBFC, board members were underscored as key actors (Hunnings 1967; Kuhn 1988; Trevelyan 1973), while the pressures from civil and industrial members outside the board remained relatively neglected. In the current scholarship, the BFI is understood as an artefact of educational and cultural policy. Therefore, educationalists and public authorities were conceptualised as central actors (Dupin 2006; Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012), whereas the film industry was characterised as an external opponent. For the CFF, although the key figures in the film industry (e.g., Arthur Rank and Mary Field) were fully examined (Agajanian 1998; Macnab 1993; Shail 2016), the relevant stakeholders in the educational sector and public authorities were relatively discounted despite their significant commitments to the Advisory Council. This thesis aims to explore the activities of the public,
industrial, and civil stakeholders in each of the three cases and analyse their relationships with the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. In other words, this thesis aims to explore the connections between the institutions and the diverse stakeholders within broader political, economic, and cultural contexts. Such an approach provides insight into the dynamics of state-market-civic cooperation in British film policy from a historical and comparative perspective.

2.3 Theoretical/Analytical Frameworks

This thesis applies the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) to articulate the interactive policy process in terms of the state-market-civic triangle. The ACF offers an analytical approach that can be used to examine the role of coalitions and generate hypotheses regarding the policymaking process (Cairney 2015). The ACF emerged from the work produced by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith in the early 1980s, which highlighted coalitions of more diverse actors and the significance of their shared beliefs (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993). The ACF defines public policy as a consequence of competing advocacy coalitions or groups of people—and usually their organisational affiliation—who form informal alliances around policy issues (Weible and Ingold 2018). This framework challenges earlier political theories that focused on formal politics and narrow groups of policymakers (e.g., the iron-triangle model featuring administrative agencies, legislative committees, and interest groups in Washington politics; Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1993; Sabatier and Weible 2007). The ACF is designed to generate hypotheses for scientific enquiries based on two key conceptual terms: beliefs and coalitions.

The first key concept of the ACF involves the beliefs that drive coalition-building and policymaking. According to the ACF, people engage in policymaking to transform their beliefs regarding certain policies and build advocacy coalitions with people and organisations that share
the same beliefs rather than material interests. Within this context, the scope and definition of beliefs are broad, ranging from general worldviews and ideologies to evaluations of specific policy problems and solutions. While discussing the role and influence of beliefs, Sabatier (1993, 1998, with Weible 2007) defined three primary types:

(1) Deep core beliefs: very general normative and ontological assumptions about human nature, the relative priority of fundamental values such as liberty and equality, the relative priority of the welfare of different groups, the proper role of the government vs the market in general, and about who should participate in governmental decision-making;
(2) Policy core beliefs: comprised of eleven components, including the priority of different policy-related values, whose welfare counts, the relative authority of the government and markets, the proper roles of the general public, elected officials, civil servants, and experts, and the relative seriousness and causes of policy problems in the subsystem as a whole;
(3) Secondary beliefs: relatively narrow in scope (less than subsystem-wide), and addressing, for example, detailed rules and budgetary applications within a specific programme, the seriousness and causes of problems in a specific locale’s public participation guideline within a specific statute, etc. (Sabatier and Weible 2007, pp. 194–196).

Previous literature has proposed and tested the significance of beliefs in policymaking by drawing on numerous case studies and examining them using a variety of methodologies. For instance, Weible and Moore (2010) stated that beliefs have a greater impact on shaping coalitions and opposition than knowledge of policy issues. I will return to and refer to these three categories later to discuss how they specifically apply to the educational and cultural film policies in this thesis.

Based on the definitions of the beliefs involved in analysing the policymaking process, the ACF explains the formation and dissolution of the coalitions through the interactions of relevant stakeholders. Notably, coalition members are not defined by their membership or affiliation with an official institution. Therefore, analysing coalitions and their shared beliefs both demands and

---

2 Subsystem is an analytical term defined as ‘the area or space within a country where policy issues are governed, such as the process of formulating and adopting public policies and implementing and enforcing them’ (Weible and Ingold, 2018, p. 50).
drives methodological developments. For instance, Ingold and Gschwend (2014) employed a comprehensive questionnaire to identify the role of experts within coalitions, whereas Mawhinney (1993) used document analysis to study coalitions. Moreover, scholars have discussed the varying roles of the actors who comprise and build coalitions. Indeed, Weible and Ingold (2018) presented a comprehensive picture of key actors that includes:

1) principal coalition actors (i.e., individuals or organisations who are steady in their coalition affiliation),

2) auxiliary coalition actors (i.e., individuals or organisations who are not steady in their coalition affiliation but share some general coalition goals),

3) policy brokers (i.e., one or more individuals or organisations whose primary goal is consensus and the mitigation of conflict),

4) policy entrepreneurs (i.e., one or more individuals or organisations whose primary goal is championing a particular policy idea), and

5) general citizens (i.e., people that are interested in and/or affected by policy affairs but who do not regularly participate in politics or policy issues).

The ACF also conceptualises the resources that coalition members use to realise policy goals, which include support from the public and the ability to mobilise supporters as well as access to legal authority, financial resources, information, and leadership (Jenkins-Smith, Nohrstedt, Weible and Ingold 2018).

Among these categorisations, policy brokers and policy entrepreneurs are particularly significant to the study of film policy. Scholars have developed the theory that policy brokers mediate agreements between conflicting actors and coalitions to produce compromise (Ingold 2011; Ingold and Varone 2012). These brokers are crucial to the cultural and educational film
industry in Britain, which involves the cooperation of commercial actors as well as civil associations. Since these two groups are normally in conflict, policy brokers who can mediate and help build consensus are crucial to bridging differences and constructing coalitions. Another category that this thesis highlights centres on policy entrepreneurs. Policy entrepreneurs play vital roles in launching policy discussions and leading the policymaking process by strategically mobilising support for ideas (i.e., policy solutions) and coordinating with other stakeholders. Weible and Ingold (2018) identified the core characteristics of policy entrepreneurs, which include ‘their willingness to bear the transaction cost of finding information, building networks and strengthening coalition ties, making agreements and sometimes monitoring and enforcing those agreements’ (p. 65). The three case studies presented in this thesis explore policy entrepreneurs who derive from different backgrounds (film industry organisations, the educationalists’ commission, and individual film producers and companies) and investigate how they initiate policymaking. This thesis thereby extends the discussion regarding these stakeholders and their roles in formulating a series of film policies and demonstrates the commonality between these different roles by the same actors.

The ACF explains the causes of policy formation, adjustment, and change. One advantage of the ACF is that it generates hypotheses regarding policy shifts and policy stability (Jenkins-Smith, Nohrstedt, Weible and Ingold 2018). The ACF explains that the stability of a specific policy is the result of sustaining advocacy coalitions, whereas policy changes are caused by the dissolutions of such coalitions. While coalitions can assume a dominant position that allows them to realise and sustain specific policies, they are constantly challenged by competing coalitions or other political groups. ACF scholarship specifies what types of factors influence, challenge, and change a coalition. Since shared beliefs and ideas are central factors of the ACF, new ideas and
ideological shifts can be critical in reforming a coalition. These new ideas can be brought about through novel findings from experts and scientists in other sociocultural contexts. Additionally, external shocks and impacts—including natural disasters, policy reforms, and the creation of new governments—can result in changes within a coalition. Moreover, policy-learning and knowledge-building within coalitions can prompt incremental changes in policy goals and shifts in direction (Sabatier, 1988; the impact of learning and knowledge can be identified in the development of the governing/advisory boards of the BBFC, the BFI and the CFF in the following case studies). The main theme of my thesis concerns the process of creating new advocacy coalitions rather than the process of their changes or dissolution. However, the scholarly debate regarding the changes in and dissolution of coalitions offers insightful viewpoints on the changes in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Such changes include the post-war reformation of the BFI (Dupin 2012; conclusion of Chapter 4 of the thesis) and the dissolution of the CFF in the 1980s (Shail 2016; conclusion of Chapter 5 of the thesis).

As these reflections on the transformation and stability of coalitions illustrate, the ACF is distinguished from a coalition of convenience (i.e., an ephemeral coalition that forms temporarily) since advocacy coalitions are sustained over an extended duration. A focus on the stable nature of advocacy coalitions enables academics and practitioners to investigate long-term policy trends (Weible and Ingold, 2018). The ACF’s spotlight on long-term change and stability justifies its application in historical research (Sabatier 1993). Another significant element that explains policy change under the ACF centres on negotiation and agreement in policy debates. Sabatier and Weible (2007) articulated nine prescriptions that foster negotiation: “a hurting stalemate”, broad representation, leadership, consensus decision rules, funding, commitment by actors, the importance of empirical issues, trust, and lack of alternative venues’ (pp. 205–206).
Applying the ACF in Film-policy Research

In this thesis, I draw on the ACF to create an analytical framework that allows me to explore the process of creating educational and cultural film policies in Britain during three important historical eras. Each of the case study chapters provides an overview of the key actors and illustrates how they built the advocacy coalitions vital to realising, legitimising, and sustaining each policy. The ACF is particularly useful for analysing and describing the history of British film policy for four main reasons. First, as scholars of film policy and the film industry commonly acknowledge, film has an ambiguous nature that includes characteristics of both cultural creations and economic commodities. Thus, policy actors evaluate film from different perspectives and present diverse and occasionally contradictory ideas and beliefs. In other words, film policy, particularly educational film policy, can be viewed as a battleground in which actors attempt to translate their beliefs into film policy. Second, in relation to the first point, educational film policy involves actors from disparate realms (e.g., the state, the market, and civil society). While their interests, beliefs, and viewpoints differ, their negotiations and interactions with one another are fundamental to coalition-building. Since no single actor contains sufficient decisive power to enact film policy, they must negotiate and formulate coalitions as a means of discussing, designing, implementing, and reforming film policy. The ACF offers the most appropriate analytical framework for explaining the activities of these actors.

Third, the ACF is suitable because it can clarify both the formation of and competition between policies by theorising the key factors that stabilise or challenge the coalitions. ACF scholars theorise four categories of external threats that challenge the stability of coalitions and create policy reforms: events (shocks), chronic threats, spillover of problems or solutions between
policy agendas, and changes in societal value orientations. As the case studies in this thesis illustrate, the history of educational and cultural film policy includes efforts to form new policies and challenge existing ones through advocacy. To understand both stages of policymaking, the ACF presents useful terms and perspectives that allow these dynamics to be comprehensively analysed and conceptualised. Finally, applying the ACF has the potential to broaden historical research on existing institutions. The existing research mostly focuses on institutions and the outcomes they are responsible for as central themes of historiography. As such, the political dynamics and interactions between stakeholders within and outside institutions remain largely unexplored. Using the ACF as a framework to explain the interactions of advocates offers a means of fully illustrating these types of dynamics. The table below summarises how the ACF’s key concepts and terms can be employed in exploring educational film policy.

Beliefs

- Deep core beliefs: beliefs concerning the value of film, whether state/local authorities should intervene in film business/film culture, how children should be educated, and what moral messages should be expressed and shared within the community.
- Policy core beliefs: beliefs regarding an appropriate balance between the state and the market, how film censorship/film institute/film production foundations should be arranged and managed, and which public sector actors should be active in film policy.
- Secondary beliefs: how film censorship/film institute/film production foundations should be funded, delivered, and implemented.

Regarding educational and cultural film policy, the relevant beliefs can be categorised as follows:
• Beliefs concerning film: what impact film makes or should make; what expressions and messages film should contain.

• Beliefs concerning audiences: who the audiences are or should be; what they learn or what they think they should learn from film; how they should access cinema (e.g., school shows, children’s matinee programmes).

• Beliefs concerning education: what children/adolescents learn or should learn from film; how they should learn it.

• Beliefs concerning the film industry: what kind of films commercial business should provide; how the film industry should supply and regulate content; what economic and cultural impacts the film industry should make.

• Beliefs concerning the government: what the government does or should do for national cinema and national education.

• Beliefs concerning the censorship/national film institute/children’s film foundation: Who should govern, support, and supervise these institutions; what goals and values they should pursue; how these institutions should cooperate with or distance themselves from external stakeholders.

Policy Actors (Stakeholders)

• Policy brokers: the presidents of the BBFC, key figures in the film industry, educationalists in the Commission of Educational and Cultural Films (BFI), Mary Field, and the Advisory Council in the CFF.

• Policy entrepreneurs: film industry associations (e.g., the BBFC), The Commission on Educational and Cultural Film (BFI), the Rank Organisation (CFF), as well as key
individual figures such as Mary Field (director of the CFF), J. W. Brown, and A. C. Cameron (the secretaries of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films).

Additionally, this thesis tests the commonality between brokers and entrepreneurs in addition to their influences on policymaking.

**External Shocks**

- Events (shocks): new government systems, the publications of governmental and private committees, and the First and Second World Wars.
- Chronic threats: educationalists' scepticism of commercial film, concerns with the import of foreign films.
- Spillover of problems or solutions to different policy agendas: influences of the CFF, the BFI, and the CFF in relation to the other institutions (e.g., the BBFC governors’ influence on the CFF’s production policy and reforms, the BFI’s influence on shaping affirmative public opinions on educational policy at the CFF).
- Changes in societal value orientations: liberalism, imperialism, the welfare state, minimal states, and views on children and education.

Whereas the ACF undoubtedly offers a useful perspective from which to analyse educational film policy, my ultimate objective was not to demonstrate the suitability or theoretical usefulness of this conceptual framework. Since the ACF is intended to be used as a scientific framework to generate and confirm/revise hypotheses, it is not a finalised, flawless theory, and its application has been constantly challenged and revised. As Wellstead (2017) stated, the most distinctive aspect of the ACF is its commitment to conceptual revision and empirical application. Therefore, this
thesis aims to contribute to the scholarly debate by introducing new cases from British film history that shed light on several research agendas surrounding the ACF and theorise regarding the presence and characteristics of the advocacy coalition on cultural policy. With the exception of a few publications (e.g., Gray 2000; Belfiore 2021), public policy theories—including the ACF—are rarely employed in cultural-policy scholarship. Therefore, this thesis tests and demonstrates how cultural-policy studies can be developed by employing the public policy framework.

Furthermore, the application of the ACF in the study of British film policy helps clarify certain problems that have emerged in the scholarship concerning the ACF. As Weible and Ingold (2018) noted, prior research tended to focus on the ACF in specific genres of policy (i.e., environmental policy and welfare policy). Therefore, context-specific factors, such as EU regulatory frameworks, are overemphasised, while advocacy coalitions in different policy fields or periods remain unstudied. My historical research examines how advocacy coalitions formed around film policy from the 1910s to the 1950s aids in filling this gap. Additionally, basing my work on historical research contributes to another key objective of this project: advancing the debate on both nascent and mature policy agendas. Ingold and Varone (2012) stated that the existing literature primarily discusses the advocacy coalitions around mature, established policy cases and cannot address how new coalitions and policies are developed. Echoing these arguments, historical research on the origins of significant institutions and coalitions uncovers the process of constructing burgeoning advocacy coalitions.

Most significantly, applying the ACF in historical research drives methodological developments. Since the majority of current research has been based on social and political science, it has tended to apply quantitative research methods and collect large data sets to empirically discuss the formations and reformations of advocacy coalitions. This thesis differs in that it aims
to elucidate how the ACF can be applied to historical cases in which documents are limited, and an alternative approach must be developed. For instance, Ingold and Guschwend (2014) identified the role of experts as policy brokers by circulating questionnaires and analysing them from a quantitative perspective. I explore the same question using a different methodology: a critical investigation of newspapers and magazine journals as well as private letters from key stakeholders that reveal their roles as policy brokers and their underlying beliefs (e.g., the BFI Special Collection and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre, including the CFD/CEF Advisory Council catalogue, trade journals and newspaper articles written by the diverse stakeholders). In doing so, this thesis articulates how advocacy coalitions can be identified through close readings of historical materials.

While applying the ACF within the context of cultural-policy history, I reflect on the criticisms from Fischer (2004) and Hajer (1995a, 1995b). Based on their constructivist view, these authors claimed that historical and political contexts should be closely assessed, and changes in beliefs and their fluid nature should be calculated. This thesis, therefore, considers these contexts and addresses how beliefs have been constructed and transformed in the history of educational film policy. In conclusion, the ACF offers a framework to conceptually and empirically explore the most fundamental question in cultural and public policy: why and how do stakeholders with diverse interests and beliefs work to formulate coalitions for realising specific policy goals?

2.4 Research Methodology

The primary goal of this thesis is to investigate how relevant stakeholders in the state, market, and civil society communicated and cooperated to form advocacy coalitions for the BBFC (in the 1910s and 1920s), the BFI (in the 1920s and 1930s), and the CFF (in the 1940s and 1950s). Prior
research has understandably examined the BBFC, BFI, and CFF as having distinctive policy agendas: censorship, the national film institute, and children’s film, respectively. Since the institutional histories of these organisations have been contextualised within these different areas, they are rarely analysed from comparative perspectives or examined as aspects of the long history of British film policy. Research illustrating the history of these organisations has commonly been presented as single monographs (e.g., Agajanian 1996; Hunnings 1967; Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012; Shail 2016) that have rarely referred to other film policy themes. This thesis aims to contribute to broadening the scholarly debates on these institutions by examining the history of these organisations from the comparative and theoretical viewpoints of the ACF and tracing the connections between these organisations. For instance, the historical importance of the cooperation between the film industry and educationalists in the BFI during the 1930s could not be fully captured by a sole focus on the BFI’s history. However, the impact of the BFI advocacy coalition can be fully evaluated from a comparative and historical perspective. The trade-educationalist coalition for the BFI can be appreciated as an innovative achievement when compared to the hostility between the industry and civil associations during the 1910s. Notably, such a trade-educationalist coalition was a fundamental condition for the success of the CFF during the 1950s. This thesis aims to explore such comparative and long-term perspectives in researching these organisations. Therefore, to achieve this goal, my methodology involved systematically collecting and consulting relevant historical sources published by the aforementioned stakeholders and tracing the interactions between them. Table 2 summarises the categories of the documents examined.

Table 2.2: Historical Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Categories</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Key materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal documents of public authorities</td>
<td>To understand the activities of state agencies</td>
<td>HO (Home Office) 45/11191, BT (Board of Trade) 64/2291,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BT 258/55, ED (Ministry of Education) 121/424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary debates</td>
<td>To understand the political climate of film policy and governmental</td>
<td>HC Deb 19 June 1978 vol. 952 cc17-8W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official publications by public and semi-</td>
<td>To understand policy initiatives and actions to reform institutional</td>
<td>The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future Possibilities (1917) by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public authorities</td>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry by the National Council of Public Morals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Film in National Life (1932) by the Commission on Educational and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Films, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade journals and film magazines addressing</td>
<td>To understand the activities of trade associations and news from the</td>
<td>Kinematograph Weekly, Bioscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public readership</td>
<td>perspectives of the film industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational journals</td>
<td>To understand the responses of educationalists to film policy and their</td>
<td>The Head Teachers Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beliefs regarding the educational value of film</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs and books by civil actors</td>
<td>To understand civil actors’ arguments regarding film policy; to</td>
<td>Sociology of Film (1946); Good Company (1952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understand new agendas of policy reforms raised by civil society; to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understand the reflections of key figures who committed to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policymaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official reports from the BBFC, BFI, and</td>
<td>To understand the outcomes and activities of film-policy organisations</td>
<td>BBFC annual reports, BFI annual reports, CFF reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished archival materials</td>
<td>To understand the informal debates between stakeholders</td>
<td>BFI Special Collection (containing internal reports and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the BBFC, BFI, and CFF | papers in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF), University of Warwick Modern Records Centre (containing CEF Advisory Council internal reports, private letters, and the BFI governing board’s unpublished reports)

First, I explored public documents to trace the activities of public-sector authorities and their underlying beliefs concerning film/film policy. I examined the public documents, including official reports and the minutes of state agencies (e.g., the Board of Trade, the Board of Education, the Privy Council, and the Home Office). The minute papers and internal documents stored in the National Archives reveal policy discussions within and between government departments as well as relevant communication with private-sector actors. The significant documents include but are not limited to HO 45/12969, HO 45/11191 (Home Office folders regarding film censorship), BT 64/2291, BT 258/551 (Board of Trade folders regarding children’s film policy), ED 121/424 (the Board of Education folder regarding children’s film lobbying), ED 25/21, ED 121/275, ED 121/277, and ED 121/287 (Board of Education folders regarding the BFI). I also scrutinised the parliamentary debate in Hansard³ that unpacked how the politicians in both leading and opposition parties commented on and evaluated the creation and management of new film policy. These debates reveal the underlying rationales and national importance of educational and cultural film policy. Additionally, I investigated the reports commissioned or funded by public agencies. I explored the commissioned reports, including *The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future*

³ I utilised the digitalised collection of Hansard (from 1909 to 1969) to discover relevant discussions through keyword searches (keywords used: film, cinema, British film, censorship, film institute, children’s film the British Board of Film Censors, the British Film Institute, and the Children’s Film Foundation). Thus, in quoting the statements from this collection, the page numbers are omitted because they are not given.
Possibilities (1917) by the National Council of Public Morals, The Film in National Life: the report of an enquiry conducted by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films into the service which the cinematograph may render to education and social progress (1932), and Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema (1950) by a committee established by the Home Office, the Scottish Office, and the Ministry of Education, as well as The Factual Film: The Arts Enquiry (1947) by the Dartington Hall Trustees. These documents played a pivotal role in setting policy agendas and initiating policy discussions, such as the evaluation of trade-led censorship and the call for state censorship, the creation of the national film institute, and the assessment of children’s film policy by the Rank Organisation.

Second, I reviewed the periodicals addressing public readership and trade papers published by the film-industry organisations, including the Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly (1989–1907), which was later renamed The Kinematograph Weekly (1907–1971), the Bioscope (1908–1932), the Close Up (1927–1933), the Daily Film Renter (1927–1957), and the Monthly Film Bulletin (1934–1991). Additionally, I reviewed Sight and Sound (1932–present), published by the British Institute of Adult Education (1932–1933) and the BFI (1934–present) to understand the BFI’s activities and the opinions of film producers, educational and religious leaders, and civil servants in their contributed articles. These magazines explain the film industry’s interests and lobbying activities and contain news reports on key events related to film exhibitions and productions. These journals circulated in the film industry to the extent that they have driven shared beliefs and collective actions in the industry. They also reflected the interests and activities of organisations within the various sectors of the emerging film industry. Such organisations included the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association, the Kinematograph Renters Society, the Federation of

---

4 I collected articles in these journals from 1909 to 1969 in order to investigate news, opinion articles, and advertisements concerning the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF.
British Industries Film Production, the Specialised Film Producers Association, and the Association of Cinematograph Technicians.

Third, I reviewed publications from the general media, including daily newspapers (*The Times, The Daily Mail, The Guardian, and The Observer*), political authorities, members of civil society, and both supporters and opponents of the commercial cinema business, constantly published in national newspapers to arouse public support for film policy. In several cases, editors and readers replied to these articles and discussed why and how British film should be promoted or regulated. The national newspapers provided platforms in which stakeholders representing different sectors exchanged their opinions and showcased the process of policy discussion by those authors.

Fourth, I reviewed civil actors’ responses to film policy and the film industry by exploring their books and educational journals. Journals such as the *Head Teachers Review*\(^5\) by the National Federation of Head Teachers’ Association illustrate how educational associations collectively reacted to film policy. The journal also reveals how the association interacted with the film industry to realise educational film policy for the benefit of schoolteachers. My resources included the books and pamphlets published by individual authors, which depict the viewpoints of external critics and key figures advocating film policies. The consulted books include *The Political Censorship of Films* (1929) by established filmmaker and critic Ivor Montague, *The Cinema and the Public* (1934) by independent journalist and critic of the BFI, Walter Ashley, *Sociology of Film* (1946) by J. P. Mayer, the cultural sociologist commissioned by Arthur Rank, and *The Entertainment Film for Children* (1950) and *Good Company: The Story of the Children's Entertainment Film Movement in Great Britain 1943–1950* (1952) by CFF director Mary Field.

---

\(^5\) I consulted issues of this journal published from 1929 to 1961 to study how the Association of Head Teachers, a key educationalist association, responded to the creation of the BFI and CFF.
These texts reflect the cultural status of film as well as the concerns and expectations regarding the potential of film as a cultural and educational medium in different periods.

Finally, and most importantly, I investigated unpublished archival documents stored in relevant institutions: the BBFC Archive, the BFI National Archive Special Collection, the BFI Southbank, and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre. These archives offer documents invaluable for unpacking the internal discussions and processes for making new policies in each organisation. The most significant documents I thoroughly examined include the minutes of the BFI governing board (stored in the BFI Special Collection and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre), the BBFC annual reports (stored in the BBFC Archive and the BFI Special Collection), the CFD/CEF Advisory Council reports (recorded in the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre), the CFF internal reports and discussion papers (stored in the BFI Special Collection and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre), and BFI materials, including the Trade Union Congress report and leaflets on the BBFC, the BFI and CFF and their relationship with the trade unions in the film industry (stored in the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre). These resources were vital to tracing the internal discussions and cooperation processes that were not explicitly recorded in the official publications or policy documents and include: the internal discussion between educationalists and the representatives of the film industry in the BFI governing board and its subcommittees, the support from the Home Office and the informal consultations with the BBFC, and the processes of building mutual understanding among the educationalists, public authorities, and the film industry in the CEF Advisory Council.

I started collecting these documents by keyword search in the relevant digital archives and catalogues (i.e., newspaper archives, trade journal archives available in ProQuest, the digital catalogues in the BFI Archive, the British Library digital catalogue (Explore the British Library),
and the National Archives online catalogue). The keywords I used include names of the key institutions (the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF), key figures, (e.g., Mary Field, Arthur Rank in the Rank Organisation, Oscar Deutsch in the ODEON chains, and Herbert Samuel as the Home Secretary), and terms related to film and film policy (such as film, cinema, educational film, screen, film industry, British cinema, censorship, film institute, children’s cinema, etc.). Meanwhile, the catalogues of the BFI Special Collection and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre were not fully digitalised, so I contacted and consulted the archivists in the collections to obtain the lists of stored materials and examined all catalogues about the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF in order to identify relevant documents. Moreover, I also consulted the prior research to search for potentially significant materials referred to in the previous writings about the BBFC, the BFI and the CFF. Employing keyword research and reference lists of prior research enabled me to cover both significant materials identified in the keyword search but overlooked in the prior research and key texts that were repeatedly referred to in the scholarly debate but failed to be identified in the keyword search.

After this initial research, I reviewed all the documents and searched relevant materials that were overlooked in the previous keyword research. Some materials (e.g., Home Office papers and newspaper articles) often mention other relevant items that were unidentified in the keyword research. By closely reviewing these materials from the archival research, I identified relevant materials (such as educational journals stored in the British Library) and significant keywords (such as the National Council of Public Morals, specialist panels in the BFI Advisory Council, and the Advisory Council in the CFD and the CEF) and employed these resources and keywords to identify related resources. By repeating the process of reading identified documents and identifying relevant keywords/resources/catalogues, I was able to discover a variety of materials
regarding the diverse stakeholders, organisations, and individuals in the public, business, and civic sectors. Therefore, the circle of reading, identifying, and collecting relevant materials was pivotally significant in discovering useful and relevant documents and including them in the thesis discussion.

As the various categories of documents this thesis consults represent a variety of stakeholders and their diversified viewpoints, the insights from these documents also indicate the tensions and misunderstandings that exist between these stakeholders. For instance, the internal discussion of the public authorities documented in the Home Office catalogue and policy discussion in the trade and educational journals demonstrate that the ideal policy goals of the public and private sector actors were contradictory and conflicting in the initial policy discussion about the BBFC and BFI. However, these historical materials showcase how such tensions between the stakeholders’ viewpoints came about and how the stakeholders resolved these tensions and inconsistencies by holding informal meetings and formal conferences, discussing public inquiries, and exchanging letters and articles in trade journals and national newspapers.

As such, these archival documents delineate how stakeholders representing different sectors or organisations communicated, occasionally faced tensions or conflicts and were finally able to form collaborative partnerships. In particular, unofficial and informal documents of the BFI and the CFF, which have rarely been referenced in extant research, reveal the dialogue and interactions between stakeholders. For instance, letters exchanged between the CFD/CEF Advisory Council and the film industry particularise how they approached children’s films and reconciled educational and economic interests. Similarly, the BFI Special Collection covers informal debates by its governors, who represented educational, industrial, and public interests in film. The comprehensive review of these documents characterises my research method regarding
mapping the relevant stakeholders from the state, market, and civil society while exploring coalition-making processes and the discussions through which the participants reached consensus. Existing research on the selected case studies has primarily been concerned with the institutional history and performance of the institutions. However, involving external actors from different domains, this thesis aims to comprehensively explore the political processes underpinning the creation and initial development of these institutions.

I regularly conducted archival research from July 2019 to June 2022 to collect relevant materials stored in the National Archives, the British Library, the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre, and the BFI Special Collection. Following my preliminary research on the BFI from August 2019 to January 2020, the archival research was severely delayed and access was restricted due to COVID-19 pandemic control measures and the closure of these institutions. However, to collect the resources required, I visited the archives more often than I originally planned when visits were allowed and also fully employed the digital resources provided by these institutions. For instance, instead of visiting the BBFC Archive in London, I contacted the archivists there and they kindly shared digitised copies of historical resources, including the BBFC annual reports. In making full use of these archival visits, the generous support from the archivists at the University of Warwick and the BFI Special Collection in Berkhamsted was particularly significant because they offered me a digital list of archival materials and recommended several key items in advance. Additionally, I also used several digital materials (e.g., newspaper and journal archives) as primary resources during the COVID-19 lockdown to minimise delays. To explore the interactions of the stakeholders and the process of forming the advocacy coalition, unpublished materials such as minutes and letters exchanged between key figures were vitally significant. I was only able to access these materials in the BFI Special Collection and the Warwick
Modern Records Centre after April 2021 due to the generous support and guidance of the archivists and staff members at these institutions.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter provided a literature review and outlined the theoretical framework and methodology of this thesis. The introduction stated a central theme of the thesis: elucidating why and how the stakeholders in the state, the market, and the civil society interacted and cooperated with each other in formulating the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Section 2 then delivered a focused literature review on film policy. The overview of film policy in general and the comprehensive review of British film policy in particular reveals that the conventional understanding of film policy has been underpinned by the distinction between the economic and cultural aspects of film. A dichotomous view of commerce and culture was identified in the literature on British film policy while the interactions between the film industry and public/civic actors remained underexplored in this framework. The literature review in this section demonstrated that an investigation of state-market-civil cooperation in educational and cultural film policy fills the gaps in the preceding literature.

To investigate state-market-civil relations and their interactions, this thesis utilises the ACF, which provides an analytical framework to illustrate the policymaking process. The ACF offers key analytical terms with which we can make sense of the creation of and changes to film policy. The ACF also helps to generate hypotheses and general theories regarding why and how cultural policy was formulated from various perspectives in different periods. The analytical terms regarding beliefs and coalitions as well as key actors (policy entrepreneurs and policy brokers) are extensively employed in the case studies presented in the three subsequent chapters and the discussion chapter that follows. Employing these theoretical frameworks is useful in discussing
the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF and in conceptualising the reiterating patterns and long-term trends of cooperation between the film business, public authorities, and educationalists in educational and cultural film policy.

Section 4 of this chapter introduces the research methodology of this thesis, which outlines how the historical materials were collected and analysed to trace the development of advocacy coalitions for British film policy. This thesis systematically reviews and employs diverse categories of documents, including a variety of published and unpublished materials from the BBFC, BFI, and CFF. Although my 3-year archival research period was severely influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic due to restricted access to archives, I managed to collect all the relevant items and unearthed significant sources, such as the BFI Special Collection and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre. In addition to employing the ACF, by fully exploring these resources, this thesis aims to make unique contributions to film- and cultural-policy scholarship by studying the significant but underexplored history of advocacy coalitions underpinned by the cooperation of the public authorities, film industry, and civic actors.
Chapter 3
The British Board of Film Censors in the 1910s and 1920s

3.1 Introduction
This chapter traces the creation and development of Britain’s film censorship agency, the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC) in the 1910s and 1920s using the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) discussed in the previous chapter. The BBFC is an independent organisation conducting the censorship and classification of films shown at cinemas in Britain. The BBFC was established in 1912 as a private organisation created by film industry organisations and funded by film producers seeking censorship/classification certificates for their films. The members of the BBFC included anonymous censors who examined all submitted films and its governing members, including the presidents. The censored film would be certified as universally accessible or only accessible for adults. The creation of the BBFC by the film industry was a defensive response to the emergence of independent and random censorship by local municipalities and concerns regarding the moral harm of the film as a then new cultural activity and medium. Although launched by the film industry, the BBFC was more than an instrument of commercial business. It involved the public, business, and civic sectors in highly intricate manners, which brought about the growth of the BBFC as a gatekeeper of British film content until the present.

As an original contribution, this chapter explores how key stakeholders in the state, the market, and civil society—represented by the Home Office, film-industry organisations, and educationalists, respectively—interacted in devising the BBFC. Applying the ACF as an analytical framework, this chapter elucidates how film-industry organisations, as policy entrepreneurs,
formulated the BBFC while sustaining its autonomy from commercial interests. The chapter also addresses how BBFC governors such as T. P. O’Connor mediated the tensions between the Home Office and educationalists concerned with the influence of the film industry on censorship. By explaining the BBFC in terms of the interactional growth between the public, business, and civic sectors, this chapter enables a comparison of the BBFC with the BFI and the CFF in the following chapters. Furthermore, this chapter demonstrates that the founding of the BBFC was a historically significant turning point for film industry organisations and policy. The creation of the BBFC brought about the emergence of film-industry organisations (the CEA, the KRS and the KMA) and enhanced their cooperation with each other, resulting in their contiguous involvements in the making of educational and cultural film policies in Britain.

This chapter is structured as follows. Section 3.2 explains the institutional history of the BBFC. It tracks how industrial associations of the film industry launched the BBFC as a private enterprise, how the BBFC conducted censorship, and how its system, classifications, and practices were gradually reformed through dialogue with stakeholders outside the film industry. Section 3.3 traces the process of developing the advocacy coalition by analysing: (1) why the film industry formulated industry organisations and how their collective initiative created the BBFC (3.3.1); (2) why and how the Home Secretary and educational and religious leaders formed an opposing coalition to abandon the BBFC and form a state censorship structure as an alternative (3.3.2); (3) how the BBFC and the film industry succeeded in involving the Home Office and educationalists as coalition members and supporters of the BBFC after the state censorship campaign was dissolved (3.3.3). In Section 3.4, I examine the impact of the BBFC advocacy coalition on state-market-civic relations in British film policy, including the development of the BBFC independent of yet supported by the Home Office and film industry organisations (3.4.1). I also address the
formation and cooperation of film-industry organisations as significant policy actors and the growth of trade journals published by these organisations (3.4.2). In conclusion, I summarise the key findings regarding the BBFC and its advocacy coalition and how they were related to the educational and cultural film policies discussed, the BFI in the interwar period, and the CFF in the post-war period.

3.2 The Institutional History of the BBFC

3.2.1. The Cinematograph Act of 1909 and the formation of the BBFC

The debate and legislation on film censorship originated in the Cinematograph Act of 1909, which allowed local authorities to regulate or ban cinema shows in their regions by licensing cinema exhibitions. The original aim of the 1909 law was to avoid fire hazards and secure the physical safety of theatres rather than to prohibit film screenings on the basis of the cinema’s moral and cultural influence. Nevertheless, local municipalities swiftly employed the law to regulate film exhibitions from the perspective of moral concern, imposing conditions irrelevant to fire protection (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1909 April 8, 1912 July 11, 1912 December 19). The London County Council ushered in the regulation of cinema screenings and other councils followed its lead, condemning the moral damage cinema caused. Local municipalities subsequently employed their right to legally regulate film exhibitions and implemented their own censorship (Hunnings 1967).

In response, the film industry established the BBFC in 1912 as a private agency to conduct its own film censorship. Though formed by the film industry, the BBFC was conceived as an autonomous organisation independent of the industry’s control in order to serve the general public by banning undesirable films. The decisions and certifications provided by the BBFC were
intended to be universally accepted in Britain to ensure that local authorities did not have to implement their own censorship, which would impose unpredictable regulations on cinema presentations. To achieve this goal, the BBFC needed to establish its status as a legitimate institution that local governments and the general public could trust to control the new popular culture of cinema. The film industry was eager to demonstrate the BBFC’s public character and exhibited sensitivity concerning sustaining the BBFC’s independence from the film industry.

Appointments to the BBFC governors indicate the board’s thoughtful tactics for establishing institutional legitimacy and balancing diverse interests. In its early days, the BBFC was comprised of a president, a secretary, and four film examiners. The president played a crucial role as a coordinator of the BBFC’s external relations, collaborating with other authorities at national and local levels as well as with the film industry. Thus, during its early days, BBFC presidents were figures with an established status, such as former MPs and civil servants (e.g., George Redford (1913-1916), T. P. O’Connor (1916-1929), Edward Shortt (1929-1935), William Tyrrell (1935-1949) as presidents and Joseph Brooke Wilkinson (1913-1949) as a director). The film industry appointed the president and the secretary yet consulted the Home Office to confirm its support. By doing so, the industry ascertained that the appointment of the president was consented to by the public stakeholders. The presidents appointed the four censors but concealed their names and backgrounds in official documents with the aim of ensuring that the film industry could not influence them (BBFC 1913, 1914).

3.2.2 BBFC censorship in the 1910s and 1920s

After its creation, the BBFC actively examined and classified a substantial number of films. The organisation divided films into two categories: films that could be universally presented were
designated with a ‘U’, while an ‘A’ was used for films restricted to adult audiences. Originally, the U category was intended to identify the film as being particularly suitable for children. However, in 1916, the emphasis shifted, and U films were defined as ‘permitted’, rather than ‘recommended’ for child audiences (Hunnings 1967). To classify the films, the board appointed four anonymous examiners who gathered in the same space to view films submitted to the BBFC and whose names were kept secret even after their retirements. Two examiners watched one film while the others watched another. When the examiners identified a problematic film, all four examiners watched it and discussed their collective decision. In 1914, its first recorded year, the BBFC reviewed 6,282 films (6,881,614 feet of film) submitted by 84 companies. After reviewing all of these, the BBFC passed 5,866 films for universal exhibition (U) and 416 with the A certificate (BBFC 1914). The board categorised A films into three groups: films permitted for adult audiences, exceptional films with a more complex nature the censors closely re-examine and advice how to revise and edit to offer certificates, and films that were entirely rejected. Before providing final certification, the board offered the producers of these films the opportunity to delete or edit problematic elements. In the 1910s and 1920s, the BBFC served as a gatekeeper, continuously reviewing several thousand films annually, while the fees paid by the producers to apply for the BBFC certificates financed the costs of this censorship. The table below indicates the number of films examined and classified in the 1910s and 1920s. The statistics from 1916 to 1918, 1920, 1922, and 1924 were excluded because the annual reports were either not published due to the Great War or were not preserved in the BBFC Archive.

Table 3.1: Statistics concerning the BBFC’s censored films (U and A).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of classified films</th>
<th>U (Universal)</th>
<th>A (Adult audience only)</th>
<th>Exceptional⁶</th>
<th>Entirely Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>7,488</td>
<td>6,821</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The BBFC Annual Reports stored in the BBFC Archive and the BFI Library

The rules of the classification process were not initially stipulated, and the examiners assessed the films on a case-by-case basis. However, through the involvement of external stakeholders, censorship regulations were articulated and new categories of classification were installed. For instance, in the investigation of the National Council of Public Morals (NCPM), the president of the BBFC listed categories and expressions that the BBFC would not permit.⁷ The

---

⁶ After reviewing the films submitted for the censorship, examiners identified exceptional films that cannot be certified as (A) or (U). However, these exceptional films were eventually passed after significant deletion or revisions that were made to meet the objection raised by the censors. A small number of films that could not pass this process of revision/deletion were categorised as ‘entirely rejected’ films with no certificates from the BBFC.

Regarding the reasons why some films were entirely rejected, the BBFC annual report in 1915 lists the following 10 reasons: (1) the irrelevant treatment of scared subjects (2) Vulgarity and impropriety in conduct and dress (3) Scenes depicting the movement or disposition of troops, and other incidents calculated to afford information to the enemy (4) Subjects dealing with White Slave Traffic (5) Scenes suggestive of immorality (6) Indelicate sexual situations (7) Situations accentuating delicate marital relations (8) Stories tinctured with salacious wit (9) Scenes laid in disorderly houses (10) Sensual exposition of Eugenic Doctrines (BBFC 1914, p. 7).

⁷ The 43 categories of expressions the BBFC censored and banned are as follows: (1) Indecorous, ambiguous and irreverent titles and subtitles, (2) Cruelty to animals, (3) The irreverent treatment of scared subjects, (4) Drunken scenes carried to excess, (5) Vulgar accessories in the staging, (6) The modus operandi of criminals, (7) Cruelty to young infants and excessive cruelty and torture to adults, especially women, (8) Unnecessary exhibition of feminine underclothing, (9) The exhibition of profuse bleeding, (10) Nude figures, (11) Offensive vulgarity, and impropriety in conduct and dress, (12) Indecorous dancing, (13) Excessively passionate love scenes, (14) Bathing scenes passing the limit of propriety, (15) References to controversial politics, (16) Relations of Capital and Labour, (17) Scenes tending to disparage public characters and institutions, (18) Realistic horrors of warfare, (19) Scenes and incidents calculated to afford information to the enemy, (20) Incidents having a tendency to disparage our Allies, (21) Scenes holding up the King’s uniform to contempt or ridicule, (22) Subjects dealing with India, in which British Officers are seen in an odious light, and otherwise attempting to suggest the disloyalty of Native States or bringing into disrepute British prestige in the Empire, (23) The exploitation of tragic incidents of the war, (24) Gruesome murders and strangulation scenes, (25) Executions, (26) The effects of vitriol throwing, (27) The drug habit, e.g., opium, morphia, cocaine, etc., (28) Subjects dealing with White Slave traffic, (29) Subjects dealing with
BBFC also reformed and expanded its censorship policies by responding to requests from the public sector. For instance, in 1914, the Home Office advised the BBFC to include a new genre of film—topical films (a category of short film focusing on a specific period or issue) related to the war—as an object of film censorship. The BBFC accepted the request from the Home Office in the same year even though, in principle, the organisation had detached itself from the censorship of topical films because it believed it should focus on the other categories of films (BBFC 1914). Later, during the Great War, the BBFC also received a request from the Home Office and the War Office to review the films circulating throughout the empire during the war (BBFC 1915, 1919). The efficiency of these actions during the pre-war and war periods incrementally changed the views of public authorities and revealed the usefulness of the BBFC to public interest. Moreover, in response to the popular importation of horror films from the US, the BBFC introduced the ‘H’ classification in 1932 to categorise such films as an undesirable genre in the 1930s. The BBFC was also keen to more effectively judge the desirability of films and share its decisions in advance. For that purpose, it began to encourage film producers to submit their scripts in advance and let the BBFC make decisions based on them (BBFC 1923b, 1932). This initial examination conducted prior to the following formal censorship enabled producers to prepare for potential restrictions or prohibitions before proceeding with the substantive costs of shooting and editing.

the premedicated seduction of girls, (30) “First night” scenes, (31) Scenes suggestive of immorality, (32) Indelicate sexual situations, (33) Situations accentuating delicate marital relations, (34) Men and women in bed together, (35) Illicit sexual relationships, (36) Prostitution and procuration, (37) Incidents indicating the actual perpetration of criminal assaults on women, (38) Scenes depicting the effect of venereal diseases, inherited or acquired, (39) Incidents suggestive of incestuous relations, (40) Themes and references relative to “race suicide”, (41) Confinements, (42) Scenes laid in disorderly houses, (43) Materialisation of the conventional figure of Christ. (National Council of Public Morals 1917, pp. 254-5) The publication of such comprehensive lists is pivotal for film producers and scenario writers because they can avoid these elements in advance to secure certification. Additionally, these criteria are evidently beneficial for the public authorities, including the Home Office and War Office, because they ban films damaging the reputation of the military and government as well as those productions benefiting their enemies.
3.3 The Process of Establishing the Advocacy Coalition

3.3.1 The formation of the BBFC by film-industry organisations as policy entrepreneurs (1905-1916)

The first two decades of the twentieth century saw the creation of organisations in Britain that represented the production, distribution, and exhibition of film and played significant roles as policy entrepreneurs to initiate and realise the creation of the BBFC. The three industry organisations were the Kinematograph Manufacturers’ Association (KMA), representing production; the Kinematograph Renters’ Society (KRS), representing renters/distributors; and the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association (CEA), representing exhibitors. Appendix 3.1 offers a timetable of key events regarding the stakeholders and advocacy coalition for establishing the BBFC, including the activities of these film-industry organisations as well as the Home Office and educationalists (3.3.2 and 3.3.3).

As a representative of the producers, the KMA was established in 1905. The rationale and beliefs underlying the organisation’s necessity was explained thus:

[T]he life of the kinematograph depends on the safety of the public — that public opinion and taste must be carefully catered for — the public must be made to feel secure whilst patronising shows and the class of subject on exhibition shall be selected with the respect to high moral tone. It is found also that care is needed in determining the best ways and means of obtaining proper recognition for the importance of the cinematograph from the government. (*The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 1907, November 7, p. 433)

The KMA was expected to ensure that the public could see films with an appropriate moral tone and feel safe at the cinema. Moreover, the KMA recognised the necessity of obtaining recognition from the government. For those purposes, the KMA conducted initiatives to serve general interests, such as warning of the dominance of American films in the British market (*The Kinematograph*...
and Lantern Weekly 1908, October 22). The KMA also played the important role of a consultant to public agencies. For instance, when the Cinematograph Films Act of 1909 was introduced, the London County Council (LCC) contacted the KMA to ask for advice on how it should manage the licensing. The KMA provided detailed suggestions on how to protect cinema audiences from fire hazards (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1909, April 8).

The CEA was established in 1912 as an organisation representing the interests of cinema exhibitors. Its missions included advocating on behalf of the exhibition sector, cooperating with the other sectors of the industry, and lobbying and negotiating with public authorities (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1913, April 3; 1916, October 19a; 1916, November 9). The last item was closely related to the debate on censorship and the BBFC. The CEA announced that its primary concern was to contest local authorities conducting the censorship of film (Bioscope 1912, January 25; Burrows 2017). Since then, the CEA has repeatedly proposed in its official meetings that it should initiate the institutionalisation of the censorship board in partnership with the other industry organisations (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1912, July 11; 1913, April 3). It further implemented a series of policies to protect exhibitors’ interests and those of the BBFC, including a conference with local municipalities and policy discussions with the Home Office. The motivation behind the CEA’s leadership was succinctly summarised in a quote from the first executive meeting of the CEA:

Whether they [the CEA members] liked it or not, a Censorship of some sort would be sooner instituted … if they did not take steps, someone else would … there are undoubtedly films which were objectionable to some people … it would be better to exclude such films, and still better for exhibitors and more advantageous in every way to institute a censorship themselves than to have one forced upon them. (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1912, July 11, p. 718)

---

8 The organisation is currently named the UK Cinema Association, representing more than 90% of cinema managers/companies and lobbying and working with the government.
In this article, the CEA members attending the executive meeting concluded that the creation of a new organisation, which would later become the BBFC, was inevitable, and carried a detailed resolution about how the censorship board should be structured. After the formulation of the BBFC, the CEA actively cooperated with local municipalities and the Home Office to protect the film industry’s autonomy. As early as December 1912, it sent a deputation to the Home Office calling for ‘the uniformity of action by the local authorities and elimination of harassing and objectionable conditions’ imposed by local authorities as licensing conditions (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1912, December 19, p. 817).

Following the creation and activities of these production and exhibition organisations, the KRS, an organisation for film distributors, was established in 1915. Among its central objectives were:

(a) Mutual protection of trade interests
(b) To co-operate with other branches of the trade for the protection of mutual interests
(c) To confer with County Councils, Local Boards and other public bodies on matters affecting the Trade …
(j) To watch the interests of members in regard to any proposed restrictive legislation affecting the trade. (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1915, December 16, p. 30).

Evidently, a primary activity of the organisation was negotiation and cooperation with other trade bodies and both local and national governments.

Given representatives of the KMA and CEA sent a deputation to the Home Office proposing the creation of the BBFC, and these organisations initiated the formulation of the BBFC as policy entrepreneurs proposing and justifying the censorship board. In doing so, these organisations underlined their detachment from industry-led censorship and emphasised its independence. Indeed, the BBFC’s annual reports underline the separation between the BBFC and
the film industry. The BBFC’s first annual report in 1913 states that ‘it is generally becoming consolidated for the best interests of the trade’ (BBFC 1913, p. 1). However, it is the following year’s annual report that describes its activities, stating that ‘steady progress continues to be made by the Board, and the results of its works appear to justify the inauguration of such an institution in the best interests of the public and the kinematograph industry’ (BBFC 1914, p. 2). The significant difference between these two reports is that the 1913 report merely focuses on the interests of the film industry whereas the 1914 report states that the BBFC serves both the public and the film industry. In the 1917 investigation of the Cinema Commission of Enquiry in the National Council of Public Morals, O’Connor, the president of the BBFC at the time, emphasised that the BBFC is ‘for the establishment of a censorship which would give legitimate freedom for the proper development of the cinematograph whilst rigorously cutting out undesirable films’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. vii) and that it is ‘perfectly independent of the film industry and … is free to accept or reject any film without appeal and, indeed, often without complaint’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. 245-6). The BBFC implemented censorships from 1913 to regulate the contents and quality of British films exhibited in domestic theatres based on its own independent judgements.

3.3.2 The oppositional coalition calling for state censorship and its failure (1916-1917)

The film industry and the BBFC faced their greatest challenge when the Home Secretary and opposing educationalists campaigned from 1916 to 1917 to establish state censorship that would

---

9 The BBFC’s annual report in 1925 further articulates the mission to balance trade and public interests with the BBFC’s censorship: ‘The endeavour of the Board is to weigh the considerations impartially—with a desire on the one hand, to permit nothing which, in their opinion, can be regarded by reasonable people as lowering the standards of the country, and on the other, to safeguard the industry, now firmly established in the favour of the public, and avoid curtailment of the legitimate development of what is recognised as a new and important art’ (BBFC 1925, p. 11).
replace the BBFC. Herbert Samuel, who was the Home Secretary (the secretary of the Home Office) in 1916, initiated an opposing campaign for state censorship. Samuel problematised the inefficiency of the existing film censorship by underlining that the lack of uniformity and binding force was the primary limitation of the BBFC. He was concerned that, due to the restricted influence of the BBFC, its decisions were occasionally rejected by local authorities or that films banned in some regions might be shown in others. To solve this problem, he proposed the alternative of state censorship.

1. A voluntary censorship under the control of the Home Office for which the trade was to pay a sum of not less than 6,000 pounds a year
2. The Chief Censor and Examiners were to be selected and appointed by the Home Office.
3. There was to be a strong Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary of State, including representatives of local authorities (including educational authorities), well-known members of the general public. (National Council of Public Morals 1917, pp. 264-5).

Samuel described the new censorship system as ‘voluntary’ because state censorship would require the new legislation of the cinematograph act; however, as the Home Office would nominate the advisor and censor in this proposal, it was commonly and justifiably understood as constituting state censorship. The proposed censorship board would be financed by the film industry, but the Secretary of State would lead and control it by appointing the censors and advisory committee. It would also involve the local and educational authorities and would resolve their concerns regarding the trade’s censorship by introducing the control of the Home Office.

Samuel’s campaign to establish state censorship was supported by educational and religious figures with complaints regarding the BBFC and the film industry. Significantly, these opponents (including the Home Secretary, religious, and educational leaders) also formulated a policy coalition comprised of diverse policy actors who shared apprehensions concerning the film
industry and the imposition of film censorship. For instance, in December 1915, the chief constables of several towns in Lancashire went in a deputation to the Home Office and recommended either official censorship or uniform rules (Home Office 1923d). Later, *The Times* reported the comments from the Bishop of Birmingham, underlining the profit-driven nature of the film industry and the necessity of public supervision:

[T]he cinema was an entertainment carried on for profit by people who were riding their money in it. It was only accidentally if at all, educational at present. The authority which licensed an entertainment had a right to expect no moral mental, or physical hurt to anyone; but no child had to be specially cared for. If the State demanded more, it should exercise some personal sacrifice, or else bear the whole burden of the expense. (*The Times* 1917, February 20, p. 5)

More critical comments appeared in an editorial on 15 February 1917. The article commented on current films, largely from the US, saying that there was ‘no doubt that the increase in crime amongst children is owing to the ghastly show of crime and low tragedy at the majors of the cinema theatres’ (*The Times* 1917, February 15, p. 9). The article also claimed that the BBFC was ‘unsuited to deal with the difficulties which present themselves … if the present state of affairs continues, it will one day cause such a revulsion of feelings to inflict serious injury to an industry that might do much for educational and healthy amusement’ (*The Times* 1917, February 15, p. 9). It should be pointed that these civil-sector actors problematised the BBFC’s censorship by underlining the negative impacts of film on children. Connecting youth crime to unsatisfactory film censorship was a driving force for these opponents.

The civil society opponents also criticised the film industry’s dominance over the BBFC’s censorship and proposed new state censorship. For instance, the National Council of Public Morals offered a platform on which educationalists articulated their criticisms of the BBFC and the film industry. Mr Percival Sharp, B. Sc., Director of Education for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, stated that
censorship should be entirely maintained at public expense and be free from responsibility to any authority other than that of the state (National Council of Public Morals 1917). The following quote exemplifies the most explicit complaint regarding the incompetence and inappropriateness of the film industry as a leader in censorship:

We recognise quite clearly that it would be a mistake to throw on an industry commercially connected for private profit the onus of leading public opinion, and indeed no claim is made that the leaders of the industry desire or are competent to undertake this work. Accordingly, educational and other authorities in the country might well consider how far they can assist in raising the whole status of the cinema, and to assist them in this endeavour has been a main object of our inquiry. (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. xxii)

Different understandings of the BBFC and the film industry’s limitations can be identified between Samuel in the Home Office and educationalists participating in the National Council of Public Morals. Samuel simply problematised the BBFC’s lack of regulatory uniformity and enforcement power and proposed state leadership as a solution. He did not claim that the profit-oriented nature of BBFC censorship or the connection between the BBFC and the film industry were problems.10 Neither did he even comment on the performance of the BBFC’s censorship decisions. He simply claimed that its decisions were not considered mandatory. However, the educationalists and religious leaders advocating state censorship judged that the BBFC’s performance and the moral character of exhibited films were both unsatisfactory and claimed the film industry could not sufficiently address this problem. The educational and religious opposition figures therefore conceptualised the state as a gatekeeper capable of improving public morals from an impartial viewpoint and believed educational and other civil authorities should assist in such a process.

10 Later, in the 1920s, the Home Office stated that critiques of the BBFC were caused ‘due partly to unfounded suggestions that the censors are influenced by persons interested in the trade, and partly to ignorance of the inherent difficulties of the task’ (Home Office 1924, pp. 3-4). However, it evaluated this as a ‘misunderstanding’ in light of the BBFC’s independence from trade control or interests (Home Office 1924).
From the film industry’s perspective, however, the Home Office’s proposal was far from acceptable (e.g., *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 1916, October 19a; 1916, October 19b). The industry pointed out that government censorship could not replace existing censorship, as proposed state censorship could not be applied as compulsory standard for all the local municipalities unless new law was legislated. Furthermore, the film industry opposed the idea that the Home Office would appoint the censorship board members, as a proposed new organisation would not adequately represent the trade’s interests. Responding to the film industry’s criticisms, the Home Office admitted that compulsory film censorship demanded new legislation that could not be realised at this point, and it was willing to accept the film industry’s request to appoint trade members to the BBFC’s advisory board. The proposed censorship board lacking binding force on national censorship reflects the restricted power of the central agencies over the local municipalities.

Although Samuel and other opponents supported the campaign for state censorship, the Home Office finally abandoned the proposal in 1917 because their proposal of state censorship did not satisfy the film industry. According to a Home Office memorandum, the severe challenge from the film industry resulted in the Home Office abandoning the idea of national film censorship, stating that:

> [B]ut it now appears from a communication which has been received from the Cinematograph Trade Council that the scheme will not be accepted by the Trade and in view of this opposition the Secretary of State has come to the conclusion that it is impracticable now to proceed with the proposal, and that the question of a Central Censorship must be postponed until there is opportunity for legislation. (Home Office 1917, p. 1)

Additionally, the resignation of Samuel—a passionate advocate for state censorship—at the end of 1916 toned down the campaign. The rise and fall of the state censorship campaign initiated by
Samuel clearly demonstrates that top-down leadership and initiative from an enthusiastic individual, or their absence, can critically influence the formulation and devolution of an advocacy coalition. Since the end of Samuel’s campaign, the Home Office came to be more supportive of and cooperative with the BBFC and attempted to realise desirable conditions by improving the BBFC’s censorship rather than installing state censorship.

For both advocates for and opponents of the BBFC, the report from the Cinema Commission of Inquiry by the National Council of Public Morals (NCPM) was a pivotal milestone. The NCPM was a private institution created in 1904 to monitor public morals and national culture by launching a series of research projects.\(^\text{11}\) The NCPM committed to the investigation of the cinema since the film-industry organisations requested the NCPM to establish the Cinema Commission of Inquiry to explore ‘the physical, social, moral, and educational influence of the cinema, with special reference to young people’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. vii). The Cinema Commission of Inquiry as well as the NCPM were comprised of religious, scientific, and educational leaders (a list of the members of the commission can be found in Appendix 3.3). The Cinema Commission undertook the research and published a report: *The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future Possibilities* (1917), on the moral and social influences of the cinema (Section I), cinema’s impact on the education and criminality of children (Section II), the darkness and eye-strain caused by the cinema (Section III), and the history and conditions of the BBFC (Section IV). Additionally, the Cinema Commission conducted interviews and collected statements from 42

\(^{11}\) As in the BBFC and other case studies in the thesis, the NCPM involved established figures, including James Ramsay MacDonald, who was the first Prime Minister of the Labour Party and was committed to social problems of public nature.
figures representing the BBFC, the trade organisations, and educational and religious leaders (Appendix 3.4), all of whose statements were recorded in the commission’s report.12

The film-industry organisations involved with the NCPM Cinema Commission research to support its independent research and such sponsorship eventually resulted in the legitimisation of the film industry. The film industry asked the NCPM to conduct research on the moral and social aspects of film and to impartially examine the achievements and limitations of the BBFC to compare it with the proposed state censorship. In doing so, the film industry succeeded in participating in an unbiased public investigation led by educational leaders and public authorities. The industry also sent three representatives from the KMA, KRS, and CEA while cooperating with the Home Office as an observer and confirmed that the investigation should be neutral rather than advocating for state censorship unconditionally. The film industry’s initiative with the NCPM research brought several advantages to the trade: demonstrating and explaining how the BBFC worked, drawing on the report’s conclusion that the BBFC was more desirable than state censorship, and, more importantly, illustrating that the film industry was as cautious regarding film’s moral and social impact as the NCPM was.

In its conclusion and recommendation, the report explained both sides of the argument: the advocates of the BBFC objecting to state censorship and the opponents of the BBFC advocating for such censorship. Drawing on these arguments equally, the commission concluded that the BBFC censorship should be continued given the achievements and efforts of the BBFC in cooperation with the film industry, local municipalities, and the Home Office. It should be pointed

---

12 As Appendices 3 and 4 reveal, the commission members and its witnesses include both religious and educational leaders from civil society. However, in the following case studies concerning the BFI in the 1920s-1930s and the CFF in the 1940s-1950s, the presence of religious leaders decreased, and the educationalists were involved in both the governing boards and advisory councils of these organisations. This may be because the National Council of Public Morals was more concerned with cinema’s moral and social impact, whereas the BFI and CFF were framed as more educational structures that educationalists and schoolteachers should commit to.
out that the Cinema Commission was launched in response to the request of the film-industry organisations, yet the commission clarified that the investigation and report would be impartial and balanced. For that purpose, the commission invited observers from the Home Office and representatives from the film-industry organisations. Indeed, the commission’s report was balanced, including both critical and supportive comments regarding the BBFC and proposed state censorship. The Cinema Commission’s report and investigation enabled the BBFC and the film industry to explain the BBFC’s impartiality and expected roles and demonstrate how the BBFC could serve the moral and social improvement of Britain, which was the main concern of the NCPM and its Cinema Commission.\footnote{Even after the withdrawal of the Home Office from the opposing coalitions, several local municipalities and educationalists continued campaigns to challenge the BBFC and realise public censorship. For instance, in a conference held by the Home Office in July 1923, representatives from local governments expressed their concerns and once again problematised the trade’s dominance over the BBFC. Mr Barton, representing Liverpool, questioned the existing system of appointment and suggested alternatives:

[T]hey do feel that the position is not quite satisfactory inasmuch as the Board are appointed by the trade itself, and although we found no real ground to complain of the decision of the Board … we feel that perhaps under different management difficulties might be created, and my committee have asked me to put the point before you and before the Conference for consideration as to whether the appointment of the Board might not be in your hands. (Barton cited in Home Office 1919, p. 4)

However, these opposing campaigns in the 1920s never became influential, as an increasing plurality of local municipalities accepted the BBFC’s censorship and the Home Office came to support rather than substitute it.}

\subsection*{3.3.3 Involvement of the public authorities and educationalists}

The advocacy coalition for the BBFC further expanded by successfully involving public and civic sector actors who came to appreciate the importance and contributions of the BBFC in regulating the ‘harmful’ aspects of the cinema. Among those public and civic actors, the Home Office was the most influential and impactful stakeholder supporting the BBFC. From its inception in 1912, the BBFC recognised the importance of the Home Office’s support for the new censorship board.
and was eager to involve the Home Office as a coalition member. However, the Home Office denied direct control over or responsibility for the film trade’s censorship. Nevertheless, close communication and frequent approaches from the BBFC enabled the Home Office to recognise the BBFC’s usefulness. The collaboration between the Home Office and the BBFC originated from the BBFC’s efforts to obtain the Home Office’s acknowledgement and support. As early as 1913, the BBFC’s first annual report states:

The progress is … consolidation to the fact that the objects of the Board have the approval of the Home Office and the Home Secretary very much appreciates the useful work which the Board has done. (BBFC 1913, p. 1)

Since then, the BBFC has regularly consulted with the Home Office by sending circular letters and receiving the Home Office’s opinions and suggestions. It was crucial for the BBFC to involve the Home Office as its sponsor because its critics and opponents usually attempted to launch political campaigns by involving the Home Office and calling for government-led reforms on censorship, including state censorship (Brown 2019).

The connection between the Home Office and the BBFC was tightened under O’Connor’s presidency (1916–1929). When invited to provide testimony to the NCPM, O’Connor highlighted his intention to realise ‘a closer co-operation between the Home Office and the Board of Censors’ by giving ‘the Home Office the right of veto of the appointment of the president’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. 246). He also commented that there were more than 300 local municipalities and ‘it would produce an undesirable state of things if each of these authorities were to insist on a separate and perhaps different decision’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. 246). However, O’Connor believed that the involvement of the Home Office would convince these local governments to accept the BBFC’s standardised censorship decisions. Because of the
BBFC’s independence, achievements, and close cooperation with the film industry, the Home Office identified its advantages, resulting in a favourable evaluation of the BBFC’s capacity and efficiency:

After all it is a consideration in these days that the Trade is paying the whole cost of the existing censorship, and I [the Home Secretary] think it is due to those who have taken part in the censorship organisation that so far as the experience of the Home Office goes … they have carried on their work as conscientiously and as efficiently as any Body of examiners appointed by any Government Department should be expected to do. (Home Office 1923a, p. 23)

The stakeholders in the public sector and civil society realised the advantage of the BBFC: independence while being fully supported by the film industry.14

Although the BBFC governors welcomed further initiatives and leadership from the Home Office, the Home Office chose to keep the BBFC as an autonomous organisation so it did not have to take responsibility for each censorship decision (Richards 2001). In parliamentary debates and other minutes, the Home Secretary repeatedly emphasised that the Home Office was not responsible for BBFC censorship and that the local authorities still retained the power to make final decisions on film exhibitions. Moreover, the Home Office recognised that the further commitment of state agencies required an amendment to the Cinematograph Films Act of 1909, and it was not ready to spend such time and efforts (Home Office 1923b, 1923c, 1923d). Therefore,

---

14 Later, in an official meeting between the Home Office and participants representing the local municipalities, the participants stressed that the advantage of the BBFC was based on close cooperation with the film industry:

One of the great advantages which the Board possesses is that they can often persuade members of the Trade by private negotiation to alter films, involving in some instances heavy expense, as the capital involved in a single film is often very considerable. I doubt if an official Board would retain the same influence, and it might easily happen that the Trade would be tempted to fight the decisions of an official Board to the utmost. (Home Office 1923e, p. 2)

This view presented by representatives of the local municipalities demonstrates that the BBFC’s advantage was the informal conversations and supportive responses from the film industry: without the film industry’s commitment, state censorship could not effectively act as a substitute for the BBFC.
the Home Office decided to approach film censorship, being an advocate for the BBFC rather than a leader of reform campaigns that included state censorship.

After the Home Office abandoned its attempt to establish state censorship in 1917 (Section 3.3.2), it committed to the censorship as a supporter for the BBFC. The Home Office facilitated the dialogue and cooperation between the BBFC and local municipalities to replace diverse local censorships with BBFC censorship in order to realise nationally standardised censorship. For that purpose, the Home Office circulated a variety of letters, organised conferences, and proposed model conditions (details are given in Section 3.4.1). Its commitment to cinema censorship and related debates was driven by a moral concern regarding the film. For instance, in December 1917, the Home Secretary (Sir George Cave) commented that ‘the moral danger might be very grave indeed … and there must be some form of censorship and supervision’ (*The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly*, 1917 December 20, p. 50). His comment reflects film’s ambivalent status in standing between the entertainment and educational spheres:

He [the Home Secretary] frankly admitted that the main function of the kinema today was to amuse, … the mere figures of the attendances of people at the picture theatres were quite sufficient to prove that the subject deserved very careful consideration at the hands of those who took interest in the welfare of our great population … there must be some form of censorship and supervision. (*The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 1917, December 20, p. 50)

Based on the recognition of film’s potential benefits and hazards, the Home Office committed to the discussion of censorship and supervision from an educational perspective. Similarly, the Board of Education also came to demonstrate an interest in cinema and censorship as it ‘looked at this question of the kinema from the point of view as guardians of the welfare of children’ (*The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 1917, December 20, p. 50). The Board of Education also commented that there was room for considerable improvement in cinema shown in Britain. From
this viewpoint, the Board of Education argued that the censorship should be more strictly implemented, suggesting that children should be excluded from the cinema ‘to guard against danger to health or to morals’ (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1917, December 20, p. 50). Such belief in the potential of film was a crucial driving force triggering the campaign for a national film institute (Chapter 4).

While the Home Office closely cooperated with the BBFC, the educationalists—comprising individual teachers, their associations, and local educational committees—remained external critics of the BBFC in the early history of cinema censorship in the 1910s. To collect concerns and criticism on censorship from the educationalists, the BBFC offered regular meetings with educational associations. For instance, the BBFC received a deputation from groups of civil associations concerning the morals of cinemas in London, and the BBFC responded to their requests (BBFC 1921). It also accepted the criticisms from the Mothers Union and installed a new standard regarding ‘reverential treatment of sacred rites’ (BBFC 1921, p. 6). The union welcomed the BBFC’s attitude and supported the board’s view on sacred themes. In 1926, the National Association of Head Teachers held a meeting with the BBFC and exchanged opinions on appropriate film censorship. After the meeting, the association published an official announcement positively evaluating the BBFC and its achievements:

The teachers of this country may be thoroughly re-assured that the aims and objects of the Board of Censors are precisely those that they themselves cherish. The endeavour—the very strong endeavour—is to have produced all the time, and every time, tableaux which do not offend propriety and public taste, which, in a word are devoid of suggestiveness and are thoroughly wholesome. If I say that the deputation was very much impressed indeed with the great care bestowed, and the effort made to render adequate justice to legitimate trade interests, it should suffice to quieten any professional fears. (The Head Teachers Review 1926, p. 85)
The educationalists’ approving perspective derived from the BBFC and film industry’s efforts to actively communicate with them. As a president of the BBFC, O’Connor explained his plan to establish an advisory council that ‘should include educationalists who might strengthen [the BBFC’s] hands in any point of difficulty’ (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. 246).

It should be noted, however, that some educationalists remained critical and unsatisfactory regarding both moral dangers of commercial cinema and BBFC film censorship even after these affirmative comments from educational associations. For instance, in 1927, the Home Office hosted a conference of educational associations and the members emphasised that they were ‘being convinced that many of the films which children are admitted to witness are of an unsuitable and objectionable character and in view of the fact that the existing censorship has failed to prevent the exhibition of such films’ (Home Office 1927). While the film-industry organisations integrated their opinions and collectively supported the BBFC, the educationalists remained diverse and incoherent, which made them less influential in policymaking of censorship than the well-organised film industry.

### 3.4 Impacts of the BBFC Advocacy Coalition

#### 3.4.1 Decline of local censorship/popularisation of the BBFC as a common standard

The most evident outcome of the BBFC’s advocacy coalition is the decline of local censorships, causing inconsistency and difficulties for cinema exhibitions, and replacement of them into the BBFC as a national standard of censorship. While local municipalities sustained their legal rights to implement censorships under the Cinematograph Act of 1909, they in effect accepted the
BBFC’s decisions unconditionally in 1920s. In 1919, the Home Office published a report reflecting the impacts of the Cinematograph Act of 1909 and concluded that ‘the status of the Board of Censors [BBFC] has very considerably improved in the eyes both of the Press and the Licensing Authorities - a change which is reflected in the views expressed recently on Home Office papers and in Parliament’ (Home Office 1919, p. 18). According to the questionnaire circulated by the Home Office, the local municipalities concluded that ‘they had not adopted any censorship conditions as they considered that the presence of the Board rendered them unnecessary’ or that ‘no film shall be exhibited that has not been passed by the British Board of Film Censors’ (Home Office 1919). In the interwar period, almost all the licensing authorities accepted the BBFC’s decisions without question and permitted any ‘U’ and ‘A’ films to be exhibited in their areas unconditionally. In other words, the BBFC integrated local censorships and established its status as a national standard of censorship (Commission on Educational and Cultural Film 1932).

The Home Office and film-industry organisations played a pivotal role in making the BBFC an impactful standard and convinced local authorities to adopt BBFC censorship. For instance, in 1917, the Home Office proposed model conditions of censorship that could be shared and accepted by all local municipalities. The Home Office explained that the ultimate goal of proposing the model conditions was to make local authorities admit that ‘the Trade Censorship [following these model conditions] was satisfactory and made careful supervision by local authorities unnecessary’ (Home Office 1921a). The proposed model conditions were as follows:

1. No film shall be shown which is likely to be injurious to morality or to encourage or incite to crime, or to lead to disorder, or to be offensive to public feeling, or which contains any offensive representations of living persons. If the licensing authority serve a notice on the licensee that they object to the exhibition of any film on any of the grounds aforesaid that film shall not be shown;

15 In 1919, the Home Office concluded that ‘local authority censorship is on the whole negligible and the only effective existing censorship is that of the Board’ (Home Office 1919, p. 21).
2. No film shall be shown unless three clear days’ notice, stating the name and subject of the film, together with a copy of any synopsis or description used or issued in connection with the film has been given to the licensing authority; and the licensee shall within that period, if the licensing authority so require, exhibit the film to such persons as they may direct;
3. Films which have been examined by any person on behalf of the licensing authority shall be exhibited exactly in the form in which they were passed for exhibition, without any alterations or additions unless the consent of the licensing authority to such alterations or additions has previously been obtained;
4. No poster, advertisement, sketch, synopsis or programme of a film shall be displayed, sold or supplied either inside or outside the premises which is likely to be injurious to morality or to encourage or incite to crime, or to lead to disorder or to be offensive to public feelings or which contains any offensive representations of living persons;
5. Every party of the premises to which the public are admitted shall be so lighted during the whole of the time it is open to the public as to make it possible to see clearly over the whole area. (Home Office 1917, p. 8)

In formulating these conditions, the Home Office closely consulted with local municipalities and the film industry as well as the BBFC, holding conferences and meetings with the municipalities to explain the model’s importance before persuading them into accepting it (Home Office 1917). The BBFC published and circulated these model conditions of censorship in order to integrate the inconsistent rules and decisions of local censorship, and consequently, advised the local authorities to accept the BBFC as a common standard of censorship.

Moreover, The Home Office facilitated mutual understanding and cooperation between the BBFC and local municipalities to integrate their different censorship. The Home Office extolled the usefulness of the BBFC’s censorship toward the local governments and educationalists in order to convince external critics to accept it. To persuade the local governments to trust the BBFC, the Home Office repeatedly circulated letters and organised conferences to explain its merits. For instance, they organised a conference on 17 April 1923 and stated that the ‘principal object of the conference would be to consider how far Licensing Authorities find themselves able to accept the decisions of the present Board of Film Censors’ (Home Office 1923b, p. 1). Significantly, the
purpose of the conference was not only to examine the conditions but also to encourage the applications of the BBFC. During the conference, the Home Secretary emphasised the achievements of the BBFC: ‘from his experience of the work of the Board, [the Home Secretary] believes that they have performed a very difficult task with considerable success, and that as a result of their work there has been a marked improvement in the characters of the films in recent years’ (Bell cited in Home Office 1923c, p. 22). Moreover, the Secretary of State acknowledged that the BBFC’s activities were motivated ‘with a sincere wish to prevent the exhibition of any film which is likely to give offence to public taste’ (BBFC 1923c, p. 1).

In addition to the Home Office, the film-industry organisations committed to make the BBFC more impactful as a common standard of censorship by employing their resources and networks. For instance, the CEA, representing cinema exhibitors, made a statement that ‘no films shall be exhibited by any of their members except such as have been passed by the Board [BBFC]’ (BBFC 1919 p. 10). To do so, the CEA circulated a monthly list of films the BBFC had passed to all of its members. The CEA’s comprehensive guidelines encouraging compliance with the BBFC’s decisions were designed to make the BBFC more influential, which the Home Office and several local municipalities recognised. The film industry also fostered the legitimacy of the BBFC by contributing to public enquiries that examined the existing censorship, clearly expressing the autonomy of the BBFC and its willingness to serve the general public. For instance, the Cinematograph Trades Council supported the research of the NCPM in drawing conclusions on the status of cinema and censorship. The NCPM report acknowledged the support from the Cinematograph Trades Council:

---

16 The details of so-called public tastes and films violating them are exemplified in the lists of undesirable conditions, O’Connor (1923) explained.
17 The Cinematograph Trade Council was a trade body consisting of representatives from the KMA, the KRS, and the CEA.
The Cinematograph Trades Council has rendered every assistance in its power, has produced all documents, and films necessary to the inquiry, has freely answered every request for information, and its officials have willingly submitted to the extensive cross-examination. For this assistance the Council desires to offer its best thanks; and in particular to Mr. A. W. Newbould, Chairman of the Exhibitors’ Association, who has rendered conspicuous public service in working for the highest interest of the industry and the country. (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. x)

Moreover, the film industry also tactically approached representatives of local councils, several of whom were severe critics of the BBFC and advocates of state censorship. For instance, the KRS, an industry organisation of film renters, communicated with the London County Council (LCC) to improve its understanding of film censorship, resulting in mutual agreement regarding effective and realistic methods of circulating the BBFC certificate on exhibited films (London County Council 1921, 1922). The LCC originally hoped for a reproduction of the Board’s certificate to be exhibited immediately before a screening on a slide displaying the film’s title and stating that the Board had passed the film. However, the KRS’s explanations prompted the LCC to admit the technical difficulty of installing these slides on every film and withdrew its recommendation.

The substantive support of the film industry for the BBFC was motivated by the industry’s necessity to improve the public image of films because they were concerned as a cause of delinquency and social problems (Kuhn 2002). Notably, the film industry was not entirely against the regulation and censorship of cinema, as the industry expected that appropriate regulation would contribute to excluding foreign films that would undermine the film industry’s reputation, consequently improving the public image of Britain’s newly emerging film culture (e.g., statements from the secretary of the CEA in National Council of Public Morals 1917). For instance, William G. Barker, a British film manufacturer, contributed a statement to the Morning Post in which he argued that his motivation to support the film industry’s own censorship was ‘to protect
my business’ and that he was ‘against anything which I would not like my children to see’ (Morning Post 1912, November 6, p. 11). Resonating with this, A. E. Newbould, chairman of the CEA, made a statement during the investigation of the NCPM concerning charges against the film industry:

Of all the charges brought against the cinematograph industry, the most damaging is the charge that the cinema is largely responsible for the increase in juvenile crime. The trade … has made an effort to find out what the actual truth in this connection is. (National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. 270)

To address such beliefs, the film industry had to demonstrate its capacity to regulate and reform the character of films through its own efforts. The creation of the BBFC was in line with the trade’s effort to enhance film’s poor reputation for being sensational and morally harmful entertainment. A 1921 letter from the film industry to the LCC commented that the goal of film censorship was ‘to improve the status of the Cinematograph Exhibitions in general’, and the BBFC was part of the film industry’s efforts ‘to make the business reputable and respectable’ (London County Council 1921, p. 1). Moreover, the film industry and the BBFC shared a view that film censorship would benefit the industry and the development of film culture. In testimony to the NCPM, the president of the BBFC posited that it contributed to the film industry by safeguarding the freedom of expression and the liberty of film art. He claimed that the BBFC had a duty to protect such freedom by conducting censorship effectively and protecting the film industry. For him, the BBFC was ‘responsible for the guardianship of the cinema industry’ and its duty was ‘to fight for the liberty of this new form of artistic expression’ (O’Connor 1923, p. 10).

The Home Office and film-industry organisations were able to effectively collaborate with each other to make the BBFC as national standard because they appreciated that the BBFC was an autonomous and impartial agency independent from both public control and commercial interests.
Although the film industry was a central patron and initiator of the BBFC, the two spheres were kept at arm’s length from each other. For instance, the BBFC did not publish the names and contact information of its censors in order to prevent the film companies from intervening in the censors’ decisions. O’Connor explains that such a practice was pivotal because it ‘saves our examiners from the possibility of any social or personal pressure’ (O’Connor 1923, p. 1). The independence from the film industry enabled the BBFC to critically examine and make decisions based on its own judgement (BBFC 1923b). In regular circulars explaining the criteria of film censorship and its decisions, the BBFC warned the film industry against the increase in crime films, stating that it would decline a certificate to this genre without any improvement from the production side because it was ‘detrimental to the public interests’ and that there had been ‘some agitation as to the effect of the film on the child mind, and the unsuitability of some subjects for exhibition to children’ (BBFC 1928, p. 8). The independence of the BBFC from the film industry was acknowledged and appreciated by the Home Office. It confirmed in its official report:

The Board although maintained by the trade has been able to preserve an entirely independent judgement, and its policy rarely fails to command the support of the public opinion. (Home Office 1925, p. 4)

The BBFC was willing to demonstrate its autonomy from the commercial interest by positing that there was ‘nothing more rigorously insisted, than the independence of its judgements; and this attitude has been respected with unbroken loyalty by the Trade itself’ (BBFC 1919, p. 10). Consequently, the Home Office confidently acknowledged that it was ‘safe to assume that the possibility of an uncertificated film being shown is now very remote’ (Home Office 1919, see also, The National Council of Public Morals 1917, 1921).
The withdrawal of the state censorship plan in 1917 also determined the BBFC’s autonomy from public authorities, as it managed to avoid the installation of state censorship or the direct supervision from the Home Office. In contrast, the Home Office sustained its original stance of distancing itself from the responsibility of censorship and instead fostered the development of the BBFC. The Home Office concluded that there was ‘no doubt that the general tone of the film has improved … a good deal of the improvement may properly be attributed to the influence of the censors’ (Home Office 1921b, p. 1). It even commented that ‘the failure in 1916 to establish a Central Official Censorship’ was a ‘blessing in disguise’ considering ‘how embarrassing the work of an official censorship would be to the Minister responsible for it’ (p. 1). In conclusion, the BBFC’s status as an autonomous organisation independent of both the state control and commercial interests brought about the efficient collaboration between the Home Office and the film industry to make the BBFC more impactful.

3.4.2 The cooperation between the film-industry organisations and the growth of trade journals

The creation of the BBFC by the film industry (Section 3.3.1) and the debate on national film censorship (Section 3.3.2) were significant turning points in the history of film industry organisations. This was the time in which they learnt to closely communicate and cooperate with each other. Unsurprisingly, before establishing the collaborative partnership around censorship debates, these trade organisations were not always mutually supportive but occasionally faced conflicts with each other (Brown 2013, Burrows 2006). The power and size of each organisation was not equal, and such imbalances caused concerns and conflict between the sectors. For instance, when the KMA was formed, only 12 production companies joined, though approximately 200
exhibitors existed in 1905 (Burrows 2006), meaning that the exhibitor association was much more influential than the production sector. To change this situation, the KMA and KRS proposed a collective licensing system under which the integration of cinema producers and renters was encouraged. However, the CEA attacked such an arrangement because a coalition between the production and distribution sectors would cause the exhibitors to have to accept their offers unconditionally (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1913, April 3). Moreover, the debate on film censorship also raised concerns regarding the equality of the trade organisations. The BBFC was initially discussed and proposed by the KMA (as the BBFC’s first president was the former president of the KMA), which the CEA was uneasy about and thus demanded further representation for the other two organisations. Later, the BBFC balanced the interests of the three sectors and functioned as a representative of trade interests as a whole rather than specific subsectors. As such, the CEA fully supported the BBFC. The equality of the three sectors was a crucial condition for these organisations. Therefore, when new film policy was discussed, these three organisations were comprehensively involved and equally represented (e.g., the BFI governing board and the CEF Advisory Council).  

The collaborative partnership between the trade organisations was particularly important when they needed to work cooperatively to realise their common interests. For instance, on 18 September 1916, the representatives of the KMA, KRS, and CEA passed a resolution presenting their consensus regarding state censorship and explaining why they opposed it:

> It is strongly opposed to any scheme of censorship which does not include finality, and is not prepared to co-operate with the Home Office unless satisfactory safeguards are introduced to guarantee the business … It is our opinion that no Censorship can be legally

---

18 The dominance of Hollywood films in the British market caused further conflicts of interest between the KRS and KMA, proposing that producers should cease to supply films to renters who largely distributed Hollywood films (Brown 2013).
imposed upon the trade without the authority of Parliament\textsuperscript{19}, and no censorship by consent will be accepted by any of the parties represented by this conference, which does not embody the fullest protection of the interests involved. (\textit{The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} 1916, October 19b, p. 15)

To demonstrate their opposition to state censorship, the three trade organisations organised a deputation and held a meeting with the Home Office on 13 October 1916, declaring that state censorship would not mitigate public opinion regarding what was desirable, and such censorship would thus ruin the film business (\textit{The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} 1916c). Interestingly, the BBFC president also called for cooperation between the trade organisations, commenting that ‘so far as the industry is concerned … the watchword is UNITY, UNITY, AND AGAIN UNITY’ (quoted in \textit{Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} 1917, February 1, p. 7)\textsuperscript{20}. Moreover, in November 1916, the \textit{Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} posted an article warning that the current division between the trade organisations undermined the influence of the film industry, suggesting that ‘the trade should speak with a single voice, and leave the Home Secretary in no doubt as to what its aims and intentions are’ (\textit{The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} 1916, November 9, p. 19).

In November 1916, the trade organisations held a conference to discuss how they should respond to the Home Office’s state-censorship initiative. They commissioned a report regarding the Home Secretary’s response to the deputation, stressing their ‘intense disappointment at the ambiguity of [their] reply upon the question of the Advisory Council’ (\textit{The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} 1916, November 9, p. 18). The trade body was frustrated by the Home Office proposal’s lack of any force compelling the local municipalities to abandon their own censorship:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19} ‘no censorship can be legally imposed … without the authority of Parliament’ indicates that the imposition of state censorship as an alternative with the local censorship based on Cinematograph Act of 1909 demands the new legislation to empower the Home Office to impose it.
\item \textsuperscript{20} See also, \textit{Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly} (1919, November 23)
\end{itemize}
Why should the trade be dragooned into giving up its freedom? Let Mr Samuel dragoon the licensing authorities to accept his proposal first, for until the whole of the licensing authorities accepted the finality of censorship, there would be a rock of discord that would keep him and the trade far apart. (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1916, November 9, p. 18)

In the same article from which the above quotation is drawn, the cinema exhibitor in Birmingham drew attention to a comment from the Chairman of the Birmingham magistrates, who stated that he could not be certain whether Birmingham would relinquish its censorship powers following the installation of state censorship, proposing that the film industry should not permit such state censorship (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1916, November 9). This article contributed to keeping the readers updated and agitating for a counteraction against state censorship. It also quoted a conference participant’s comment that the film industry was in favour of ‘a fighting policy to protect the liberty and rights of the trade’ because they would otherwise be allowing ‘the trade to be trammelled and fettered by one official censorship’ (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1916, November 9, p. 19). Consequently, the trade members concluded that to achieve their political goals, the film industry should influence public opinion and approach MPs rather than negotiate with Samuel as the only interlocutor. To enable cooperation, the vice-chairman of the KRS passed ‘a resolution authorising any action that exhibitors thought desirable to take’ (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1916, November 9, p. 19). More specifically, the trade bodies unanimously agreed to establish a defence fund to collect donations from trade bodies and implement counter campaigns. The experience of collective action against top-down initiatives from the state was a landmark for the film industry and an important opportunity to learn how to conduct political action. They continued to sustain their coalition in relation to several other film policies. For example, in the legislation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 (Street and Dickinson 1985), representatives from these organisations proposed the cinema quota to protect
and facilitate film policy. Such representatives were also active in the formulation of the BFI in the 1930s and the CFF in the 1950s.

Moreover, trade journals offered significant channels through which the film industry could exchange opinions and reach mutual understandings. Journals such as the *Bioscope* and the *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* enabled members of the film industry to cover film industry events and activities in diverse regions and different sectors. The *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* regularly posted records of local CEA branch meetings and published news regarding political and economic issues related to the film industry. For instance, the dispute in Birmingham and London concerning magistrates and local municipalities that opposed film shows was covered in the journals. The trade journals also mentioned the film industry’s manifestos. For example, the *Bioscope* reported the objectives of the KMA and their expected outcomes. These resources were crucial in developing the film industry’s networks and mutual understandings. For instance, when the KRS revised its constitution and planned new policies, the governing committee first contributed an article to the *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* explaining the outline of its new organisation and policy (*The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* 1918, August 22). Moreover, the *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* published an interesting article in 1920 that highlighted expectations of and space for cooperation between renters and exhibitors. The journal invited the chairmen of the KRS and CEA to express what they would do if each were chairman of the other organisation (*The Kinematograph Weekly* 1920, January 1a; 1920, January1b).

More fundamentally, the trade journals were unmissable media that voiced the opinions and interests of the film industry, which were rarely mentioned in general media. The table below counts the number of articles referring to the KRS and CEA in two periods: 1907–1919, when *The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly* was published, and 1920–1930, the subsequent period in
which *The Kinematograph Weekly* was published. The table illustrates that these trade organisations were rarely mentioned in general media such as *The Times* in the first period, but were emphasised in the trade journals over the same period. Later, from 1920 to 1930, the general media acknowledged the roles of these trade organisations and their representatives were offered opportunities to contribute articles (e.g., the 1930s dialogue between trade members and educationalists regarding the establishment of the BFI, Chapter 4; see Table 1). However, while the trade organisations were relatively ignored by general media, the trade journals were crucial resources covering the news reports and opinions of key figures in the industry.

Table 1: The number of newspaper and trade-journal articles mentioning the film-industry organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>keyword</th>
<th>Journals/newspapers</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>KLS (<em>The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly</em>)</td>
<td>1907–1919</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>1907–1919</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>KW (<em>The Kinematograph Weekly</em>)</td>
<td>1920–1930</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>1920–1930</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>KLS</td>
<td>1907–1919</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>1907–1919</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>KW</td>
<td>1920–1930</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>1920–1930</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: my analysis of the number of articles on *The Kinematograph Weekly*, *Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly*, *The Times* in ProQuest and Times Digital archival collections

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter explored how the advocacy coalition bridging state authorities and the private film business formulated and developed the BBFC in the 1910s and 1920s. Triggered by the Cinematograph Films Act of 1909 and the lack of uniformity in local municipality censorship, the

---

21 The number of *The Times* articles referring to the CEA dramatically increased from the 1920s to 1930 and the rapid increase reflects the growing interests of the British film industry and film policy (particularly, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927, better known as the Quota Act). The topics of these articles included trends in film programs in Britain and abroad (such as in the US and Germany), film censorship and the BBFC, and the Cinematograph Films Act and quota.
film industry led the creation of the BBFC in 1912. The trade organisations of the film industry collectively played the roles of policy entrepreneur and advocate, launching and supporting the institution of film censorship to demonstrate that the BBFC could substitute for the censorship implemented by local municipalities and that the film industry could improve its shows and content by itself. From the public sector, the Home Office was involved with the BBFC as a policy broker that mediated between stakeholders in the film industry and local municipalities. The film industry and the Home Office shared key policy beliefs concerning the ideal conditions of film censorship: the BBFC should be autonomous from both state intervention and the control of the film industry and should therefore be more effective than state censorship or the diverse restrictions of local boroughs.

While the advocacy coalition of the BBFC was strong, the BBFC occasionally faced criticism and challenges from its opponents in the public and civic sectors. The most critical challenge was the movement proposing state censorship led by the Home Secretary, Herbert Samuel, in 1916. This resulted in counteractions by the BBFC and the film industry and a withdrawal of the proposal. Although the state censorship campaign was unfruitful, the opponents formulated an advocacy coalition for state censorship that shared beliefs regarding the moral danger of film and a conceptualisation of the film industry as a profit-seeker lacking in concern for the public interest. The pressure of these external opponents encouraged the industry to cooperate and collectively protest against top-down initiatives by fostering collaboration and dialogue between trade organisations representing the industry’s production, distribution, and exhibition. The trade journals called for ‘unity’ and ‘making a single voice’ in the film industry, and such a uniform campaign was repeated in the following policy debates (e.g., the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 and the BFI in the 1930s).
The creation and development of the BBFC brought about diverse policy outcomes and traditions that can be repeatedly identified in the history of British film policy. The most evident outcome was the decline of the local censorships and their integration into the BBFC censorships. For installing the BBFC censorship as a national standard, the Home Office and film-industry organisations cooperated with each other. The Home Office’s methods of commitment demonstrate a nuanced relationship between the state and the market: the Home Office implicitly but actively supported the growth of the BBFC by facilitating dialogue between the Board and local municipalities but would never take charge of the censorship by establishing state censorship. Furthermore, the creation of the BBFC and the protest against state censorship triggered and fostered the institutionalisation of trade organisations (e.g., the KMA, the KRS, and the CEA) and their cooperation. These trade organisations also published journals that formulated shared opinions regarding the film industry and censorship and reported news, such as disputes between the local municipalities and film exhibitors. As the following chapters address, these organisations and their trade journals were fundamental contributors to the history of British film policy.

Although the early history of the BBFC demonstrates the emergence of key stakeholders and their coalition’s gradual commitment to educational and cultural concerns, the educationalists and policymakers recognised the limitations of censorship as an instrument of educational and cultural policy. When the policy entrepreneurs of the BFI proposed the creation of the national film institute in the 1930s, they conceptualised the film institute and censorship as contrasting approaches. A group of educationalists discussing the educational and cultural values of film claimed that ‘censorship at its best is a negative force: it stops the occasional outrageous film — no doubt a necessary, but not an important function’, whereas the national film institute should ‘promote a constructive and not a restrictive influence of cinema’ (Commission on Educational
and Cultural Film 1932, p. 28). In other words, the debate around the national film institute began by recognising the limitations of film censorship as an instrument for improving film. The BFI was intended to fill this gap as an organisation central to constructing national film culture by developing film audiences’ tastes. The subsequent chapter examines how the BFI was created and discusses the constructiveness of its policy outcomes. In doing so, it elucidates how the advocacy coalition for the BFI was formulated and how it was different from but shared strategies and ideas with the BBFC.
Chapter 4
The British Film Institute in the 1920s and 1930s

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the creation of the British Film Institute (BFI) and its advocacy coalition in the 1920s and 1930s. The BFI was formulated in 1933 as a response to the recommendations by a committee of educationalists belonging to the British Institute of Adult Education. The BFI was established with the cooperation of educationalists in the committee and representatives of the film industry and was later expanded with the involvement of public authorities. Therefore, in the interwar period, the BFI was the outcome of a collaboration between state, market, and civic stakeholders. The BFI has been central to implementing British film policies, even today. Such policies include the promotion and distribution of film for education in schools, the introduction of British film with the BFI’s own publications such as periodicals and pamphlets, and advising public authorities, the film industry, and educational associations interested in the use of film for school education and professional training. The output of the BFI includes the National Film Library, the BFI’s theatres, and funding for experimental film.

This chapter aims to make original contributions to research into the BFI and British film policy by closely tracing the process of communication and coalition-making between the relevant partners in the state, the market, and civil society. Drawing on the dichotomy between commerce and culture, prior research on the BFI has tended to conceptualise the film industry as an opponent.

---

22 The British Institute of Adult Education was a charity organisation established in 1921 to promote adult education. For a brief overview of the Institute and its connection with the BFI see The Guardian (2011, May 17).
of the BFI created for educational and cultural purposes (Dupin 2006; Nowell-Smith and Dupin 2012; Paterson 2017). However, this chapter explains that the BFI was based on an advocacy coalition involving educationalists, the film industry, and later governmental departments. The constructive partnership between these stakeholders was vitally important because it exemplified the successful coalition reconciling the tensions between the business and educationalists as well as the commercial and cultural interests ‘as a means of furthering effective co-operation between those who make, distribute, and exhibit films on the one hand, and all who are interested in the artistic, educational, and cultural possibilities of films on the other’ (BFI 1935b, p. 4). Their cooperation brought about experimental ideas and policies, further nurturing film with educational and cultural value in Britain. To explore the process of forging the advocacy coalition and its impact, I employ diverse historical records, such as unpublished archival resources in the BFI Special Collection (including BFI newspaper clippings and the minutes of the BFI governing board meetings) in addition to officially published documents that include the BFI’s annual reports, newspaper articles, and trade and educational journals. These materials uncover the overlooked but pivotal communication and cooperation between diverse parties in shaping the BFI in the interwar period.

To analyse the BFI and its advocacy coalition, this chapter is structured as follows. Section 4.2 introduces the institutional history of the BFI by illustrating its original purposes, its initial institutional arrangements, and its governing body in the interwar period. Section 4.3 traces the development of the advocacy coalition for the BFI by focusing on: (1) the roles of the educationalists in the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films as policy entrepreneurs initiating the policy discussion (4.3.1), (2) the initial tensions between educationalists and the film industry concerning the proposed film institute (4.3.2), (3) the process of how educationalists and
the industry reached mutual understanding and how their cooperation created the BFI (4.3.3), and (4) how the BFI expanded after the public authorities became coalition members (4.3.4). Section 4.4 evaluates the effects of the BFI advocacy coalition in the interwar period. This section delineates the cooperation of the public, business, and civic actors under the BFI Advisory Council and its specialist panels (particularly the Education Panel and Entertainment Panel; 4.4.1). The section also addresses the experimental proposals promoting children’s film in the Conference for Children’s Cinema (4.4.2). The section then proceeds to analyse the new ideas regarding how British film can and should overcome the commerce/culture dichotomy and the discourses calling for cooperation between private business and educationalists in making constructive educational film. In conclusion, I summarise the key findings concerning the BFI advocacy coalition in the interwar period and how it was revised and challenged in the post-war period. Additionally, this section illustrates the connection between the BFI and the CFF discussed in Chapter 5.

4.2 The Institutional History of the BFI

4.2.1 The Film in National Life report

The Film in National Life report, published in May 1932 by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films (hereafter, the ‘Commission’), triggered a debate over the formation of a national film institute in Britain. The Commission originated at a conference of the British Institute of Adult Education, a charity that sought to support adult education, to discuss the use of film to promote British national culture and function as a pedagogical instrument. The variety of 52 Commission members—a comprehensive list of which can be found in Appendix 4.1—reflects the broader attention drawn from educational and civic associations at both national and local levels. Participants also included university professors, schoolteachers, and governing members of local
educational committees. On the other hand, only two representatives from film companies attended: Miss M. Locket, Educational Manager of British Instructional Films Ltd. and H. Bruce Woolfe, a representative of the Film Industry Department in the Federation of British Industries.\textsuperscript{23} The constitution of the Commission members implies that the impetus for a national film institute came from educationalists rather than the film industry. Moreover, the Commission members were, interestingly, not confined to specific members of the film industry but also included members from different sectors (including museums, science, agriculture, and fisheries) because film in the interwar period was related to documentation, promotion, and education regarding these activities (e.g., BFI 1934a; \textit{Observer} 1932, December 11).

Examining the political and economic contexts and the relevant authorities surrounding British film, including the BBFC, the report concluded that, to promote film and contribute to national well-being, ‘a National Film Institute [should] be set up in Great Britain and financed in part by public funds and incorporated under Royal Charter’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 155). The structure of the governing body and the expected activities that the Commission report proposed differed from those realised by the BFI in 1933. For instance, the Commission emphasised the significance of the government’s commitment, commenting that ‘government recognition is essential, [as well as] some form of Government control, even if Government funds are not available’ (p. 151). Despite such expectations, the involvement of the government in the Commission’s initiative was minimal, and it declined to offer a Royal Charter to the film institute or to appoint the institute’s governors. Due to such reluctance, the educationalists in the Commission (such as its joint honorary secretaries, A. C. Cameron and J. W.

\textsuperscript{23} The Film Industry Department of the Federation of British Industries was a major organisation representing the production sector of the British film industry in the 1920s and 1930s. As a representative of the production sector, it was also involved in formulating major economic film policy such as the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 (the legislation installing quotas for showing British cinema).
Brown) and the above two film organisations were the principal initiators of the policy discussion concerning how to realise a national film institute. At the time, the British film industry saw the emergence of various interest groups: the Federation of British Industries Film Industry Department in the production sector, the KRS in the distribution sector, and the CEA in the exhibition sector.24 These industry groups paid close attention to the creation of the BFI following the publication of the *Film in National Life* report, as the proposed tasks of the national film institute either directly or indirectly related to all three sectors. The opinions and lobbying activities of these three sectors was evident in trade journals, including *The Kinematograph Weekly*,25 *Today’s Cinema*, and the *Daily Film Renter*. Those Commission members with educational backgrounds, as well as key figures representing the film industry, frequently published statements in national and local newspapers as well as trade journals addressing concerns and expectations regarding the national film institute. Finally, they arranged an informal meeting and reached a consensus from 1932 to 1933 on establishing the BFI (section 4.3 closely examines this process).

### 4.2.2 Missions and activities of the BFI during the interwar period

In October 1933, the BFI was officially established following policy discussions in parliament, trade journals, and national newspapers. Its general goal was ‘to encourage the use and development of the cinema as a means of entertainment and instruction’ (BFI 1934a, p. 8) in addition to more specific goals:

1. To act as a clearinghouse for information on all matters affecting films at home and abroad, particularly as regards education and general culture.
2. To influence public opinion to appreciate the value of films as entertainment and general culture.

---

24 While the KRS and the CEA had continued to be central agencies representing the distribution and exhibition sectors since the 1910s (Chapter 3), the industrial organisation for production was substituted by the BFI.
25 For details about the Kinematograph Weekly and the film industry in the 1930s, see James (2006)
(3) To advise educational institutions and other organisations and persons on films as apparatus.
(4) To link up the film trade and the cultural and educational interests of the country.
(5) To encourage research into the various uses of film.
(6) To establish a national repository of films of permanent value.
(7) To provide a descriptive and critical catalogue of films of educational and cultural value.
(8) To advise Government Departments concerned with film.
(9) To certify films as educational, cultural or scientific.
(10) To undertake similar duties in relation to the Empire. (BFI 1934a, p. 9)

Even as a mere declaration of intent, the BFI established the goal of connecting the film industry with cultural and educational interests and promoting the value of film as general entertainment. At least when it was established, the BFI was not expected to confine itself to film in the classroom or educational film in a strict sense but, rather, to influence film as entertainment.

In the years before the Second World War, the BFI implemented several projects to achieve its goals. First, it contributed to the use of film for educational purposes by producing leaflets and reports containing instructions and information for schoolteachers on how to use films in classrooms. Second, it attempted to enhance the cultural status and quality of British films through its own publications. These included *Sight and Sound* (1932–present), which the BFI inherited from the British Institute of Adult Education, and *Monthly Film Bulletin* (1934–1991), which offered reviews of films and commentary on how to develop film culture from a wide range of authors, including professional critics, educationalists, and religious leaders. Moreover, the BFI hosted conferences around specific themes, such as children’s films, so those interested in film from both commercial and educational perspectives could obtain information. Finally, it greatly affected British film culture by establishing the National Film Library in 1935 for the collection and loan of films for educational and cultural purposes. In planning and implementing these new policies, the BFI consulted diverse specialist panels on its Advisory Council, including professionals and stakeholders from different sectors. The achievements of these new policy
initiatives were recorded and published in the BFI’s annual reports and in the minutes of its official meetings. It was pivotal for the BFI to continuously demonstrate its initiatives and achievements, as its principal funding came from the Cinematograph Fund, which consisting of tax revenue from Sunday cinema exhibitions, and the BFI needed annual Privy Council approval to secure this income.

The fundamental principle of the new film institute was the ‘disinterestedness’ of all stakeholders (The Times 1932, August 9, p. 6). This principle was highlighted at the very beginning of the film institute debate, when the Film in National Life report warned that the institute should be independent of government control, since ‘too close a State control either of production or of public taste would almost certainly have worse effects’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 143).\(^{26}\) Key members of the institute’s Advisory Council repeatedly raised the principle of disinterestedness. The government also confirmed the distancing of the BFI from public control in order to balance diverse interests as ‘a non-official, non-commercial body—aspects of which, as well as its being a focal point for trade, educational and general public interests, were sine qua non’ (Board of Education 1932a, p. 1).

The BFI Board of Governors played a central role in formulating its activities, embodying its impartiality in representing educational, industrial, and public interests. To realise impartial and equal representation within the film industry, the board consisted of three representatives from the educational sector—Sir Charles Cleland of the Corporation of Glasgow Education Committee, R. S. Lambert of the British Institute of Adult Education, and A. C. Cameron, Secretary of Education for the City of Oxford. The board also included three figures expected to represent the general public—John Buchan, Conservative MP; John Lawson, Labour MP; and Lady Levita. Further, F.

\(^{26}\text{This determination echoes the discussion of state censorship in 1916 and its conclusion that state censorship would be less effective than the BBFC (see Chapter 3).}\)
W. Walker of the Kinematograph Renters Society, Thomas Ormiston of the CEA, and C. M. Woolf of the Federation of British Industries Film Department, respectively represented film’s production, distribution, and exhibition sectors.\textsuperscript{27} The Board of Governors also appointed an Advisory Council to consult professionals and specialists from the film industry, the education sector, and the civil sector, representing important organisations in various sectors (see Appendix 4.3). These mechanisms allowed the institute to involve diverse stakeholders and serve as a hub. Later, the governing board was expanded to include representatives nominated by such public authorities as the Home Office, the Board of Trade, and the Scottish Office. The inclusion of new representatives from state agencies reflected the expanding interests of the public sector within the BFI.

As a newly established institution for film policy, the BFI was evaluated by external critics from numerous angles. In 1934, an independent journalist, Walter Ashley, published a criticism of the BFI. His influence as a journalist is difficult to assess, but his criticism of the BFI as a trade-controlled institute and its perceived failure to equally balance educational, trade, and public interests, attracted attention from both national newspapers and trade journals (Ashley 1934). Historians shared Ashley’s view and repeatedly claimed that, in the interwar period, the film industry dominated the BFI and could not achieve a substantive outcome in fostering national film culture. For example, in 1947, the Dartington Hall Trustees on the Visual Arts, the Factual Film, Music and Theatre conducted and published a survey (Arts Enquiry 1947; Upchurch 2013) and critically evaluated the outcomes of the BFI in its initial years. Its second report, \textit{The Factual Film} (1947), comprehensively reviewed film policy and the industry until the beginning of the post-war era. The report evaluated the BFI’s activities and roles and severely criticised its limited outcomes, pointing out that the institute’s lack of budget and leadership ‘made it difficult for the Institute to

\textsuperscript{27} The equal representation of production, distribution, and exhibition was a common practice during the development of the BBFC in the 1910s.
adapt to a constructive and active policy’ (p. 31). Nevertheless, the following sections aim to elucidate that the BFI was based on the advocacy coalition involving the educationalists, film industry, and public authorities, and the BFI made a significant contribution to educational and cultural film policy in Britain by developing the cooperation and communication between the stakeholders in the state, market, and civil society.

4.3 The Process of Creating the Advocacy Coalition

This section illustrates the formation of the BFI’s Advocacy Coalition, involving the educationalists, the film industry, and the public authorities in the 1920s and 1930s. The debate over a national film institute had been initiated by a group of educationalists in the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films. These policy entrepreneurs highlighted the potential of educational film and the importance of establishing a national film institute financed through public funding and supported by the film industry (4.3.1). However, the responses from the film industry were rather critical or reluctant because the film industry was afraid of the restriction on the commercial business by a new institute (4.3.2). To involve the film industry as a coalition member, the Commission played the role of a policy broker that closely negotiated with the film industry, reaching consensus on the well-defined scope of the BFI and the independence of the film business from the BFI’s intervention (4.3.3). The coalition between educationalists and the film industry enabled the formulation of the BFI, and these advocates managed to expand the advocacy coalition by including governmental departments as members of the BFI’s governing/advisory boards (4.3.4).
4.3.1 Policy initiative by the educationalists on the Commission

The discussion of a film institute was instigated by the group of educationalists on the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films: associations and individuals with educational backgrounds (e.g., schoolteachers, university professors, and members of educational committees). As Appendix 4.1 clearly illustrates, most members of the Commission were from local boards of education and universities, such as the chairman of the Commission, Sir Benjamin Gott, Secretary for Education in Middlesex. Consequently, the educationalists rather than the industry or government set the agenda for the film institute and presented the rationale behind its creation in national newspapers and trade journals. Several key educationalists were actively engaged in the debate: R. S. Lambert, previously Head of the Adult Education Section of the BBC and editor of its weekly magazine, The Listener (1929-1991); J. W. Brown, Secretary of the British Institute of Adult Education; and A. C. Cameron, Secretary for Education, City of Oxford, the latter two both having been Joint Honorary Secretaries of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films. In national newspapers and books featuring British film, these actors emerged as opinion leaders discussing and assessing the potentials of film as a new form of entertainment and medium (e.g., The Times 1932, August 7; 1933, January 6; 1933, January 23). They also occasionally launched political campaigns to control the film industry and reform film policy.

The educationalists on the Commission proposed the creation of a national institute that would highlight the cultural and educational value of film by improving film culture and promoting the use of film as an educational instrument. By doing so, they played the role of ‘policy entrepreneurs’ (Weible and Ingold 2018), setting new agendas and delivering their ideas to initiate the policymaking process. To understand how innovative such a policy enterprise was, it is important to consider the clichéd critique on the moral harm of film in that period. The 1925
conference of the National Union of Women Teachers in Bristol featured the circulation of undesirable films for children as a central agenda item, reflecting the interests of the educationalists. At this meeting, a representative from the Birmingham branch of the National Union of Women Teachers proposed a resolution that opposed presenting undesirable films to children, remarking that ‘the worst pictures were shown in the slum quarters of our cities’ (*The Manchester Guardian* 1925, December 31, p. 10). Echoing such critical comments by the schoolteachers’ group, religious leaders repeatedly voiced their apprehensions concerning the negative impact of film on religion and morals: the Archbishop of Canterbury claimed that ‘the real danger of undesirable films was not their effect on children, though that was considerable, but their effect on adolescents at an impressionable age’ (*The Manchester Guardian* 1935, January 6, p. 9). The educationalists’ critical views had been presented at the annual meeting of charitable education school in Manchester, commenting that ‘unfortunately, however, some of the films shown … were of a debasing character and should be prohibited by law’ (*The Manchester Guardian* 1926, December 6, p. 11).

While such critical comments highlighting the moral harm of film were dominant, the educationalists also recognised film’s potential for educational purposes if used properly. For instance, in the exact same meeting mentioned above, the speaker (T. R Ackroyd) indicated that ‘the kinema could become a powerful instrument for the importing of knowledge in addition to providing a pleasant entertainment. It had possibilities of becoming an important agency for the promotion of the intellectual, physical, and moral education of children’ (*The Manchester Guardian* 1926, December 6, p. 11). Moreover, at the annual meeting of the National Association of Head Teachers, one of the participants expressed their appreciation for the potential of film by highlighting cinema’s wide reach:
Mr F. A. Metcalf, who introduced the subject, said there were in Great Britain over 5000 commercial cinemas—one to every 8000 of the population. These simple facts were sufficient to indicate the great and growing power of the film. Teachers must recognise the wonderful appeal of the cinema to the children. (*The Manchester Guardian* 1932, May 18, p. 12)

The association underlined ‘the necessity for the institution of a body qualified to influence the development of the cinema in the interests of national welfare, appealing to producers and exhibitors to cooperate with all those responsible for the training of children by producing films with a healthy mental, moral and emotional tone’ (*The Manchester Guardian* 1932, May 18, p. 12). This conference is particularly important, as it revealed the educationalists’ expectations for an organisation such as the BFI. Indeed, such interest in film’s potential drove the educationalists on the Commission on Educational and Cultural Film to propose a national film institute.

### 4.3.2 Initial tensions between the public authorities, the film industry, and the educationalists in the Commission

Although the educationalists in the Commission actively advocated establishing a national film institute, this did not immediately result in an advocacy coalition involving the film industry and public authorities. On the contrary, indifference and misunderstandings caused conflict between the stakeholders that had to be resolved by close communication. As policy entrepreneurs, the educationalists faced two barriers to forming the advocacy coalition: (1) indifference from the public authorities, and (2) tensions between the film industry and educationalists regarding the roles of the proposed film institute.

Regarding the first point, the government departments had been reluctant to commit to the Commission’s initiative to establish a national film institute since the *Film in National Life* report
had been prepared at the very beginning of the policy debate. A few months before its publication, the Board of Education circulated papers to the other relevant state departments, saying that ‘it would save many complications and a great deal of trouble if no attempts were made to get the representatives of Government Departments to sign the Report in the ordinary way’ (Board of Education 1932b), suggesting that the government departments should simply acknowledge their participation in the Conference for Educational and Cultural Film instead of officially signing the Commission’s report. Consequently, the departments all agreed to withhold their signatures, although A. C. Cameron, a core member of the Commission, sent a letter to the President of the Board of Education claiming that the government should officially sign the report (Cameron 1932).

More importantly, the Commission claimed that the government should play a central role in managing the BFI by appointing its governors, providing public funding, and granting a Royal Charter. The Film in National Life report stated that ‘we do not want, we repeat, to suggest a bureaucratic control of recreation, repugnant to English ideas. But almost every other country of a comparable civilisation has gone far in a direction in which we have hardly begun to move, and we feel that Great Britain should at least follow, if only a part of the way’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 149). Echoing this, Herbert Samuel28, then Home Secretary, commented that he personally believed ‘that there should be a national body charged with the responsibility of promoting the cultural development of films, instead of leaving it entirely

---

28 As Chapter 3 discusses, Herbert Samuel had been the Home Secretary in 1916 (from January to December), and he was appointed as Home Secretary again from 1931 to 1932 under the Ramsay MacDonald Government. Samuel continued to facilitate the close cooperation between the local municipalities and the BBFC by institutionalising a consultative committee comprised of representatives of the London County Council, County Councils’ Association, and Association of Municipal Corporations. The Home Office continued to facilitate the cooperation between the BBFC and external stakeholders to make the BBFC censorship a more impactful and legitimate standard (Hansard 1932).
to commercial undertakings’, but he could not commit the government to actualising such a body \textit{(The Kinematograph Weekly 1932, March 24, p. 15)}.\footnote{Despite these statements, the government finally declined to play a pivotal role in leading or designing the BFI before its creation; even after, the government was eager to distance itself from responsibility for its management. For example, when William Hutchison MP enquired about the duties of and plans for the institute in a Commons’ debate in February 1933, Oliver Stanley, Secretary of the Home Office, emphasised that ‘[t]he Government have [sic] no responsibility for the formation of the proposed film institute’, although the Privy Council funded it (Hansard 1933).}

As the governmental departments demonstrated their detachment from the beginning of the policy discussion, the policy entrepreneurs in the Commission had to negotiate and cooperate with the film industry to obtain its support in founding a national film institute. The film industry, represented by industrial organisations such as the CEA and the KRS, was not as indifferent as the government departments to the Commission’s proposal. However, they were rather critical because they worried the film institute might be employed to restrict commercial film culture. \textit{The Manchester Guardian} cites such concerns from the film industry, commenting that ‘critics were afraid either that the scheme might turn out to be too narrowly educational, or that some kind of dictatorship over public taste in film was intended, or that amateurs would meddle with the legitimate business of the film trade’ \textit{(The Manchester Guardian 1933, March 27, p. 16)}. Industrial groups expressed similar concerns in the trade journals: an editorial in \textit{The Kinematograph Weekly} worried that ‘[the BFI] would get in the hands of the fanatical, or the class conscious, or the condescending, or the log-rolling, or any other of the types who spend their energies telling the other half of the world how to live’ \textit{(The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, March 23, p. 8)}. Moreover, Oscar Deutsch, a founder of the Odeon cinema chain and then a chairman of the CEA in the Birmingham and Midland Branch paraphrased and summarised the same concern that ‘[t]here is a feeling in some quarters that the Film Institute may fall into the hands of the “high-brow” element, and become a danger’ \textit{(The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, January 12, p. 29)}. A common belief
within the film business was that creating film policy from educational and cultural perspectives might lead to the enforcement of upper-class tastes in films.

*The Economist* explained why the Commission had to face such scepticism, arguing that the term ‘cultural’ in the name of the Commission gives the impression ‘that the word “cultural” as applied to entertainment means “improving” in the most unpleasing sense’ (*The Economist* 1932, June 25, p. 1413). Such a diagnosis was important, as it indicated that claiming film to be a cultural endeavour implied a top-down, enlightening approach that could potentially undermine the autonomy of the business. From a business perspective, imposing a cultural policy on commercial films implied the imposition of educationalists’ preferences on entertainment. These claims suggested a dichotomy between educational film as the Commission envisaged it and the mainstream entertainment films that the industry largely provided. Such a binary understanding echoed the typical characterisation of the educationalists as the film industry’s ‘severest critic’ (*The Kinematograph Weekly* 1933, January 5, p. 3).

Furthermore, the trade group expressed concerns that the institute might be used as a means of exercising more stringent film censorship (*The Kinematograph Weekly* 1933, March 23). Such apprehensions indicate a miscommunication between the Commission and the trade sector because the *Film in National Life* report explicitly stated that the film institute was not to be concerned with censorship. Rather, it should be ‘a positive agency which will be concerned to encourage good films rather than to discourage bad, and to exercise a constructive critical influence over the whole field of cinematography’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 141). *The Economist* had already shared the same view regarding the role of the BFI, articulating that ‘the activities of the new Film Institute should be positive and not negative … There is already a sufficiency of censoring and restrictive bodies in the film trade. There is no genuine reason for the
agitation of the moralists who are anxious to make the new Institute yet another suppressive body’
(The Economist 1932, December 3, p. 1022). The industry’s concern was deeply rooted in the
criticism of upper-class attitudes from educationalists and not always based on the Commission’s
actual arguments.

On the other hand, the educationalists in the Commission were also careful to sustain their
leadership and would not let the film institute be dominated by the film industry. For instance, J.
W. Brown and A. C. Cameron, Joint Honorary Secretaries of the Commission on Educational and
Cultural Films, posted a letter to the editor of The Times:

The film institute will have to be in a position of indisputable commercial disinterestedness. And we therefore believe that the film trade will show wisdom and foresight if it does not try to secure ‘control’ of the new organization, but rather takes the opportunity of putting its practical experience and technical skill at the service of the institute, whereby a feeling of mutual confidence, more enduring and more fruitful than any measure of material control, will be early engendered. (The Times 1932, August 9, p. 6)

From the educationalists’ perspective, the danger was that the trade would control the new institute
and that commercial business would violate the institute’s disinterestedness. Their fears concerning the dominance of the industry over policy coincided with their reiterated criticism of the trade’s leadership regarding film censorship in the 1910s (Chapter 3). Such a concern was understandable, as members of the film industry occasionally stated that they should lead the institute. As Simon Rowson, owner of the Ideal Film Company, argued:

A film institute of some kind is, in my opinion, therefore necessary for guiding and organizing the development of the cultural film. But what kind? It should not be quite of the type recommended by the Commission … I think the best of all forms of organization is one which left the greater part of the control to the trade, with the assistance and advice of the representatives of public institutions—educational and other—and of interested Government Departments. (Rowson 1932, August 4, p. 6)
Rowson argued that the film industry should be central to the film institute, and the education sector and other stakeholders should focus on assisting the industry. This model diverged from the original concept of the BFI, which was intended to represent educational, trade, and public interests equally. The statements from the business sector and educationalists reveal that they recognised the necessity of collaboration in establishing the film institute, but both feared that control of the new organisation by the opposing side would lead to undesirable consequences. Though the educationalists recognised the risks of a coalition regarding the new film institute, they understood that support from the film industry was essential. As the Commission argued: ‘without the help of the trade any recommendations which we could make would have little more than academic interest’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 142). Considering the government’s hesitancy in supporting the new institute, the Commission’s need for assistance from the film industry is therefore understandable.  

4.3.3 Overcoming initial tensions and building the educationalist-industry coalition

To overcome initial tensions and fulfil their interest in establishing the film institute, the film industry and educationalists began to negotiate. The primary communication channels included national newspapers (e.g., The Times and The Manchester Guardian), local newspapers (e.g., Birmingham Post, Glasgow Herald), trade journals (The Kinematograph Weekly), film magazines (e.g., Sight and Sound and Today’s Cinema), and educational journals (e.g., Education and Head Teacher). The national newspapers posted the opinions of key figures, which led to a dialogue.

---

30 Prior research on the BFI in its early years has argued that the involvement of the film industry with the film institute resulted in the BFI’s inefficiency and the industry intentionally undermined the BFI without supporting it. However, my research demonstrates that the commitment of the film industry was demanded by the Commission, and the BFI could not have been established without the industry.

31 See also the Appendix 4.5 for the lists of newspapers and journals concerning the BFI and its stakeholders (stored in the BFI Special Collection in Berkhamsted). These clippings demonstrate that the creation of the BFI attracted
involving public opinion. On 23 July 1932, H. Bruce-Woolfe, an influential film producer, published an article in *The Times* explaining the expected outcome of the institute, aiming to address the misunderstanding that ‘the film trade of this country as a whole disliked the idea of an institute and resented the proposal being made’ (Bruce-Woolfe 1932, p. 6). Instead, he stated his belief that ‘the institute would be a very helpful servant both of the public and of the trade’ (Bruce-Woolfe 1932, July 23, p. 6). Of course, as Bruce-Woolfe was an original member of the Commission, his positive expectations should not be overgeneralised. However, soon after, another producer reinforced Bruce-Woolfe’s position by refuting the hostility of the film business towards the film institute, mentioning that criticisms by a small group of exhibitors regarding the Sunday Entertainment Act should not be seen as an attack on the BFI (Rowson 1932, August 4).

These articles from the trade served two purposes: presenting the usefulness of the film institute to trade members and demonstrating the film industry’s supportive attitude to the public. The national newspapers suited these goals more effectively than the trade journals. After the trade sector’s view appeared, the Commission immediately replied with a letter to *The Times* on 9 August 1932 emphasising its appreciation for the trade’s support of the BFI, going on to claim that the trade should change its “wait-and-see” attitude—in so far as it was not hostile’ because the film institute ‘[must] be founded upon a basis of real cooperation and understanding between the trade and the educational, cultural, and official interests concerned’ (*The Times* 1932, August 9, p. 6). As this letter demonstrates, the representatives of the film industry and the Commission used the exchange of letters in a national newspaper as an opportunity to confirm the trade’s appreciation for the film institute and the collaboration between them. Both sides attempted to

---

atentions from diverse associations in the civil society, including educationalists, religious leaders, film industry, and the general publics.
establish mutual understandings but did not discuss concrete ideas regarding how to organise the institute at this stage.

Echoing the constructive comments from the film industry, the Commission members presented a more determined statement emphasising the film institute’s necessity under the partnership of the film industry and the Commission members. On 6 January 1933, A. C. Cameron made a speech at the University of London for members of the Association of the University Women Teachers, emphasising that cooperation with the film industry ‘must be constructive, not restrictive; it must not attempt to exercise over entertainment a bureaucratic control, and it must be based on the authority and whole-hearted support of the three parties to the service—the general public, educational and scientific opinion, and the film trade’ (*The Times* 1933, January 6, p. 7). He argued that members of the film industry ‘were becoming increasingly convinced of the need for a permanent central organization’ (*The Times* 1933, January 6, p. 7). Here, Cameron clarified that the BFI aimed not to harm the autonomy of the film business and that the film industry was more of a supportive partner than a hostile controller of the coming institute. Furthermore, reports of fruitful meetings amongst the stakeholders began to appear in the same period. On 23 January, R. S. Lambert, a member of the Commission, declared a consensus between the trade and educationalists. He concluded that ‘[t]hose negotiations had proceeded so harmoniously and satisfactorily that he was able to announce that it was not at all a mere academic or theoretical proposition, but one which was on the point of being carried out’ (*The Times* 1933, January 23, p. 9). The priority of the Commission members was to realise a tangible rather than a theoretical/conceptual film institute, and cooperation with the film industry was a significant starting point in achieving this objective.
While it might appear that the friendly atmosphere emerged suddenly in the middle of the debate, the agreement was conditioned upon numerous factors. First and foremost, the media’s coverage of the educationalists’ support for the film industry’s presence was critical in triggering constructive dialogue. Commission members repeatedly appeared in trade journals to explain the merits of the film institute. For instance, on 26 January 1933, the Commission declared that ‘[e]ducationalists approaching the film must always remember they were approaching something which existed first and foremost for entertainment’ (The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, January 26, p. 4). Furthermore, the educationalists repeated in these articles that the institute would not censor films (The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, January 26; The Times 1933, January 23). In comparison with the policy discussion regarding state censorship in the 1910s, the educationalists and the film industry were able to exchange their opinions, expectations, and anxieties casually and publicly because they were given space in several journals and newspapers; such media settings fostered the smooth and fruitful communication necessary to fostering their advocacy coalition’s creation.

As Appendix 4.3 demonstrates, the debate on the national film institute and the stakeholders’ viewpoints were broadly covered in national and local newspapers as well as several journals issued by educational and industrial associations. These outlets mediated between the educational and industrial associations at national and local levels to help them understand the potential and merits of the BFI and how it would not violate their interests.

In addition, the consensus concerning the film institute’s governing body was influential in encouraging the trade sector to adopt a positive attitude towards the proposed institute. In The Kinematograph Weekly in March 1933, the trade sector heralded the coming of the BFI in a celebratory tone, highlighting that the production, distribution, and exhibition sectors would be able to nominate representatives to the Board of Governors (The Kinematograph Weekly 1933,
March 23). The inclusion of all three sectors on the Board of Governors was critical for the business sector. When the Commission began to discuss the creation of the film institute, they had appointed only film producers as members, whereas exhibitors and distributors were neglected, leading to scepticism among exhibitors. Moreover, in the original plan presented by the Commission, the government would appoint the seven governors of the BFI, and appointments from the business side were not guaranteed. While the Commission had excluded distributors and exhibitors, the BFI managed to equally represent the production, distribution, and exhibition sectors, allowing the film business to succeed in comprehensively safeguarding its interests. The BFI’s first Annual Report, published in 1934 (although the leaflets were published before that), briefly summarises the consequences of the satisfactory meetings between the trade and educationalists: ‘From the educational side, safeguards were agreed upon which have had the effect of steering the Institute clear of any temptation to meddle with the film censorship or interfere in matters of purely trade interest’ (BFI 1934a, p. 5). According to the report, the consensus with the educationalists that the BFI would not intervene in purely trade matters or implement film censorship relieved the film business. In return, the educationalists succeeded in acquiring trade support and thus agreement around the creation of the BFI and the trade’s engagement with it. Ambiguity concerning this accord lay in the scope of the ‘purely trade’ matters that forcibly excluded the BFI.

Once the institutional arrangements of the film institute satisfied the representatives of the film industry such as the present and past presidents of the industry organisations and owners of major film companies, they began to promote the rationale of the new film institute to sceptical members of the industry. For instance, the establishment of the BFI and the appointment of its governors were pre-announced in the trade journal (*The Kinematograph Weekly* 1933, January 5),
which also included plans explaining how the institute would be governed and its activities implemented for the benefit of the entire film industry. The trade journals provided an essential platform in which the film sectors could share information and build consensus around the need for the BFI, promoting effective dialogue between the film business and other stakeholders. Additionally, the BFI Special Collection record (Appendix 4.5) reveals that the educational journals as well as local and national newspapers provided these communication channels from the very beginning of the debate in 1929.

Tracing the BFI’s creation demonstrates the significance of policy brokers. In developing an advocacy coalition, Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) defined policy brokers as ‘a category of actors … whose dominant concerns are keeping the level of political conflict within acceptable limits and reaching some “reasonable” solution to the problem’ (p. 27). Ingold and Varone (2012) expanded this concept and discussed the influence of the broker who links members from different political circles and attains ‘a mediating position’ (p. 331). Applying this definition of policy brokers enables an acknowledgement of previously overlooked contributions that policy brokers made for institutionalising the BFI. In the process of discussing and formulating the BFI, brokers linked the film industry and educationalists, both of which were suspicious of the other side. These brokers included Commission member A. C. Cameron on the educational side, as well as film producer H. Bruce-Woolfe. The brokers not only explained the merits of the new institute to the groups they represented but also articulated the public benefits of the institute by contributing statements in more than 20 articles in national newspapers including The Times, The Manchester Guardian, The Kinematograph Weekly, and Daily Film Renters. By establishing shared beliefs concerning the BFI’s roles, their communication led to a coalition of diverse stakeholders under
the BFI governing board. Such interactions also clarified how the BFI could be independent of trade control and sustain the film industry’s autonomy.

As the next section examines, in addition to the contributions of the policy brokers for establishing the BFI, the BFI itself later offered a platform for enhancing the communication and mutual understandings of the stakeholders, setting up meetings and conferences in which the business and civil sectors exchanged views and agreed on new policies on film classification and the promotion of children’s films. Without the BFI, these participants could only have stated their concerns in media internal to their fields, such as trade journals (e.g., *The Kinematograph Weekly* *Daily Film Renters*) and educational magazines (e.g., *Head Teachers Review*). The BFI and its core members contributed to relieving tensions and misunderstandings between the film industry, public authorities, and educationalists.32

4.3.4 Expanding the advocacy coalition after the BFI

After the BFI’s creation through cooperation between the Commission’s educationalists and the film organisations, the advocacy coalition further expanded by closely engaging with public authorities including the Board of Education and the Board of Trade. In 1935, Mr H. Ramsbotham,

32 The BFI undeniably worked primarily with educational films in the interwar period and had little influence on commercial films and the film industry (Nowell-Smith & Dupin 2012). However, it is important to cautiously re-examine the picture of the demonised film trade as the central cause of this limitation and approach a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the BFI and the commercial film business. For instance, the 1934 Annual Report described the film industry as coming to an ‘increasing understanding of the possibilities which lie before a Film Institute conducted on enterprising but business-like lines’ (BFI 1934a, p. 8). The Annual Report of 1935 states, ‘The Governors wish to acknowledge the co-operation and assistance they have received in their works from … various commercial film companies’ (BFI 1935b, p. 7). More broadly, the BFI proudly branded itself as ‘a means of furthering effective co-operation between those who make, distribute and exhibit films on the one hand, and all who are interested in the artistic, educational and cultural possibilities of films on the other’ (BFI 1935b, p. 4). Here, the film industry was framed as a significant ally rather than an outsider sabotaging the BFI. It could be claimed that these comments were recorded in the interim meetings of the BFI governors because of pressure from the film industry; however, the recorded historical documents do not reveal such dominance by the film industry. Rather, the Governing Board of the BFI in the interwar period comprised educationalists, the industry, and the public equally, and the film industry simply lacked the power to control such an assemblage.
MP Parliamentary Under-Secretary of the Board of Education, approached the institute and promised that ‘the Institute [BFI] should receive any support that the Board [Board of Education] could give’ (BFI 1935b, p. 11). At that early stage, the BFI was understood as an agency that addressed educational problems involving censorship and children’s affairs rather than film in general. For instance, the Home Office invited the institute to prepare a report for the Child Welfare Committee of the League of Nations on entertainment films for children and explain how unique film performances for children could be promoted by cooperation between the film industry and local educational authorities (BFI 1934b). The conceptualisation of the BFI’s scope gradually changed as the Home Office consulted the BFI to submit a memorandum regarding the renewal of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1909 (related to the regulation of commercial cinema exhibitions and film censorship; BFI 1939a, 1939b). Although the BFI was not intended to intervene in purely trade matters, the Home Office asked for advice and research related to film policy for commercial film. This process indicates that the connection between the BFI and public authorities had been gradually extended, and the BFI had established itself as a significant consultancy.

The turning point arrived when the government sent representatives of state agencies (the Home Office, the Board of Trade, and the Scottish Office) to the governing board in 1936. These three institutions explicitly stated their interest in the potential of the educational film policy the BFI implemented, and government representatives have directly engaged in the BFI’s decision-making processes since that point. The inclusion of government departments in the BFI governing board was the result of the incremental but constructive partnership between the BFI and the public

---

33 Moreover, the Board of Education held a conference with the BFI to appoint the Institute as an adviser for policies to promote film for educational purposes. The subjects discussed in this conference included: ‘the use and development of the cinematograph in schools; problems of projection apparatus and films suitable for educational purposes; the need of a central library for the preservation and distribution of films; and the training of teachers in the use of films.’ (TBFI 1935b, p. 10).
agencies that has occurred since the BFI’s creation. The process of how government authorities and the BFI attained their cooperation is visible in the relations between the BFI and the Board of Education. The unpublished minutes of the BFI indicate how a reciprocal relationship between the BFI and the Board of Education gradually developed in the interwar period and throughout the Second World War. Most significantly, the BFI served the Board of Education as a policy consultant, proposing a series of educational film policies that it could implement. As early as January 1935, the BFI suggested that the Board of Education organise events to discuss more effective educational uses of film with teachers. On 11 January 1935, the Board of Education organised a conference with representatives of schools and local education authorities, and Mr Ramsbotham, on behalf of the Board of Education, sympathetically commented that ‘the Institute should receive any support that the Board could give’ (BFI 1935, p. 29). In the same year, the BFI cooperated with the Board of Education and school teachers’ associations to plan the production of new educational films for projection in the classroom (BFI 1935b, 1935c). In April 1937, the BFI sent a deputation to the Board of Education suggesting further action. The deputation requested that the Board of Education should:

(B) Call a Conference of interested Authorities to discuss the development of the use of film in the classroom
(C) Run teachers’ demonstrations of educational films on Saturday mornings in certain selected provisional centres
(D) Encourage Training Colleges to make use of the teaching film and have lectures and demonstrations on the use of film in the classroom
(E) Organise in 1938 a Teachers’ Summer School on visual aids to education (BFI 1937, p. 1)

In August 1939, the Board of Education consulted the BFI, commenting that the Board recognised the necessity of securing ‘an extension of the use of the cinematograph and other optical aids in schools … and the Board will be glad to receive the Governors’ observations in due course’ (BFI
1939a, p. 1). Additionally, in May 1940, the BFI Governors’ Meeting reported that the Board of Education had informally contacted the BFI to ask for its help in supplying British films in France and distributing French films in Britain (Board of Education 1939). Even in the post-war period, the BFI and the Board of Education (later, the Ministry of Education) maintained a close connection in promoting the educational use of film. In January 1946, in response to a request from UNESCO, the Board of Education invited BFI members to organise a conference on film’s educational uses and make suggestions for educational film policy. The conclusion of this meeting included recommendations that UNESCO create a Film Department and standardise educational films (Board of Education 1946). These series of consultancies illustrate how the BFI and the Board of Education established trust and built a partnership.\textsuperscript{34}

In conclusion, the BFI assisted governmental departments by consulting on, recommending, and advertising educational film policy. The BFI succeeded in including state representatives within its governing board and establishing its status as a key adviser on educational film. This indicates that, even if the public-sector actors were reluctant to raise a new policy agenda, the creation of the new institute and its pilot projects may have convinced governmental bodies to appreciate the BFI’s potential and commit to the BFI as a governing member. The table below summarises how the stakeholders’ stances toward the national film institute changed before and after the creation of the BFI.

\textsuperscript{34} In addition to public authorities at the state level, the BFI also collaborated with local authorities and educationalists interested in educational film. The BFI governors were invited to meetings with the Education Committee of the London County Council on 8 July 1935 and a series of meetings with the Association of Educational Committees and the County Councils Associations, the London School Film Society, the Nottinghamshire Joint Committee, a group of Canadian Deputy Ministers of Education, Chiswick Polytechnic, the Federation of Education of Wales and Monmouthshire, and the Annual Meeting of the Science Masters’ Associations (BFI 1939c). These associations demonstrated their support for the BFI by registering corporate memberships and annual subscriptions. \textit{Head Teachers Review}, a periodical published by teachers’ groups, recommended that its readers subscribe to BFI publications because of their educational value (\textit{Head Teachers Review} 1935, October 1935). These ties with educational associations demonstrate that the BFI was understood as an agency central to educational film policy rather than film policy in general.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before BFI creation</th>
<th>After BFI creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educationalists</td>
<td>Initiating the creation of the BFI as a policy entrepreneur and policy broker (publishing the Commission report)</td>
<td>Governing member of the BFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Industry</td>
<td>Skeptical of the Commission’s proposal (concern regarding the BFI’s control over the film industry)</td>
<td>Governing members and supporters of the BFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Authorities</td>
<td>Reluctant to commit (declined to officially sign the Commission report)</td>
<td>Governing members of the BFI; close cooperation with the BFI (the BFI’s consultancy with the Board of Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Impacts of the BFI Advocacy Coalition

4.4.1 Platform of coordinating stakeholders’ cooperation (1934-1936)

As the BFI was supported and institutionalised by the advocacy coalition of the educationalists and the film industry (and, subsequently, state actors), it offered a platform wherein these stakeholders could sit at the same table and reach policy consensus. The involvement of diverse stakeholders can be identified in the BFI Advisory Council and its specialist panels. While balancing the interests of educationalists, the trade, and the general public on the BFI governing board, the BFI also established the Advisory Council, where representatives of the film industry, the educational associations, and the public authorities cooperated to design and implement the BFI’s policies. The BFI Advisory Council established internal specialist panels, wherein representatives familiar with specific issues gathered to offer advice to the BFI (the panels included the Education Panel, the Entertainment Panel, the International Relations Panel, the Dominions, India and Colonies Panel, the Medical Panel, the Social Service Panel, the Scientific Research Panel, the Amateur Cinematography Panel, and the Documentary Film Panel).

Appendices 4.3 and 4.4 list the members of the Advisory Council in 1934 and the members of specialist panels (particularly, the Education Panel and Entertainment Panel). The table clearly
demonstrates that the state (government departments such as the Board of Education and the Board of Trade), the market (trade organisations and trade firms), and civil society (groups of educationalists such as the British Institute of Adult Education, the National Adult School Union, and the National Union of Teachers) were involved in a balanced manner in the Advisory Council and its panels. The list of Education and Entertainment Panel members in Appendix 4.4 indicates that the former involved a variety of educational associations and public authorities while the latter included a majority of the industry’s organisations and trade members. These specialist panels regularly held joint meetings and frequently launched cooperative actions to facilitate collaboration between the public, business, and civic actors. One of the most significant outcomes of the cooperation between these specialist panels and their members was the promotion of the use of films in schools. The education and entertainment panels held a joint meeting and discussed how they could facilitate the use of film for educational and cultural purposes and agreed to provide both projectors and their instructions to schools (BFI 1935). The film industry’s representatives on the panels agreed to provide suitable projectors and equip them in the schools while the educationalists monitored feedback and shared proposals on how to promote the use of film in schools. Moreover, in the process of popularising educational film, the establishment of a national film library cataloguing, storing, and supplying suitable educational films was recommended, resulting in the creation of the National Film Library at the BFI in 1935.

Additionally, this partnership also manifested within the Entertainment Panel of the Advisory Council, a platform for engaging with the film industry and addressing commercial cinema. The BFI’s first Annual Report describes the mission of the panel as including:

(1) Securing views from the public as to the type of film required
(2) The setting up of machinery whereby these opinions can be made available for film producers
(3) Special films and programmes for children’s performances
(4) Encouragement of the repertory theatre movement
(5) Methods to be adopted whereby public support may be given to films containing some unusual merit, which do not obtain appreciation from the ordinary cinema-going public (BFI 1934a, p. 15)

In 1935, the expected tasks of the Entertainment Panel were further elaborated and specified:

(1) To obtain opinions from the public as to types of film required
(2) To make these opinions available to producers
(3) Special films for children’s performances
(4) Encouraging of entertainment films of special merit
(5) To encourage the Repertory Theatre movement
(6) To discuss methods whereby public support may be given to films of special merit

[which can be realised by detecting]
(1) the entertainment value of films produced primarily for entertainment,
(2) the social significance of the approval or disapproval of the various standards portrayed in a film,
(3) the motive of films which obviously have a motive besides entertainment (BFI 1935a, p. 4).

To meet these goals, the Entertainment Panel conducted a series of projects benefitting and influencing mainstream commercial films. First, it managed the BFI’s key publications covering reviews and news, *Sight and Sound* and *Monthly Film Bulletin*, magazines to which both industry members and diverse opinion leaders (including schoolteachers, politicians, religious leaders, and film critics) contributed. Additionally, these magazines regularly presented reviews concerning feature films to attract audiences. Second, the Entertainment Panel served the cinema exhibitors and managers in a consultancy capacity, offering information on British cinema. For instance,

35 The Repertory Theatre (Repertory Cinema) should screen foreign or experimental films that cannot be broadly accessed. For instance, in 1934, Mr Eric Hakim, a cinema manager who created his repertory cinema in Liverpool, described it as ‘a cinema devoted exclusively to the showing of unusual films which would not otherwise be seen in the city’ (Manchester Guardian 1934, p. 11). He explains that the films in question were considered and selected based on their artistic values.
according to the 1935 Annual Report, the Entertainment Panel supported local cinema managers experiencing difficulties accessing the distributed films and obtaining films to be shown in their theatres by sharing information concerning films suitable for disparate sections of viewers, including children and general audiences (BFI 1935b). The aim of this activity was described as follows: ‘it is hoped to compile lists of entertainment films which are available for such performances and which, while they will be entertaining, will, at the same time, stimulate and satisfy the intelligence and imagination of children’ (BFI 1935b, pp. 29–30). The panel also responded to enquiries from both schoolteachers and cinema managers asking technical questions regarding machinery and the times and locations of screenings.

Reflecting the BFI’s character as a platform mediating between various stakeholders and facilitating their cooperation, a variety of media, including national and local newspapers and journals, emphasised the benefits and contributions of the BFI. The media landscape surrounding British film policy had changed dramatically between the formation of the BBFC in the 1910s and the BFI in the 1930s. The BFI’s special collection stores all relevant newspaper and journal articles referring to educational film, the Commission, and the creation of the BFI from 1929 to 1938. These substantive records reveal that not only trade journals such as The Kinematograph Weekly but also new categories of public media covered the development of educational film policy. In addition to educational journals, such as Scottish Education Journal, Schoolmaster, and School Government Chronicle, the media included in this archive also includes local newspapers, such as The Birmingham Post, Oxford Mail, and The Yorkshire Post. The presence of such records has two implications: first, the BFI was both cautious and sensitive concerning the public’s opinion on film and education; second, educational film policy attracted substantial attention from the general
public. Appendix 4.5 illustrates the number of articles and the variety of journals referring to the BFI and relevant educational film policies from 1929 to 1939.

Overall, these media welcomed the Commission’s agenda for a national film institute and positively evaluated the establishment and activities of the BFI. Such attention to the BFI in the 1930s contrasts starkly with that provided to the BBFC in the 1910s, when only a small number of trade journals considered film censorship significant, implying that the public and media had come to see film and film policy as an increasingly noteworthy topic. The BFI contributed to fostering national debate over educational film policy and identified this attention as a driving force in legitimatising its new activities. Coverage of the BFI and relevant educational film policy was generally supportive of the BFI’s new initiatives. Indeed, the media stressed that film was culturally and educationally valuable and the BFI was a much-needed project in exploring film’s potential.

Additionally, it was pivotal that the activities of the BFI’s advocates were reported in local newspapers and educational and film-industry journals because these media discussed the BFI’s merits with their audiences and contributed to promoting the BFI’s advantages. For instance, local newspapers in specific regions such as Birmingham, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Bath, and Glasgow reported how the BFI could benefit local film societies and educational committees (e.g., *Edinburgh Evening News* 1933, July 3; see also Appendix 4.5). Moreover, educational and industrial journals assessed how the BFI’s policies could assist in the development of film shows for educational and cultural purposes, allowing teachers and businesspeople to benefit from the BFI. These webs of local newspapers and specialist magazines identified in Appendix 4.5 indicate how public opinion emphasising and supporting the BFI was formulated in the interwar period.
By making use of these diverse media and communication channels, the BFI made a substantial contribution as an intermediary between diverse actors with different viewpoints and beliefs. In this way, the BFI laid the foundation for partnerships and collaborations in future film policy. The significant but usually underestimated contributions of the BFI were discursive and ideational: raising and circulating new ideas with diverse participants and facilitating consensus. For instance, the BFI’s series of demonstrations of educational films succeeded in convincing the educationalists, who had been sceptical of the films’ value, to appreciate their potential and positive impacts. For instance, in 1936, the Arts and History Committee of the BFI Governors proudly reported its achievement in demonstrating the potential of film as an instructional and didactic medium at an educational film exhibition. The majority of schoolteachers’ conceptions of film changed because of this demonstration:

They were all at first extremely critical, even sceptical, of the value in the classroom of such mechanical devices as film, so that their final impressions are of as much, if not more value than the actual statistical results of the experiments. The majority of them were satisfied that such films were useful as an occasional aid in the teaching of history. (BFI 1933, p. 10)

Although the scope of the experiment was limited by its focus on classroom rather than feature films, the BFI certainly helped educators recognise the potential of film. From November 1937 to November 1938, the BFI sought to involve more varied actors and influence their ideas by organising conferences for the chairmen, directors, and secretaries of Local Education Authorities in Manchester, Yorkshire, Newcastle, and London. The 1939 Governors’ meeting summarised the impact of these conferences as ‘to a large extent moral’, as ‘for the first time some of the chairmen of the educational committees found that it was the thing to do to use films in schools’ (BFI 1939c, p. 20). Additionally, at these conferences, the BFI succeeded in leading educational associations to accept that the commercial film industry was improving and possessed considerable potential.
for future development (BFI 1939). The BFI Governors were keen to establish the BFI as such an intermediary, and their meetings repeatedly referred to the BFI as an organisation ‘filling a useful space as intermediary between those who want to use and see films of a special character and those who can provide them’ (BFI 1936c, p. 16).36

In addition to demonstrating the potential benefits of educational film, the BFI occasionally raised new ideas regarding film culture that were closely related to the concept of middlebrow cinema. The interwar period produced two streams of film culture: highbrow, represented by European artistic films and Film Society movements, and lowbrow, working-class (i.e., commercial) feature films, largely from the US. Significantly, Napper (2006) and Faulkner (2010) proposed the idea of ‘middlebrow film’, which emerged between these two cultures and prospered not only in the UK but worldwide from the interwar period onward. BFI research on audiences and its exploration of new film viewers targeted the cultivation of such middlebrow cinema (BFI 1935c). The BFI Governors attempted to balance artistic cinema and working-class commercial cinema by creating middlebrow cinema that could entertain and enlighten both types of audiences. For instance, the History Committee of the BFI Advisory Council (in Educational Panel) called attention to the difference between the two film cultures, describing ‘those films suitable for intelligent audiences of, say, the Academy of Film Society type and those suitable for the average mixed audiences’ (BFI 1935c, p. 8). With such recognition, the committee clearly declared that

---

36 The BFI as an intermediary succeeded in getting public-sector actors involved in educational film policy. The governmental authorities understood the BFI as an educational institute, as the Board of Education described it, that ‘would be concerned with the business of examining the possibilities of the instrument as an educational medium and then encouraging an appropriate use of it’ (Board of Education 1932a). The film industry representatives in the BFI also welcomed the Board of Education’s recognition of the BFI as an educational organisation so that cooperation between the BFI and the Board was unlikely to intervene directly with economic issues and commercial business. Additionally, the LCC Educational Committee suggested that the LCC should obtain an annual subscription and membership of the BFI because it was an educational institution (The Kinematograph Weekly 1935). Sir Charles Grant Robertson, president of the National Cinema Inquiry, outlined the role of the BFI as ‘strengthen[ing] in every way the demand for the supply of educational and cultural films’ (The Manchester Guardian 1935, p. 9).
the BFI would ‘have to guard against over-estimating the intelligence of the former and under-estimating the latter and against intellectualism, personal moral and other prejudices’ (BFI 1935c, p. 8). The committee concluded that the BFI should not simply accept such a classification or esteem only high-art films but cautiously recognised the biases in evaluating both and developing a new film culture bridging them.

4.4.2 Children’s film promotion (1936)

One clear example of state-market-civil communication and cooperation in the BFI is the promotion of children’s film triggered by the BFI conference in 1936. 37 This conference reveals a rich data of discussion in which participants discussed how the production and exhibition of children’s film should be promoted and why this genre of film was important for both the commercial industry and educationalists. The BFI aimed to evolve the partnership between the film industry and educational associations and accelerate the supply of children’s films as early as its first Annual Report, commenting that ‘the branches aim at enlisting the co-operation of the civic authorities and the local film trade, and of all individuals and existing groups who are interested from different angles in the full development of the cinematograph as a medium of entertainment and education’ (BFI 1934a, p. 11). This sentence is one of the earliest examples summarising the ideal of and requirement for trade-civic collaboration. More specifically, the institute highlighted its local branches’ contributions 38 to the exhibitions of children’s films in

---

37 This section heavily relies on the Report of the Conference on Films For Children, November 20 and 21, 1936, which is an official report on the conference published by the BFI because other media, including the trade journals or newspapers, did not mention the event, and the report is the only source available to understand the procedure, discussion, and outcomes of the conference.

38 The BFI established local branches named the Film Institute Societies throughout the country. The branches include those in Becontree, Brighton and Hove, Bristol, Chichester, Leeds, London, Manchester, Merseyside, Northern Ireland, and Salford. The Film Institute Societies communicated with local municipalities and educationalists to discuss how to promote educational cinema and organise special film shows for children (e.g., BFI 1935b, 1939b).
local cinemas ‘with the help of the trade, exercis[ing] an increasingly effective influence on the choice of programmes available in local cinemas’ (p. 12).

The Conference on Films for Children, organised by the BFI on 20-21 November 1936, exemplified the institute’s contribution to advancing children’s film policy and enhancing the partnership between industry and educationalists. The conference involved the key educational associations, public authorities, and figures from industry, leading to proposals for expanding the production and exhibition of children’s films. The Entertainment Panel considered the conference’s suggestions, resulting in the publication of a list of films appropriate for screening to children. Closely tracing the debate at this conference reveals how trade members and other stakeholders discussed children’s films and reached realistic proposals. Simon Rowson (President of the British Kinematograph Society and Chairman of the Entertainment Panel of the BFI) was a key figure representing the interests of the film industry and leading discussions at the conference. Drawing on statistics related to children’s cinema and the size of child audiences, he cautioned that it was impossible to suddenly increase the supply of children’s films, as advocates from the educational side had suggested. He noted that, ‘so long as the producer earnings per subject were not appreciably more than 3,000 pounds each, it was impossible to contemplate special productions exclusively adapted for this market. At present such possible revenues are not in sight’ (BFI 1936b, p. 9). However, Rowson was supportive of advancing the supply and circulation of superior children’s films:

[I]t is obvious, therefore, that if means could be found for inducing the school children to attend one special performance per week, there would be an appreciable addition to the total attendances, and probably also the box-office receipts. In the interests of exhibitors, scarcely less than in the interests of the children themselves, such a source of revenue merits further examination.

…
The narrow limits within which any practical plans for providing cinema entertainment for children must be drawn. Even those restricted plans can, however, be made to serve a national good, providing healthy pleasure for children and a by no means negligible income to the various branches of the trade. (BFI 1936b, p. 9)

Significantly, conference participants from civil society positively appraised the leadership and commitment of the film industry in expanding the market for children’s film. The Hon. Eleanor Plummer, member of the BFI Advisory Council and representative of the National Council of Women, commented:

There was a growing realisation amongst social workers of the influence of the cinema and this brought growing anxiety that it should be used for the best possible development of children. The cinema trade had solved many difficult problems in attempting to provide healthy and satisfactory entertainment, and she hoped to provide healthy and satisfactory entertainment, and she hoped that there was no reason why it should not save this problem too. (BFI 1936b, p. 20)

Furthermore, the strategies to develop children’s films, such as Saturday Matinee Children’s Program (discussed in Chapter 5), were discussed in depth. Overall, participants warmly welcomed the activities of the film industry. The chairman of the Conference stated that, ‘from the addresses to be given that afternoon, the Conference would appreciate the efforts which the commercial section of the film industry had given to [children’s film promotion]’ (BFI 1936b, p. 24). Significantly, representatives of the film industry suggested that children’s film exhibitions were meaningful from a managerial angle. Sidney L. Bernstein (a Director of the Bernstein Theatres, Ltd.) stated:

Every intelligent theatre owner wants films of a better quality and knows that, if he does not give them, his public will desert him. He knows, too, that a demand from the public for better pictures will result in the production of better pictures. If he is wise, he will encourage children to start seeing films at an early age and will help to develop their critical faculties, in order that they may learn to know better films when they see them and voice their demand for better films. He wants not only to maintain his existing audiences but also
to encourage the cinema-going habit in the ‘coming generation.’ He wants the habit to be ingrained in the young, like that of reading. (BFI 1936b, p. 24)

It was agreed that providing superior films for children and educating their tastes would result in the improvement of film production in Britain, producing commercial returns for the British film industry and bridging economic and educational interests. Overall, the conference functioned as a platform in which both the film industry and other stakeholders appreciated the preceding efforts and welcomed a sociable and supportive atmosphere.

In this process, members of the film industry discussed their experiences of children’s film exhibitions, the lessons learnt from them, and the antipathy they received from civil actors. For instance, a representative commented on how the industry was unfairly demonised regarding children’s film exhibitions. He claimed that when children access undesirable books, parents or teachers are commonly criticised rather than bookstores or libraries. Thus, it was unreasonable, he claimed, that film exhibitors were denounced when children watched films intended for adult audiences. Related to this point, the Conference made a conclusive statement that, in addition to the unprofitability of the Saturday matinee children’s exhibitions and the inadequate supply of children’s films, the film industry received insufficient assistance from local education authorities, schoolteachers, and the official bodies of social workers.

These arguments represent a significant starting point in reconsidering the role of private business and bringing more nuance to the history of educational film policy. As commented earlier, critics of the BFI and the film industry in the interwar period often described the industry as a barrier to educational and cultural policy for film because of a hostile attitude towards these new initiatives (e.g., Ashley (1937), Low (1979), Dupin (2006)). However, regarding children’s films, the film industry took the opposite view and claimed that the civil and educational authorities’
antipathy and misunderstanding hindered the development and promotion of children’s films. I have no intention of offering a judgement on this issue or attributing the causes of an underdeveloped educational film policy to either side. Yet my finding is that the film industry was interested in developing children’s film and was willing to contribute to campaigning for its importance.

Furthermore, conference participants from the film-industry organisations presented the film businesses’ experimental projects to supply children’s films and explained the challenges they faced. Driven to contribute to the educational and cultural use of film, Bernstein Theatre launched a special exhibition of films in 1928. However, the exhibition was unpopular with children and faced criticism from educationalists. At the conference, cinema exhibitors drew lessons from that experiment. First, the film industry representatives admitted that they ‘aimed a little high in the programmes’ and were ‘too anxious to do the children good’ (BFI 1936b, p.12). In other words, the programme was too educational and lacked the entertainment aspect. One of the programme organisers stated that ‘at one of the children’s performances at Willesden, a slide was shown announcing the special film for the following week Cinderella. A girl—not more than nine—who was sitting immediately in front of Miss Harvey, remarked with scorn: “Cinderella? Pooh! What do they think we are? A bunch of kids?”’ (BFI 1936b, p. 29). Here, the lesson was simple and universal: successful children’s films must contain both instructional and entertainment value so that children can enjoy and appreciate the shows.39

39 Even before the conference, the film industry occasionally complained that the exhibition of morally desirable films for children was not supported by the child audiences themselves and could not bring adequate financial returns to them.

‘Mr. Sydney Lewis of the Birmingham Cinema Exhibitors’ Association said that exhibitors would rather show films of a good type, but, unfortunately, these did not give the box-office return that they had the right to ask for. Their business was not to educate or to supply moral uplift. … He claimed that the cinema exhibitors are ready to offer cultivating and educational films when the children demand, but to set up such conditions, the solution should not be censorship but education. “Nothing can be done except by education. We shall continue to show the type of film the public comes to the box-office for.” He assured the conference,
Exchanging views and experiences and surveying preceding projects, the conference invited suggestions for advancing children’s cinema. Most significantly, it encouraged the creation of a new agency with the support from the film industry that would ‘deal with the specialised booking of films for children’s performances … [and that] would widely commend itself to the Trade’ (BFI 1936b, p. 25). The conference confirmed that the collaboration with social and industrial associations was key:

If social workers and institutions were willing to collaborate with the Trade … it would be possible to form a non-profit-making company to acquire a large library of suitable films, on condition that they were available only for non-commercial performances, after the ordinary bookings had been exhausted. (BFI 1936b, p. 27)

Resonating with the agreement to encourage the production of children’s films, the participants from the film industry emphasised that the industry aimed to support such initiatives. ‘The trade—as we are called—with few exceptions—are willing helpers … if only there is co-operation and less suggestions that the cinema is a mental danger to the children and subversive of their morals’ (BFI 1936b, p. 27). The proposed new institution supplying films for children was not actualised during the interwar period, but a more immediate outcome of the conference was the publication however, of the sympathy of the exhibitors in their desire for a better type of film.’ (The Manchester Guardian, 1932, February 29, p. 9).

The supply of desirable films for children was also proposed as a solution to educate the younger generations on other occasions. For instance, in 1935, W. Lyon Blease, British Liberal Party Politician and Lecturer in the Law and Custom of the Constitution at Liverpool University, commented as follows:

‘[T]he present film censorship was entirely inadequate for improving public taste, was amazingly illogical, and in some cases quite incomprehensible. The only way to fortify the minds of children against bad films was to teach them to be excited and delighted by good ones.’

He suggested that one of the city theatres should be turned into a municipal cinema where good films in which there was real beauty should be shown. Such a theatre should be part of the school training of every child, and when the children left school they would be proof against bad films and would not want to see them. (The Manchester Guardian 1935, February 6, p. 18)

Here, encouraging desirable films and imposing restrictions through censorship were conceptualised as opposite sides of the same coin.
of a list of 85 commercial films suitable for screening to children (BFI 1936b). Educational authorities and national newspapers broadly welcomed the publication of the commercial film list as a necessary instrument to initiate children’s film exhibitions. This conference was a significant example of efforts to nurture a film culture for children by selecting desirable films for them, which will be continued as the post-war film production by the CFD/CEF/CFF (Chapter 5).

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter discussed how the advocacy coalition for the BFI was constructed and how it involved stakeholders from educational, industrial, and public-sector backgrounds to promote the use of film for educational and cultural purposes. The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films, originating from the British Institute of Adult Education, highlighted the potential of film as an educational and cultural medium and proposed the creation of a national film institute. The Commission’s policy agenda attracted the attention and concerns of organisations within the film industry, resulting in conflicts and debates between the educationalists and film-industry organisations. Due to close communication regarding the scope and merits of the BFI in national newspapers, trade journals, and informal meetings, consensus was reached on the creation of the BFI. An advocacy coalition was formed based on shared beliefs concerning the educational and cultural importance of film and the benefits the BFI could provide to existing commercial film. This advocacy coalition successfully achieved the creation of the BFI in 1933 and succeeded in involving public authorities as coalition members. By comprehensively including educationalists, the film industry, and governmental departments, the advocacy coalition for the BFI became sustainable, which has enabled the BFI to survive to the present.
The BFI’s Advisory Council (e.g., its specialist panels such as the Education Panel and the Entertainment Panel) was a significant structure through which stakeholders from different sectors were able to communicate and launch fresh policy initiatives. Furthermore, by promoting the educational and cultural value of film, the advocacy coalition centred on the BFI attracted interest from the national media and trade journals, which broadened participation in discussions on educational film policy. Among its initiatives, the BFI’s campaigns in support of children’s film (such as the Conference on Children’s Film in 1936) were pioneering and influential, demonstrating cooperation between educationalists and the film industry and overcoming the dichotomy between commerce and culture. As critical comments by academics, journalists, and the public indicate, the impact of the BFI in the interwar period was relatively modest when compared to that of the post-war era. Nevertheless, a re-examination of the BFI in the interwar period offers a fresh perspective on its overlooked importance as a platform for reconciling diverse stakeholders from the state, market, and civil society. In addition, this chapter reveals that a coalition comprising educationalists and the film industry emerged from old and mutual hostilities and their cooperation materialised the BFI. This chapter also demonstrates the means by which the BFI involved reluctant state agencies in a new policy initiative and how the BFI spotlighted children’s film as a significant target to promote, and children’s film production blossomed in the post-war period (Chapter 5).

Mary Field, a policy entrepreneur central in forming the CFF, evaluated and summarised the achievements and limitations of the BFI as follows:

The establishment of the British Film Institute in 1933 improved the quality of instructional film since its panels brought producers and educationalists together but its efforts could not materially increase markets. (Field 1952, pp. 149-150)
As Field claims, the BFI identified children’s film as a significant and promising policy goal, and it offered a structure in which producers and educationalists could cooperate. However, the BFI could not directly commit to the production of children’s films because of budget restrictions and difficulties in mobilising film producers to create desirable children’s films. The CFF, established in 1951, filled this gap and led to the production and promotion of children’s film in Britain, which is discussed as a final case study in Chapter 5. The BFI established fundamental institutional arrangements and a political climate that welcomed a constructive partnership between the film industry, the public authorities, and the educational associations. The innovators of the CFF were inspired by and learnt from the practices of the BFI in harmoniously involving external stakeholders in constructing an advocacy coalition.
Chapter 5

The Children’s Film Foundation in the 1940s and 1950s

5.1 Introduction

As the previous chapter discussed, the BFI targeted children’s film as a significant policy goal to explore the educational and cultural value of film. Nevertheless, the BFI could not produce children’s films on its own; instead, the institute could only encourage the use of existing children’s films by publishing a catalogue of valuable films and recommending that producers supply more of the same. Oliver Bell, the director of the BFI in 1938, believed that the production of children’s films would be impossible without the support of ‘multi-millionaire philanthropists or state interventions’ (Staples 1997, p. 92). This chapter explores The Rank Organisation’s Children’s Film Department (CFD), Children’s Entertainment Films (CEF) and the succeeding Children’s Film Foundation (CFF), which was at the core of children’s film policies in the 1940s and 1950s. These organisations fulfilled Bell’s conditions: they were committed to the production of special films for children using the investment of substantive capital from entrepreneur and philanthropist Arthur Rank and state investment from tax revenue.

In 1944, The Rank Organisation, then a major film production company, created the CFD to commission and finance the production of children’s films that would be circulated in special film programmes for children. The CFD pioneered the production of British domestic films made exclusively for children that sought to instil educational and cultural values. In 1947, the CFD was renamed the CEF, and it expanded the production and promotion of children’s films by commissioning feature films for children. Although the CEF’s achievements and contributions to
British film culture were broadly acknowledged by the public and civic sectors as well as the film industry, the Rank Organisation decided to dissolve the CEF in 1950 due to financial difficulties. The Children’s Film Foundation (CFF), a non-profit organisation funded by the British Film Production Fund, better known as the Eady Levy—a tax on the film industry and collectively managed by trade associations—inherited and expanded the CEF’s activities. The creation of the CFF was made possible by the engagement of and dialogue between diverse stakeholders, which included the major film industry associations (e.g., Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association), state authorities (e.g., the Ministry of Education, the Board of Trade), and the associations of educational and social workers. Their commitment forged an advocacy coalition based on shared beliefs about children’s film and its national significance. Moreover, these supporters facilitated the transfer of the CFD/CEF from a Rank private enterprise into the CFF as a non-profit organisation supported by the entire film industry and funded by public aid. This chapter illustrates how the CFF and its precursors, the CFD and the CEF was formed and developed by involving a variety of stakeholders including the Rank Organisation, film-industry organisations, the members of the Advisory Council on Children’s Film Department and Children’s Entertainment Films (hereafter, the Advisory Council), and public authorities.

To elucidate why and how the advocacy coalition for the CFF was established, this chapter is structured as follows. Section 5.2 briefly sketches the institutional history of the CFF by highlighting the formation and transfer of the CFD/CEF/CFF from the post-war period when the CFD was formulated to when the CFF ceased to produce children’s films in 1986. Following that, Section 5.3 examines the process of how the advocacy coalition for children’s film policies in post-

---

41 The British Film Production Fund for the CFF came from revenue from the newly legislated Eady Levy. The Eady Levy was based on a tax on revenues from ticket sales at the cinema. It was initially introduced in 1950 as voluntary funding based on an agreement between the Board of Trade and the film industry; however, it became official law under the Cinematograph Films Act of 1957. For details about the Eady Levy, see Stubbs (2009).
war Britain was created by analysing The Rank Organisation’s initiative as a policy entrepreneur (5.3.1) and developed by members of the Advisory Council as a policy broker to communicate and cooperate with educationalists (5.3.2). It also examines support from diverse film industry associations for the CFF as well as the financial support and acknowledgement from state departments (5.3.3). Section 5.4 reflects on the impacts of the advocacy coalition for the CFF. The most important impact the CFD/CEF/CFF made was the production of a variety of children’s films that received positive evaluations from both critics and young audiences (5.4.1). Such production of high-quality films was underpinned by the CEF/CFF and the Advisory Council’s development of empirical research on audiences. They launched several audience research projects and developed new technologies and ideas to collect data on children’s responses (5.4.2).

The original contributions this chapter makes is the exploration of dynamic interactions among these stakeholders, such as entrepreneurs in The Rank Organisation, the Advisory Council members as policy brokers, and diverse sectors and associations of the film industry and governmental organisations as policy supporters in the process of creating and developing the CFD/CEF/CFF. To trace these processes, this chapter explains why the CFD/CEF/CFF succeeded in obtaining broad support from the public, business and civic sectors by drawing on the advocacy coalition framework. Moreover, this chapter discusses how the advocacy coalition involving stakeholders from the public, business and civic sectors brought about the growth of children’s film production and audience research methodology.

In exploring the process of forming the advocacy coalition and its impacts, this chapter employs overlooked archival resources, such as the CFD/CEF Advisory Council records at the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre and the internal documents stored in the BFI Special Collection. These archival sources showcase how the relevant organisations and
individuals discussed and reached a consensus to support new initiatives to supply desirable films for British children. By investigating these dynamic processes and interactions among stakeholders, this chapter complements existing historical research on the CFF, which tends to focus on the achievements of the foundation following its creation and policy outcomes, such as the films produced (e.g., Brown 2017; Shail 2016; Staples 1997). In other words, this chapter presents new research focused on the dynamic policy process rather than on static policy outcomes.

5.2 Institutional History from the CFD to the CFF

5.2.1. From the CFD to the CEF (1944–1947)

Before the Rank Organisation formed the CFD, the supply of films for children was created and presented in Britain at special film clubs for children. First, the Granada Theatre cinema chain presented special film programmes for children on Saturday mornings in 1927.42 Following that, in 1934, Oscar Deutsch, the founder of the Odeon Cinema, created a children’s cinema club named the ‘Mickey Mouse Club’, which offered memberships for children and screened special programmes including cartoons and Western films (Brown 2017). Intriguingly, Deutsch advertised his children’s club as an educational platform in which youngsters could learn ‘how to be good and independent citizens’ (Brown 2017, p. 81). During the post-war period, a special children’s film exhibition was scheduled in Saturday matinees in commercial theatres. This tradition influenced the CFF and its precedents since they also produced films exclusively for Saturday matinee performances. In the 1930s, several children’s film clubs were managed by film companies, including the Odeon National Cinema Clubs and the Gaumont British Junior Cinema Clubs organised by The Rank Organisation, ABC Minors’ Matinees organised by the Associated

42 For the details about the Granada Theatre, see Eyles (1998).
British Cinemas, and Grenadier Clubs organised by the Granada Theatre. These children’s film clubs were supervised and licensed by local authorities. However, local cinema managers reiterated that the quality of children’s films supplied was unsatisfactory. In a public investigation conducted in 1950, one cinema owner stated that:

Many conscientious cinema managers, who were disturbed by the poor quality of the material they were offering to the children, told us that they had often been unable to obtain a film which they thought their matinee or club would enjoy. Some managers went so far as to say that the standard of films obtainable for children was deteriorating and that they would welcome any suggestion as to how the film programme might be improved. (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950, p. 10)

Although statistical records of the number of children’s films or children’s feedback from the time are not available, it was the consensus of those involved that the quality of children’s films before The Rank Organisation’s enterprise was inadequate.

Against this backdrop, Arthur Rank established the CFD in 1944 to produce children’s films to be circulated in Saturday cinema clubs in film theatres. Rank appointed Mary Field, a former teacher and producer of educational films, as an executive director of the department. Field enthusiastically conducted studies of child audiences and led the CFD’s production of diverse films. However, the CFD did not produce films on its own; instead, it commissioned the production of children’s films by writing its own scripts and recruiting film producers. Additionally, the CFD created the Advisory Council (1944–1950), which reviewed scripts and examined films by observing both their content and the responses of young audiences. The Advisory Council was

---

43 For instance, the complete list of children’s entertainment film produced for 1946 is as follows: 3 story films (Jean’s Plan, Bush Christmas, and The Boy Who Stopped Niagara), 2 serials (The Voyage of Peter Joe (6 episodes) and The Adventure of Dusty Bates (5 episodes)), periodical films (Our Club Magazines series), 2 nature films (Revised Secrets of Life and Tale of the Woodlands), 1 travel film (Portuguese Harvest), 1 interest film (educational film that is also interesting) (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1918, September 5, p. 54) (The House of Goblin) (The Advisory Council, 1946, p. 14).
essential for mediating between the CFD and diverse stakeholders in both civil society and the public sector, and it served a key role in legitimising the CFD’s new approach to children’s films (a full list of Advisory Council members is provided in Appendix 5.3, and their activities are discussed further in Section 5.4.1).

The CFD was renamed the CEF in 1947. This change allowed the institution to expand its activities and symbolically demonstrated that it was not just a department of the Rank Organisation but an autonomous agency committed to children’s film production beyond Rank’s interests. The turning point for the CEF was the release of a government committee report titled *Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema* (1950). The Departmental Committee that produced this report was established by the Home Office in 1946 in response to a parliamentary debate aiming to investigate children’s cinema clubs and the effects of cinema on children to assess potential reforms. Its members included representatives from educational and public organisations such as the County Councils Association, the Association of Municipal Corporations, the Association of Education Committees, the Joint Committee of the Four Secondary Associations, the National Union of Teachers, the Association of County Councils in Scotland, and the Educational Institute of Scotland. In the process of its investigation and report preparation, the CEF and its Advisory Council cooperated with the committee by sharing relevant evidence and observations about children’s films. The *Children and the Cinema* report (1950) praised the activities and achievements of the CEF and the Advisory Council and consequently recommended the establishment of a national board that would support and advise the production

---

44 The report explained that ‘We should like to pay high tribute to the work of the Advisory Council and to the Children’s Entertainment Films Section for the variety and quality of the films for which they have been jointly responsible. It is work of great originality and enterprise … We record with approval the existence of this machinery for the production of entertainment films for children on practical and well-considered lines, and are impressed by the imaginative grasp and pioneering spirit shown by those who direct it. Enjoyable, and often beautiful and interesting films are being increasingly made available to children through their efforts. We attach the greatest importance to the continuance and development of these projects.’ (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950, p. 78)
of children’s films. The report highlighted the CEF’s contributions and proposed more public support for children’s film policy in line with the CEF.

5.2.2 From the CEF to the CFF (1947–1951)

Although the contributions of the CEF were praised in the *Children and the Cinema* report, the Rank Organisation was forced to dissolve the CEF in response to financial difficulties the main business of Rank Organisations faced. However, at that time, the social and educational importance of the CEF was broadly recognised by policymakers, the film industry and educationalists. Thus, the CFF was established to inherit the CEF’s activities in 1951. The objectives of the CFF were summarised in its first annual report as:

(a) Provide the Distributors and Exhibitors with entertainment films of a type that children will readily pay to see (For special children’s shows)
(b) Demonstrate to educationalists and social workers that the film industry in this country aims at producing and exhibiting films which are suitable in every way for children and provide entertainment appreciated by children
(c) Develop children’s films as a new special type of production which will provide further employment for British film technicians
(d) Establish Great Britain as the Centre of the Children’s Film Movement which is attracting attention throughout the world (CFF 1952, p. 4).

In order to finance and produce entertaining films that children would pay to watch and to enhance the status of the film industry by persuading educationalists to appreciate the potential of children’s films, the CFF produced a variety of films, from feature films to serials, and attracted children audiences with Saturday matinee shows. Moreover, the CFF’s films were critically acclaimed and gained popularity and awards at international festivals and special exhibitions. For instance, one of the CFF’s films, *The Dog and the Diamond* (1953), won the award for the best national selection at the 1953 International Film Festival for Children in Venice (CFF 1969; Shail 2016).
The significant difference between the CEF and CFF is that the former was an enterprise of the Rank Organisation but the latter was cooperatively supported and funded by the film industry as a whole. The status of the CFF as the result of cooperation involving the entire film industry and public authorities was clearly evidenced and exemplified by a speech delivered by the Home Secretary, Major Gwilym Lloyd George, in 1955. He commented that ‘the trade deserves a great deal of credit for making funds available for their work (Children’s Film Foundation Ltd). This is a field in which we in this country can give a lead to the world’ (CFF 1955, p. 1). This speech was given at the annual meeting of the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association (CEA), making it clear that the Home Secretary precisely understood that the CFF was a cooperative project of not just the Rank Organisation but a coalition of diverse film industry organisations. Resonating with the Home Secretary’s praise for the pioneering work of the CFF, John Davis, chief executive of the Rank Organisation and chairman of the CFF since 1960, confidently summarised its history:

No other film industry in the world can match the record of Britain in providing this special kind of good cinema entertainment for children. It [the Children’s Film Foundation] represents the enthusiastic work of large numbers of men and women in the film industry – such as exhibitors, distributors and producers – and has made the CFF the virile and successful organisation that it is. (CFF 1969, p. 3)

In addition to the support from diverse film industry organisations, the CFF further expanded its activities with the commitment and funding from public authorities, which can be clearly identified by the public funding the CFF received. The CFF was financed by the British Film Production Fund, which was operated voluntarily by the film industry and financed by taxations on the cinema exhibition. Later, it was financed by the British Film Fund Agency, which was established by the Board of Trade after the introduction of the Cinematograph Films Act of
1957. The Act made funding to the CFF an official scheme and guaranteed an additional yearly grant from the fund with approval from the Board of Trade. The transition from CEF funding by the Rank Organisation to CFF funding by public tax revenue was possible only through cooperation between governmental authorities and the film industry. The next section closely examines how the coalition of these organisations advocating the CFF gradually developed.

5.3 Advocacy Coalition-Making Process

5.3.1 The Rank Organisation as a Policy Entrepreneur

The post-war children’s film policy was initiated by two policy entrepreneurs in the Rank Organisation, Arthur Rank and Mary Field. Arthur Rank, who owned the Rank Organisation, one of the largest cinema chains at the time, established the CFD to produce children’s films to be circulated in Saturday cinema clubs in film theatres. After being appointed as an executive director of the CFD, Field enthusiastically conducted research on both child audiences and made decisions on the production of diverse films by the CFD. It is commonly noted that, with her educational and religious background, Field was interested in the potential for film as an educational and cultural medium, and the entrepreneurs’ motivations for the film commission were not entirely profit-oriented (Field 1952, August 26).

Notably, before the success of the CFF, public opinion about the film industry and its relationship with children’s film was critical rather than affirmative. When the CFD was newly established to supply special films for children, the CFD faced severe scepticism from educationalists. In Sociology of Film: Studies and Documents (1946), J. P. Mayer, a cultural

---

45 Graduated from Bedford College for Women (Royal Holloway, University of London, now) with MA degree, Mary Field taught history and English (Easen 2021).
sociologist, criticised children’s film programmes initiated by private businesses. With initial support and suggestions from Arthur Rank, Mayer reflected on the history of the entertainment business and critically assessed the moral influence of existing children’s films in Britain. He argued that the quality and moral character of these films was far from satisfactory, commenting that ‘films available for matinee performances are either very old or sub-standard – a most unsatisfactory state of affairs’ (Mayer 1946, p. 65). Denouncing the restricted outcomes of the commercial business, Mayer proposed state intervention and leadership in reforming the children’s film programme:

There is first the entire complex of films for children, with all its related problems. It would appear that in the light of the evidence submitted in this book, the cinema clubs of the commercial film organisations will have to be terminated. Children’s cinema clubs to be supervised by educational authorities and run under the authority of commercial bodies. … In addition, considering the infancy of the children’s film, I do not hesitate to suggest that the central State authorities (Ministry of Education and Ministry of Information) should go into feature film production for children. Such a production unit could easily be linked up with a state film-distributing corporation. (Mayer 1946, pp. 279–280)

His proposal noticeably reflects the political atmosphere of the 1940s and the following post-war period, when expanding the role of the state, including nationalisation, was seen as a realistic policy option (Arts Enquiry 1947, see also Hansard 1952, 1956). Additionally, in her description of the atmosphere before the CFD enterprise, Field noted that ‘the public hates to abandon any simple and unexplored belief such as that films are bad for children’ (Field 1952, p. 1). In response to these criticisms and to legitimatise children’s film production initiated by private companies, the members of the CFD actively pursued a series of publicity campaigns, including a press exhibition of children’s films in 1944. However, this promotional event could not fully communicate the CFD’s significance and usefulness to the participants. For example, Mary Field observed that ‘the staff of the Children’s Film Department were surprised to find, through the Press
Show, how little their purpose was understood by educationalists’ (Field 1952, p. 15). As a result, they realised the need to promote the CFD’s activities and legitimise the production and exhibition of children’s films as a socially significant project. The promotional events to attract support from journalists and educationalists failed at that time mostly because the CFD had not yet produced a variety of films and could not demonstrate its achievements and future potential. Field reflected that the CFD’s press show of its productions such as *Tom’s Ride* (1947), *Robbie Finds a Gun* (1947) and *Our Magazine* (1946-1950) were puzzling to audiences and journalists because the CFD could not establish its beliefs about what films children enjoy (Field 1952).\(^4\) In response, the CFD shifted its production policy to prioritise making stories with entertainment value as well as implicit moral messages. The CFD was renamed the Children’s Entertainment Films (CEF) in 1947, which is symbolic because the new name implied a focus on entertainment and that the institution was more than just a department of the Rank Organisation. The CEF continued to produce entertaining children’s films and established its reputation by earning awards at international film festivals and producing critically acclaimed films. As I state in the following section, the CEF’s film production and its success were critically important because they demonstrated the potential of children’s films and created a constructive relationship with the film industry, including both exhibitors and producers.

\(^4\) It should be also noted that, immediately after the creation of the CFD, its director, Mary Field, commented that ‘to attempt to influence the morals of 400,000 children every week was too great a responsibility for any commercial concern, however well intended.’ (Field 1952, p. 7). Evidently, Field understood the limitation of commercial interest in committing to educational and cultural film production and attempted to involve non-commercial stakeholders such as educationalists and public authorities.
5.3.2 The Advisory Council Members as a Policy Broker

Charged with formulating and reinforcing the advocacy coalition for the CFF, the CFD/CEF Advisory Council played a pivotal role in communicating and cooperating with the other stakeholders in the film industry, educational sector, and public sector. The Advisory Council contributed by inviting representatives of educational and social workers into the discussion and evaluation of the CFD/CEF productions. Consequently, the Advisory Council facilitated the support for the institutionalisation of the CFF in 1951 by strengthening the advocacy coalition mediating the film industry and these civic actors.\(^{47}\) This section articulates how the Advisory Council succeeded in communicating with educational and social workers associations in the civil society and involving them as advocates for the CFD/CEF/CFF.

The Advisory Council was established in 1944 to consult on CFD and CEF activities (see Appendix 5.3 for a list of the Advisory Council’s founding members). The Advisory Council included representatives from civic associations and public authorities, and its chairman was Lady Allen of Hurtwood, who was an active philanthropist and child welfare activist. The founding members of the council included Miss M. Clayton from the Ministry of Education, Mr M. M. Simmons from the Home Office, Mr H. Forsyth Hardy from the Scottish Office, educationalists (e.g., Mr W. Griffith from the National Union of Teachers) and representatives from the BBC, Library Association, National Association of Boys’/Girls’ Club and National Federation of Women’s Institutes (Advisory Council 1944). By involving these representatives from diverse

\(^{47}\) To explore the Advisory Council’s activities and impacts, this section refers to the archival records of the Advisory Council and its chairperson (Lady Allen of Hurtwood), which are stored in the University of Warwick’s Modern Records Centre. Whereas the archival resources regarding the CFF are preserved in various major archives including the British Library, the National Archives, and the BFI Special Collection, the documents about its Advisory Council were rarely identified, except in the Warwick Modern Records Centre collection. Therefore, this collection presents insights into the significant and mostly overlooked history of this authority. Appendix 5.1 provides a comprehensive list of the historical documents stored in this collection, including the annual reports of the Advisory Council, the informal meeting records, and minutes and exchanged letters between the Council members. By investigating these sources, I have reviewed the institutional arrangements and activities of the Advisory Council.
authorities and establishing regular meetings with them, the Advisory Council effectively involved these civic actors and built a platform on which the CFD and civic agencies could establish mutual trust through dialogue. Field summarised that ‘the composition of the Advisory Council was such that it afforded obvious channels of communication between CEF and government departments as well as between it and the educational world’ (Field 1952, p. 51).

The Advisory Council employed a variety of approaches to examine and research the CFD/CEF’s films. With the support of the chief scenario writer of the CFD/CEF, the Council examined the stories of children’s films. The Advisory Council also watched the produced films and collected information about children’s reactions to them, which were reported by cinema managers as well as the managers’ own analyses. Based on these resources, the council usually confirmed 95% of the exhibited films to be appropriate as CEF films targeted for children and presented criticisms and concerns about the remaining 5% to the CEF. Such critical feedback was generally focused on scenes and genres that tended to bore children or on seemingly inappropriate representations and expressions identified in the film. In discussing these issues, the Advisory Council paid close attention not only to films’ desirability from an adult’s perspective but also to their popularity from a child’s perspective. This is because the Advisory Council realised that the films shown in children’s cinema clubs must be entertaining and attractive to youngsters, which later would be a broadly shared belief of the public authorities and educationalists who appreciated the success of the CFF (e.g., Advisory Council 1947b, 1948c, 1949, 1950).

The Advisory Council helped to develop the advocacy coalition by mediating the CFD/CEF and civic/public actors in three ways: (1) Advisory Council meetings with the stakeholders’ representatives, (2) conferences including representatives of local educationalists and public authorities, and (3) policy consultancy and lobbying to communicate with public
authorities. To effectively communicate and establish the legitimacy of the CFD, the Council developed audience research methods\(^{48}\) that offered convincing and empirical resources demonstrating the potential of children’s films. The Advisory Council also popularised and legitimised the children’s film programme by setting up occasions for the council members and external stakeholders to attend actual film screenings in the company of children.

First, the regular and frequent meetings helped to build mutual trust and affirmative relationships between the representatives of the council and the CFD. The Advisory Council’s annual report in 1946 states that it was ‘small in membership so that it [could] meet frequently and be constantly consulted by those responsible for the production of films’ (Advisory Council 1946b, p. 2). Moreover, the Advisory Council meetings offered a platform on which representatives from diverse authorities could deliver their questions, concerns, and recommendations about children’s films and share how the CFD/CEF responded to them. For instance, a representative of Christian Cinema and Religious Film Society raised a concern about the quality of children’s films and asked whether the council could view them. In response, the CFD offered the Advisory Council opportunities to view and critically evaluate the CFD/CEF’s films. As such, the Advisory Council review system was systematically developed in the form of Reading Committees that allowed all the members to review the scripts before production and call for revision if they identified problematic expressions and views. Field confidently reflected on the fruitful discussions and outcomes of the Advisory Council meeting as follows:

> [S]everal representative of groups which, because they were uninformed, had been hostile to the whole movement for children’s clubs and films saw, for the first time, what the

\(^{48}\) The Advisory Council combined a variety of research methods including the questionnaire with children, interviews with cinema managers attending and observing the children’s cinema shows, and the Council members’ participation in children’s film shows. Later, the CFF also refined the audience research by recording children’s reactions on the camera (The Advisory Council 1944, 1946a, 1947a, 1950).
possibilities of children in the cinema could be, while others, who had been neutral in the dispute, became interested in our new approach to the project (Field 1952, p. 23).

The examination of the scripts before production, as well as the provision of suggestions for revision, if necessary, were common practices that the BBFC (Chapter 3) invented and articulated in its script reviews. The advantage of this approach is that film producers could confirm the reviewers’ judgements and approvals before spending any money on production. The potential risk was that script reviews could function as informal and soft censorship, thereby undermining the creativity and autonomy of film producers. As for script reviews by the Advisory Council, its influence was restricted so that the producers could challenge the Council’s judgement. Thus, Council members were required to collect evidence to support their judgements.

Moreover, to reinforce the involvement of diverse actors and to build an affirmative atmosphere among them, the Advisory Council was eager to recruit key figures from the civic sector. For instance, Mrs Alderman Gregory, who represented the Association of Educational Committees, was appointed vice president of the Advisory Council in 1948 (Advisory Council, 1948a, 1948b). The recruitment of such figures reflects the council’s role as a mediator seeking to involve representatives and supporters from the civic and public sectors. Additionally, a representative of the BFI also joined the Advisory Council (Advisory Council 1946b). In response to a request from these representatives, the CFD appointed Miss Martha McCulloch as a lecturer and staff member of the CFD. She undertook research work and investigated possible legislation related to the production of children’s films (Advisory Council 1946a).

49 In the 1940s, the BFI was acknowledged as an authority that can certify appropriate films for children. For instance, when Lady Allen Hurtwood faced the criticism that many of the films shown to children are inappropriate, she responded that ‘it should be remembered that all the films selected for club programmes have first been approved and passed by the British Film Institute as being appropriate for showing to children’ (Advisory Council 1946c, p. 1).
Second, in addition to the council meetings, another significant channel to promote the CFD was a series of conferences organised by the Advisory Council. The leading members of the council, including Lady Allen of Hurtwood and Mary Field, realised that the CFD enterprise needed to dedicate substantive time and effort to acquire the understanding of the associations of educational and social workers; after all, when the CFD was established, ‘there [were] practically no films in this country made especially for children’ (Field 1952, p. 42). Therefore, the Advisory Council actively organised events and meetings by launching new children’s film clubs in local municipalities. For instance, according to private letters between Arthur Rank and the Advisory Council, the council members organised a conference in Belfast to establish the clubs and demonstrate the usefulness of children’s cinema (Advisory Council 1947a, 1947b). The primary goal was to present children’s films and create a demand for them before the ensuing policy discussion. In fact, before the film business established any children’s clubs in new areas, the Advisory Council aimed to attract the interest and attention of residents in these areas so that ‘the clubs … would be formed as the result of a demand rather than being initiated, as it were, from above’ (Advisory Council 1947a, p. 15). In 1946, the Advisory Council selected this bottom-up approach to broadly popularise children’s films by organising conferences with the representatives of educational committees and local municipalities in major cities including London, Glasgow, and Liverpool. In doing so, the council was able to visibly demonstrate children’s responses to the CFD films. According to the 1946 Annual Report, the council set up these conferences to inform the public about the works of the CEF and the Council, noting that the participants ‘were a serious and representative group working as a valuable adjunct to Children’s Entertainment Films, but also that they were anxious to benefit by the informed criticism of the public’ (Advisory Council, 1946, p. 4). The Advisory Council went on to evaluate the conferences as a whole:
On reviewing the conferences, the Advisory Council considered that they were of value both to the Advisory Council and to Children’s Entertainment Films, that although adverse criticism was voiced, much of it was beneficial and constructive, and that many of the informal conversations between delegates and members of the Advisory Council were valuable. In regard to future conferences, one of which is contemplated at Newcastle, the Advisory Council is considering a change in approach. (Advisory Council 1946a, p. 5)

In addition, the Council held conferences in 1946 with local educational authorities, teachers, magistrates, psychologists, and others interested in young children to discuss the question of children’s films (Advisory Council 1947b). At each conference, the CEF staff and council members first attended special screenings of children’s films. Advisory Council members ended these conferences in 1947, confidently concluding that ‘it was felt that the work of the Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films is now so well-known and understood as to render conferences no longer necessary’ (Advisory Council 1947c, p. 5).

The success of these promotional conferences was partly due to the Advisory Council’s tactic of setting up occasions where the participants could immediately and directly experience children’s responses to CFD/CEF programmes. As a president of the council, Lady Allen of Hurtwood summarised the practice as follows:

We seek the cooperation of many groups of people outside the Council by holding frequent Conferences in different parts of the country, for we are all most anxious to benefit from the informed criticism of the public. … our guests are invited to be present at a morning meeting of a children’s Cinema Club, so that they may see for themselves the reaction of the children to the various types of films shown. (Advisory Council 1947d, p. 2)

These screenings enabled the participants to recognise the children’s positive feedback while also allowing the council members to observe the participants’ reactions to the films. Lady Allen of Hurtwood applied the same approach when exhibiting the CFD films abroad, including during her visit to Copenhagen (Advisory Council 1947e).
Third, the Advisory Council also tightened ties between the CEF and the governmental agencies involved through lobbying and policy consultancy. For instance, in 1948, the Advisory Council sent a letter to the Privy Council Office to recommend the organisation of a national festival for children as part of the coming Festival of the Arts in 1951. They suggested that the festival could feature children’s culture and film and spotlight the achievements of the CEF (Privy Council Office 1948; Advisory Council 1948b). Such public events offered opportunities for the CFD/CEF/CFF to legitimise and promote their films for children as educational content. Moreover, the Advisory Council played a pivotal role in the debate and an investigation conducted by the Departmental Committee on the Children and the Cinema, which was launched by the Home Office in 1946 and other public authorities. By employing its experiences and evidence, the Advisory Council contributed to the Departmental Committee by submitting key findings and evidence about children’s films. At the Advisory Council meeting and in its official report, Lady Allen of Hurtwood and Mary Field confidently claimed that the Children and the Cinema report affirmatively acknowledged the CFD/CEF activities, since ‘it became very clear that the work which we have been trying to do with your assistance has made an outstanding contribution to this very important subject’ (Advisory Council 1950c). A summary of the Advisory Council’s own activities and findings was included in the document titled The Evidence Submitted to the Committee on Children and the Cinema by the Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films. The Departmental Committee used the evidence collected by the Advisory Council to draw affirmative conclusions about the achievements of the CFD/CEF and to make proposals for public aid to further develop their activities. The committee report evaluated the achievements of the CFD/CEF very highly, stating that ‘the need for a study to improve the quality of films for children has happily been realised by the J. Arthur Rank Organisation, which, during the past four or five
years, has set up special machinery for producing films for children’ (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950, p. 42).

5.3.3 Involving the Film Industry and Public Authorities

Beginning with the Rank Organisation’s enterprise (5.3.1) and the Advisory Council’s successful efforts to involve educational and social workers associations in civil society as supporters for the CEF/CFF (5.3.2), the advocacy coalition for the CFD/CEF/CFF was extended by involving film-industry organisations and diverse public authorities. These stakeholders received active communications from the governors of the CFD/CEF/CFF. Their successful communications facilitated substantive financial support to produce children’s films and the legitimisation of new policy ideas to support children’s film production by the committee established by the government departments.

5.3.3.1 Film Industry

The origin of the CFF was different from those of the BBFC (see Chapter 3) and the BFI (see Chapter 4). Whereas the BBFC and BFI were created with support from the entire film industry, the CFF originated from an enterprise of a single film company, the Rank Organisation. Although the Rank Organisation was a large and influential company at the time, the entrepreneurs of the CFF found it necessary to involve other organisations and stakeholders in the film industry as advocacy coalition members and to acquire their support and approval. The formation of the CFF and its effective involvement in the entire film industry was a significant factor contributing to the successful development of children’s film policy and the creation of a rigorous advocacy coalition for the CFF.
Before the creation of the CFF, the film industry, except for the Rank Organisation, paid scant attention to the production of children’s films. Mary Field reflected on the initial indifference of the film industry when she started the CFD, noting that ‘the film industry is naturally allergic to new ideas’ (Field 1952, p. 1) and that it did not recognise the potential of the CFD and children’s films. Although plans and experiments for new children’s films in Wales or Ireland were occasionally reported in major trade journals such as *Kinematograph Weekly*, such journals rarely covered the CFD/CEF’s efforts to explore children’s film as a new genre. However, the Rank Organisation was forced to dissolve the CEF in 1951 due to financial difficulties. Thus, in transferring the CEF into a newly created CFF, they needed financial support from other trade organisations to sustain the tradition of children’s film production, because this endeavour could no longer be exclusively supported by the Rank Organisation.

To successfully involve the film industry as a coalition partner, the CEF/CFF employed two approaches: (1) close communication to understand and reflect the broad interests of the film industry, and (2) comprehensive representation of diverse sections of the industry in its governing board and the Advisory Council. CEF leaders were cautioned to hear and reflect on the suggestions from the film industry before arranging the institutional setting of the CFF. In 1951, the former members of the CEF organised informal meetings with the trade organisations to gather their

---

50 In 1951, *Kinematograph Weekly* showed that the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association repeatedly sent representatives to the government and published open letters to stop the introduction of the levy or at least discount the taxation rate. During that period, *Kinematograph Weekly* frequently dedicated its cover page to the issue of the Eady Levy and political negotiations from the trade side. This demonstrates that the Eady Levy was a much more critical policy agenda than the CFF for the film industry. *Sight and Sound* explicitly argued that ‘The most important event of 1951 for the British film industry has, of course, been the new entertainments tax concessions agreed between various sections of the trade and Dir Wilfred Eady’ (*Sight and Sound* 1951, August 1, p. 4). The tax was a critical issue for the industry because it could have caused conflicts between the exhibition and production sectors since the former faced additional taxation whilst the latter could expect new semi-public funding for British film production. Therefore, the trade journals repeatedly traced and highlighted negotiations over the Eady Levy in 1950 and 1951 so that the CFF was relatively overshadowed.

51 After the CFF was established with support from the entire film industry, the Rank Organisation (particularly its presidents) became merely one of the governing members of the foundation (among other representatives from the industry organisations) and committed to the CFF’s production.
opinions and obtain their support for the creation of the CFF before it was formally institutionalised. In these meetings, members of the trade organisations (i.e., the British Film Producers Association, the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association, the Kinematograph Renters’ Society and the Association of Specialised Film Producers\(^{52}\)) agreed to establish the CFF with their equal representation as its governing members (see Appendix 5.2; The CFF 1969). The CEF was careful to confirm full agreement from all trade representatives and revised the planned outline of the CFF as necessary, ultimately appointing three representatives from all four organisations. Moreover, the CEF regularly organised public events and meetings with representatives of the film industry, and the CFF continued these practices. For instance, when the CFF was established in 1951, the newly appointed executive director published an article soliciting suggestions from film exhibitors and emphasizing that the voices of the exhibitors would determine the character of the films supplied by the CFF (The Kinematograph Weekly 1951). The CFF’s approach to film companies was also reported in The Times (1951), which noted that the foundation invited production companies to submit ideas suitable for children’s films. The CFF sought to carefully and equally reflect the interests of diverse trade organisations so that the various sectors of the film industry supported its children’s film policy. Appendix 5.2 lists the representatives from the film industry on the CFF’s governing board\(^{53}\) to illustrate that critical figures in mainstream trade organisations appeared on the list. The constitution of the CFF governing board further reveals that all sectors of production, distribution, and exhibition were broadly involved as directors of the CFF.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{52}\) See also The Board of Trade (1947).

\(^{53}\) According the CFF report listing all members of the governing board until 1960, the governing board only included the representatives from the film industry organisations, the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, Federation of British Film Makers, Cinematograph Exhibitors Association, the Association of Specialised Film Producers, and the British Film Producers’ Association (CFF 1960, pp. 41-2). The CFF governing board and production committees comprised of representatives of film-industry organisations or film producers. Thus, neither civil or public sector representatives were excluded but they were consulted as external advisers.

\(^{54}\) The directors comprised of Frank A Hoare, Donald F. Carter, and A.V. Curtice (nominated by the Association of Specialised Film Producers), Major R. P. Baker, John Davis, Sir Henry L. French (nominated by the British Film
Significantly, most of these representative figures from the film industry and industrial organisations were appointed to the CFF’s Public Relations Committee, which discussed and planned promotional events (CFF 1960). The presence of trade members in the public relations office helped the CFF realise effective promotion and communication with the film industry. The structure of its governing board demonstrates that the CFF did not simply reflect the interests of the Rank Organisation but also involved diverse associations and companies. In particular, the CFF included representatives of production, distribution, and exhibition trade associations as well as newly developed film companies and associations, such as independent cinema producers and the Association of Specialised Film Producers. The latter was a newly created association of film producers that aimed to protect its members’ interests and commit to policymaking by applying for and promoting ‘any Act of Parliament, licences, privileges, authorities or concessions necessary or desirable for the carrying into effect of any of the objects of the Association’ (Board of Trade 1948). The Association of Specialised Film Producers was able to regularly meet with and lobby governmental agencies and initiate policy discussions. For instance, it was invited by the Board of Trade to consult on the future of the broadcasting committee and educational film policy (Board of Trade 1947) and it had a channel to set up regular meetings with the Board of Trade (1947). Therefore, including this association on the governing board of the CFF was a reasonable and effective practice to establish the Foundation’s social and political influence. The CFF also equally realised the interests of diverse film companies by sharing its content in a fair manner. As described in *The Times* (1952b), the CFF divided film theatres into four groups: independent cinemas (two groups), ABC Minors’ Matinees (one group), and Rank Saturday Clubs...
The CFF drafted a rule that ‘an equal share of the Foundation’s product will be given to each group on an executive basis, and over some time, the films will be shown by all four groups in rotation’ (The Times 1952b, p. 9). The involvement of independent cinema groups indicates that the CFF served both large companies and associations of independent producers and exhibitors despite the vertical integration and monopolisation of the British film industry in the 1950s.

While the preceding literature tends to emphasize the connection between the CFF and the Rank Organisation (e.g., Shail 2016), it ispivotally important to conceptualise the CFF as a result of broad cooperation from across the entire film industry, indicating that the advocacy coalition of the film industry made the CFF and its achievements possible. The CFF certainly recognised the importance of such an advocacy coalition because it continuously ensured that the trade representatives were engaged on its governing board.

5.3.3.2 Public Authorities

Whereas the CFD, CEF, and CFF were mostly developed as initiatives of the film industry, the public authorities occasionally played a significant role in developing and institutionalising the production of children’s films. The critical moment was when the Home Office established the Committee on Children and the Cinema to investigate children’s films and published the Children and the Cinema report in 1950 (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950). It praised both the CEF and Advisory Council and insisted on a Constitution of the National Board, which would support and advise the production of children’s films. This report was crucial because it addressed the sincere appreciation of the children’s film business and recommended further engagement from the public sector. Therefore, although the CFF began as an industry-funded body,
the public sector became involved and took on critical roles in sustaining and developing the foundation.

The process of developing partnerships between the CFD/CEF/CFF and public authorities illustrates how an advocacy coalition based on shared beliefs about the values and significance of British children’s film was developed in the post-war period. Before the Rank Organisation created the CFD, the commitments of public authorities to children’s film production were restrictive rather than constructive. While government departments attended the children’s film conferences presented by the BFI in the 1930s, the government offered no substantive support. As a result, the BFI could not produce its own children’s films but could only publish a catalogue of suitable films and recommendations for producers. Meanwhile, at the local level, municipal governments supervised and regulated children’s film screenings by children’s film clubs. Thus, children’s films were regulated rather than encouraged at the time.

When the CFD began producing and exhibiting children’s film programmes, it contacted these public agencies through the Advisory Council. In its first annual meeting, representatives from national authorities—including the Ministry of Education, the Home Office, and the Scottish Office—were invited to hear about CFD’s activities and share their opinions and recommendations for children’s film production (Field 1952). The CFD/CEF also developed communication channels with local municipalities and the Association of Local Education Committees by organising conferences to exhibit their films to children and explain the missions and achievements of their productions. The Advisory Council confidently reported affirmative responses from the participants at these conferences. The success of this promotional campaign is evident in the supportive review in the Children and the Cinema report. After consulting diverse public
authorities, the committee set up by the Home Office concluded that the achievements of the CEF were invaluable and that public support should be provided to develop it.

5.4 Impacts of the CFF Advocacy Coalition

5.4.1 The growth of children’s film production

The most evident achievement of the advocacy coalitions formed in relation to the CFD/CEF/CFF was the production and exhibition of high-quality children’s films. While a comprehensive review of CFF film production was provided by Shail (2016, see the Appendix 5.1 Production Chronology, pp. 161-185), this section focuses on the initial outcomes of the CFD/CEF/CFF from 1944 to 1954 and examines the growth of children’s film during that period. These organisations produced not only feature films but also a variety of films including documentary, educational, and fictional movies. For instance, in 1946, the CEF produced three story films (Jeans’ Plan, Bush Christmas, and The Boy Who Stopped Niagara), two film serials (six episodes of The Voyage of Peter Joe; five episodes of The Adventure of Dusty Bates), one news film (Our Club Magazine), two films about nature (Revised Secrets of Life and Tales of the Woodlands), one film about travelling (Portuguese Harvest) and one interest film (The House Goblin) (The Advisory Council 1946). The number of films produced annually also gradually increased, as CEF made 18 films in 1945, 45 in 1946, 74 in 1947, 106 in 1948 and 146 in 1949 (CEF 1947, 1948, 1949).55

The production of films further expanded after the creation of the CFF in 1951. According to the first annual report (CFF 1953), the foundation made eight feature films (The Stolen Plans, John of the Fair, Skid Kids, Heights of Danger, Johnny on the Run, The Dog and the Diamonds, Gibraltar Adventure, and The Secret Cave). While Shail (2016) focuses on such lengthy feature

---

55 The categories (labels) of films in this section is from the original categorisations in the CEF/CFD annual reports.
films, it is also noteworthy that the CFF produced other categories such as travel films (*A Letter From Ayrshire, A Letter from East Anglia, and A Letter from the Isle of Wight*), periodical films (*Our Magazine from No.1 to No. 8*) and other short feature films (*Swifter Water, To the Rescue, Rover Makes Good, Stable Rivals, Juno Helps Out, Mardi and the Monkey, Watch Out, A Good Pull Up, and Bouncer Breaks Up*). By the end of 1954, 14 long stories of one hour each, 12 short stories of 20 minutes each, 16 periodical films, and four travel films had been produced. Additionally, five feature films were in progress (CFF 1955). Table 5.1 offers a comprehensive list of CFF films produced by 1955.

Table 5.1: CFF Film Production by 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Stolen Plans</em></td>
<td>Spy thriller set in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>John of the Fair</em></td>
<td>Costume adventure story of a kidnapped heir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Skid Kids</em></td>
<td>London children on the track of bicycle thieves who haunt their bicycle dirt track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heights of Danger</em></td>
<td>An English family in an Alpine motor rally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Johnny on the Run</em></td>
<td>A Polish orphan involved with jewel thieves finds refuge in an international children’s village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Dog and the Diamonds</em></td>
<td>The problem of children in a London block of flats where pets are forbidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Club of the Missing Ape</em></td>
<td>Spy adventure in Gibraltar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Secret Cave</em></td>
<td>Set in limestone caves in Somerset, the theme of this film is the danger of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adventure in the Hopfields</em></td>
<td>An achievement story where the menace comes from mischievous children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mystery on Bird Island</em></td>
<td>A smuggling story set in a bird sanctuary in the Channel Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tim Driscoll’s Donkey</em></td>
<td>An Irish story of effort and achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kekec</em></td>
<td>An adaptation of a Yugoslav folk tale of a brave boy who overcomes a savage hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Flying Eye</em></td>
<td>A ‘scientific’ comedy detective thriller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Stolen Airliner</em></td>
<td>Three air cadets prevent the Fragovinian revolutionaries from stealing the new Vickers Viscount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Swift Water</em></td>
<td>Sailing bird watching and rescue of a dog on the River Dart in Devonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To the Rescue</em></td>
<td>A Richard Massingham comedy of a stolen poodle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rover Makes Good</em></td>
<td>A mischievous sheepdog brings help to children trapped in an old Cornish mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stable Rivals</em></td>
<td>A study of children’s gymkhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juno Helps Out</em></td>
<td>A Great Dane helps children with their housework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mardi and Monkey</em></td>
<td>An Indonesian story of a little boy who has a pet monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Watch Out</em></td>
<td>Comedies starring Peter Butterworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Good Pull Up</em></td>
<td>Comedies starring Peter Butterworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Appendix 5.5 provides details of the CFF’s production policy, clearly explaining its aims, processes, and philosophy for film production. It states that the CFF’s production should meet the defined three objectives: ‘(a) to entertain by providing healthy recreation for children of the age group attending special performances organised by exhibitors, (b) to set as high a standard of taste and behaviour as possible by appealing to children’s intelligence and love of adventure and (c) to employ the art of cinematography and its technical qualities at the highest level consistent with the telling of a good clear story’ (CFF 1969, p. 6). 56 While these objectives reflect the ideals from adults viewpoints resonating with the debates of desirable children’s films from the 1910s to the 1930s (Chapter 3 and Chapter 4), the Foundation noticeably emphasised that it should provide films that children enjoy because ‘the Foundation’s first duty is to entertain its audience’ (CFF 1960, p. 6).

Once these films were produced, they were circulated and exhibited in major cinema chains. 57 CFF films were categorised into four groups, and each cinema chain could screen only

---

56 These rules and principles of the CFF were discussed and confirmed in the general meetings of the Foundation. Details of the rules of the Foundation is provided in CFF (1951). Appendix 5.6 also provides the full text of the rules of the Foundation.

57 The BBFC and the CFF also attempted to cooperate which each other for the promotion and exhibition of children’s film. In an informal meeting between the trade organisations and the CFF in 1952, the installation of a new ‘C’ certificate to clarify films especially suitable for children was agreed upon. Also, they agreed to suggest that the BBFC
one group in each season; thereafter, the films were circulated in order. According to the statistics of the distribution booking for CFF films in the domestic market in 1954, four cinema chains (Independent Cinema Group, GB, ABC, Odeon) signed contracts to show each film approximately 1,000 to 1,200 times each season (CFF 1955, p. 9), and those films are shown in all parts of Great Britain (CFF 1952). After they were screened by each of the four chains, the films were presented to young audiences between 4,000 and 4,800 times annually. Box office records reflect the popularity of the CFF’s films. For instance, the net revenue of the CFF in 1960 was £49,848 from the domestic market and £173,172 from international markets, which represented an impressive return on its annual budget of £150,000 per year. 58

In addition to the screenings in domestic theatres, CFF children’s films were broadly shown and welcomed at international festivals. For example, four CFF films were shown at the Berlin Film Festival in August 1954 and were circulated in continental cities such as Amsterdam as well (CFF 1960)59. In December 1954, two CEF films were shown at the Bombay Children’s Film Festival. In 1955, at the Venice Children’s Film Festival, a CFF film won the prize for the best long film,60 an award for the best short film, and the Silver Gondola Award for the best cultural film (CFF 1953, p. 8).

---

58 According to the UK Office for National Statistics, £1 in 1950 is approximately equal to £38 in 2020.
59 The CFF films were shown overseas mostly in special educational programs, as the foundation reflects that ‘in many countries children’s shows are mainly organised by Educational and Religious bodies’ (CFF 1969, p. 10). Meanwhile, in the domestic market, the CFF programs were produced, distributed, and exhibited by the hands of commercial film business in Britain. Additionally, the CFF films are also broadly distributed in film festivals overseas to promote CFF films and observe the reactions of child audiences abroad. The distribution of CFF films abroad was in charge of the Rank Overseas Film Distributors Limited. (Appendix 5.6 presents a complete list of rules of the Foundation).
60 ‘Long film’ is a category officially labelled in this festival, equivalent to the feature films.
5.4.2 Development of Audience Research and Improvement of Children’s Film in Britain

The CFD/CEF/CFF’s pivotal policy for film production was to understand children’s tastes and expectations. The CFF’s first annual report defined its primary goal as being to supply entertaining films ‘that children will readily pay to see’, stating that ‘it cannot be emphasised too strongly that the Foundation’s aim is to produce entertainment films that children will enjoy’ (CFF 1952, p. 6). To produce films that can truly entertain children, the CFD/CEF/CFF had to study young audiences and improve research methods that resulted in production of children’s films that can attract and entertain children. It was the Advisory Council that played a leading role in designing, developing, and elaborating the CEF’s audience research. The archival records of the Advisory Council showcase how the CEF critically challenged the limitations of previous audience research and developed sophisticated new methodologies by combining participative observation, questionnaires, and interviews with both children and managers to understand and document the influence of cinema on children in a more convincing manner. To understand children’s responses to films, the Advisory Council also closely reviewed the production and casting of the films. In consultancy with the Governmental Committee in 1950, the Advisory Council emphasised the necessity of watching films with children when they evaluated the works:

The Advisory Council wishes to emphasise most strongly that a final criticism of a children’s entertainment film can only be valid if that film has been seen in the presence of a child audience. … it is in view of its complete conviction with regard to the necessity of seeing the films in the presence of a child audience that the Council wishes to submit as the outstandingly important section of the evidence the seeing the members of the Government Committee on Children in the Cinema, of two programmes of Children’s Entertainment Films. (Advisory Council 1950, p. 9)
This quotation stresses that the value of children’s films should be assessed only by observing children’s reactions. In this vein, the Advisory Council was wary of associating adults’ evaluations of films with children’s perceptions of them, commenting that:

When children’s films are being judged, it is essential to remember that, while adults can decide whether a film is morally fit for children to see or sufficiently well produced to help train good film-taste, only children can judge whether it provides them with good entertainment … It is not the business of adults to dictate to children that they must find enjoyment and pleasure in what is considered good for them. (Advisory Council 1949, p. 4)

Such a view indirectly challenged the educationalists’ criticism of children’s films, which were based on their own beliefs and assessments rather than on children’s responses. The Advisory Council’s approach to audience research and the evaluation of films reflected its beliefs about children as proactive and sensible audiences. The CFD/CEF challenged and discredited common views that children were easily and uncritically influenced by undesirable films. Instead, they offered high praise for children’s evaluations:

There is nothing passive about them [children]. They are extremely active and intelligent, so we were able in many cases to give up the obvious ‘black and white’ construction of plots and substitute instead studies in the character of children wrestling with the problems of their environment. (Field 1952, p. 77)

The Advisory Council’s effective and frequent application of audience research does not indicate that it merely championed children’s preferences and advised the CFD/CEF to supply what children wanted. On the contrary, the Advisory Council believed that audience research should be

---

61 Such conflicting beliefs were gradually solved by the achievements of the CFF’s film production, including the popularity of CFF films, high evaluations by critics, awards from international film festivals, and an examination of film and the moral character of children’s films (CFF 1955, 1969)
employed to balance entertainment and education so that the CFD could create children’s films that both attracted children and made them ideal audiences with good morals and tastes.

Driven by its belief that children’s tastes should be studied and respected, the Advisory Council developed methodologies to systematically review children’s responses and evaluate films’ impacts on youngsters. The review from the 1949 annual report explains in detail how the Advisory Council combined different methodologies to overcome each restriction and comprehensively understand the influence of children’s cinema (see Appendix 5.4). Additionally, a minute paper titled *The Psychological Purpose Underlying the Work Attempted by the Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films* (Advisory Council 1950b) contains several key points about audience research, including the need to evaluate the cumulative effect of seeing a large number of films rather than simply discussing the influence of a single film on a given child.62

The Advisory Council also improved the methodology used to assess cinema’s influence on children by developing new technologies and methods. The previous methodology relied mainly on questionnaires for children (the BFI children’s film model) or on analyses of film texts (the BBFC model). In contrast to such techniques based on textual and content analysis, the philosophy of the Advisory Council was to set up occasions for direct observations of children’s responses to films. To achieve this, Advisory Council members regularly attended children’s film club screenings and interviewed the cinema managers, which meant that the council’s evaluations depended on the support of these local cinema managers. The findings of the Advisory Council

---

62 This report written and submitted by the Advisory Council was included in the UNESCO’s report titled *THE ENTERTAINMENT FILM FOR JUVENILE AUDIENCES* (1950). In this report, the Advisory Council explains its mission as follows:

The Advisory Council is primarily concerned with the improvement of the standard of entertainment films for children, and thus the question of the whole content of the film and its potential value to the child audience, educationally and culturally, is a matter of great concern to all its members … The Advisory Council takes note of the opinions of educationalists, magistrates, social workers, etc., concerning the effect of cinema-going on children (p. 213)
were directly reflected in CFD/CEF film production through regular meetings between the council and CFD/CEF governors such as Rank and Field as well as other members of the CFD/CEF. Indeed, the letters exchanged between Lady Allen of Hurtwood and Arthur Rank attest to close and frequent meetings between the Advisory Council and the CFD/CEF (e.g., Advisory Council 1947f).

Later, the audience research methodology became further developed and sophisticated in the CFF from 1951. The empirical approach elaborated by Field was cautiously designed to identify what children wanted. In her experience at the CEF, she found that questionnaires were not necessarily a suitable approach for children. She argued that due to their restricted literacy, young children’s written answers were unreliable. Field offered the example of one boy who answered that his favourite genre was Western film, despite the fact that he spent much more time enthusiastically watching documentaries. Based on that, Field developed a research methodology that involved directly recording and analysing the reactions of the audiences during the CFF film screenings. This exemplified how the CFF prioritised thoughtful and well-designed research methods and how they were constructed in the CFD and CEF. To develop research methodology, Field succeeded in introducing the new infrared photography technology in 1954, which enabled her to record children’s reactions and to analyse which scenes children particularly enjoyed. Field published a report on child audiences based on this research, which was commissioned by the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust (Field 1954). The findings from this series of audience screening studies were diverse, indicating that boys and girls or children from rural or metropolitan areas often had different reactions to the same film. Additionally, the children’s reactions to the most popular genres, plots, and settings also differed.

As a result, the CFF learned direct lessons about popular expressions and editing techniques. For instance, children are more interested and concentrate more closely when youths
of the same age appear on the screen. Meanwhile, long shots are unwelcome because children cannot concentrate on them. Furthermore, more detailed observations were delivered on the different cohorts. For instance, Field highlighted the clear distinction between male and female audiences: boys tended to prefer action or Western films whereas girls were more sympathetic towards, and enjoyed, emotional drama. Interestingly, Field also noticed differences between audiences from different backgrounds. She concluded that children whose parents worked in manufacturing and agriculture in rural areas were more patient with long films, while children in cities and metropolitan areas were likely to be distracted.

By acknowledging both children’s spontaneous responses and their established tastes in films, the CFD/CEF aimed to balance entertainment and moral lessons. The 1948 report also articulated the goals of CEF films, claiming that it was difficult or almost impossible to draw a clear line between entertainment films and educational films (Advisory Council 1948c). Therefore, the CEF should produce films containing both educational messages and entertaining experiences. By offering such films and attracting children, the CEF can produce ‘intelligent and discriminating film-goers’ who can distinguish and choose high quality films from poor films (Advisory Council 1948c, p. 4). Ideal CEF films should be ‘entertainment films, suited to their age and capacity, that can evoke in children a feeling of wonder, enable them to satisfy vicariously their sense of adventure and provide the necessary opportunities for healthy laughter’ (Advisory Council, 1948c, p. 4). Consequently, their audience research resulted in the improvement of children’s film quality and fuelled its increasing popularity, which led to positive evaluations among diverse stakeholders that continue today. Field noted, ‘It was by studying the reaction of children to the actors in the films that we were able to cast so much more successfully. All this study and research probably accounts for our successes at Venice in 1950 and 1951’ (Field 1952, p. 76).
Wisely, C.E.F. recognised that the cinema’s full influence could only be exerted if the moral purpose found expression in artistic terms; it was important not only to advocate good conduct but to make good films. At the same time, the tastes and needs of an imperfectly known public had to be studied. Therefore, to reconcile the equally valid claims of the film and its consumers, the department set out to give children the best that they could enjoy. (*The Times* 1952, October 21, p. 2)

An important part of the Foundation’s policy lies in the realisation that a message can best be given to an audience that is wholeheartedly with you: the moral pill about living has to have a sugar coating of good story-telling. (*The Manchester Guardian* 1961, March 24, p. 5)

These two quotations addressed the key characteristics of film production by the CFF and its precedents. The work of the CFF’s succeeded in achieving two primary goals: attracting children’s interests by offering entertainment and delivering moral messages to young audiences. Of course, diverse actors—including politicians, filmmakers and educationalists—often identified the potential of film to serve as both an educational instrument and a form of entertainment, even before the creation of the CFF. As the above quotations from national newspapers indicate, the beliefs of the CEF/CFF and the Advisory Council about young audiences and desirable children’s films came to be shared with educationalists and social workers interested in juvenile education and convinced them to appreciate the performances and approaches of the CEF/CFF. The

---

63 See also, *The Times* (1951, August 18; 1952, October 2; 1953, November 4)
64 Moreover, an official report published in 1967 inherited the same views and reflected on the achievements of the CFF. John Davis, Chairman and Chief Executive of the Rank Organisation and the chairman of the CFF since 1960 argued in defence of adapting to changes in children’s tastes:

Children today are a more sophisticated audience than they used to be and demand a high level of technical perfection as well as entertainment values. The films that are made for them may be different in tempo, but there can be no relaxation of the film making discipline. All of us have experienced the clear and critical perception of children in other walks of life. They are just as critical of any sign in films made for their enjoyment of “talking down” or “patronising”. The skill with which these pitfalls are avoided in CFF productions never fails to fascinate me (forward by John Davis quoted in *Children’s Film Foundation* 1969, p. 4).

65 Before the CEF’s audience research, the *Children and Cinema* Report in 1950 claimed that educationalists knew surprisingly little about children’s film and its audiences.
audience research and its outcomes were crucially significant, not only for improving the quality and popularity of children’s films, but also for demonstrating the advantage of the CED/CEF and reinforcing the advocacy coalition of the CEF/CFF.

5.4.3. The film industry and increased commitment of public authorities to children’s films

Due to the CFF’s close communication with diverse trade organisations and the equal representation of these labour groups, the CFF attracted support from the entire film industry. The CFF’s first annual report clearly states that the CFF was ‘the result of a co-operative effort on the part of the film industry as a whole’ (CFF 1952, p. 3) Consequently, the CFF was presented as the film industry’s series of initiatives to improve its image and demonstrate its contributions to the public good, since the CFF seeks ‘to demonstrate to educationalists and social workers that the film industry in this country aims at producing and exhibiting films which are suitable in every way for children and provide entertainment appreciated by children’ (CFF 1952, p. 4). For example, due to help from the distributer and exhibitor associations, the CFF managed to efficiently circulate its children’s films. According to the CFF’s first annual report, it assigned one of the commercial distributors (Associated British Film Distributors, Ltd.) to distribute all of its children’s films and asked the CEA to smoothly accept and exhibit these films. Such cooperation resulted in the

We have pointed out that comparatively few parents, teachers or members of licensing authorities see the films which are being shown to the children, and we have recommended that parents, teachers and others who are especially interested in the welfare of children should be admitted to the exhibitions. The films are seldom, if ever, advertised either in the ordinary cinema or at earlier children’s performances. In our view, it is desirable that they should be. The mothers who were asked for their opinions of the children’s clubs and matinees frequently said they would like to have more information about the films shown, though they assumed that only films suitable for children were shown, and indeed approved of children’s exhibitions on this ground. Unfortunately, their assumption is far from being generally true (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950, p. 27).

The findings from the audience research were employed to tackle such ignorance and prejudice regarding children’s film and their impacts on child audiences.
competitive advantage of the CFF in international competition since its second annual report concluded, ‘In most countries, the producer of a children’s film finds great difficulty in getting the picture distributed and exhibited. In Great Britain, because all three sections of the film industry are supporting the Children’s Film Foundation, the productions of the Foundation have assured distribution and exhibition’ (CFF 1953, p. 5). Moreover, the CFF positively evaluated the film industry’s support because children’s film screenings were an experimental new category, yet the fact that ‘…it appears to be working smoothly is largely due to the initiative and flexibility shown by renters and exhibitors alike’ (CFF 1953, p. 6). The CFF also signed a contract with the J. Arthur Rank Overseas Film Distributors Ltd. to distribute its content overseas. In November 1953, The Times described the cooperation between the CFF and the film industry as follows:

[S]ince the film industry is supporting the foundation, there is no difficulty about distribution and exhibition, and by allocating the films in turn to each of the four groups into which the cinemas that organise special performances for children have been divided, each film takes about four years to go the rounds of all the children who would like to see it. (The Times 1953, November 4, p. 2)

Later, in 1956, a House of Commons debate titled Film Industry examined the achievements of the CFF and evaluated them positively. Mrs Eirene White, who was Parliamentary Under-Secretary of the State and Ministry of State, commented:

Having said a few hard words about the trade, I should like to say the warmest appreciation about what first The Rank Organisation – and, since it became a matter for the whole trade, other organisations – have done in supporting the Children’s Film Foundation. I think that they give 125,000 pounds a year from the Film Production Fund, for which they get little direct financial return, and they have done a really excellent job of work. (Hansard 1956)

Moreover, support from the film industry was crucial to developing audience research on children, which was fundamental for the CFF production policy (as discussed section 5.4.2). The
production, distribution and exhibition of children’s films, as well as data collection for audience research, relied on the infrastructure and support of the existing film industry. The contributions of local cinema managers were essential for developing audience research methods and collecting adequate data based on participatory observation of screenings. According to Lady Allen of Hurtwood, the success of children’s film clubs and screenings was due to the efforts and observations of local cinema managers:

I am continually amazed that the managers I have watched conducting their clubs, all seem to have a natural and spontaneous affection for the children, which is reflected in a genial atmosphere of mutual confidence and trust. They know, what many of the critics fail to appreciate that the children come to the cinema alive and eager and full of interest, it is on this interest that the wise manager builds his work. (Advisory Council 1947f, p. 2)

Additionally, the CFF’s annual report emphasised that the cinema managers continued to support its audience research, mentioning that ‘cinema managers send in valuable reports on the reception of the pictures. Managers, who are not used to screening this type of film [children’s film] comment particularly on how quiet and absorbed the children are except where they are expected to express their feelings vocally’ (CFF 1953, p. 7). In this report, the CFF stated that the number of independent exhibitors showing its films exceeded that of the three circuits (i.e., ABC, Gaumont and Odeon) in 1951. Therefore, it was crucial for the CFF to receive feedback from independent cinema managers, which became possible because the CFF involved representatives of the independent cinema owners and established cooperative relationships with them rather than focusing only on the large-scale film business chains.

---

66 Moreover, the CFF’s annual report comments that the foundation collected the reports by cinema managers explaining the children’s responses to the cinema and concluded ‘these reports tend to confirm belief in the value of the films’ (CFF 1953, p. 7).
Evidently, coalition-building in the CFF was much swifter, and the coalition between the film industry and the new institution was much stronger than in the previous case studies. In the 1910s, the BBFC experienced challenges posed by the various exhibition methods and practices in local cinemas. In contrast, the CFF took advantage of the practices of equal representation and the tradition of industry organisations for its coalition-building. Additionally, the CFF succeeded in including diverse interests and actors from the film industry, thereby allowing it to acquire a consensus. The CFF’s success in systematically involving diverse industrial stakeholders was critical to establishing a consensus about the new enterprise of children’s film and expanding the scope of the advocacy coalition. This became possible because the film industry itself had been organised through representative associations and new groups. Additionally, the 1950s saw the emergence of well-capitalized film companies and their monopolisation. Therefore, the CEF/CFF could individually communicate with these large companies and include them in the advocacy coalition and the circuit of children’s film exhibitions.

Due to the supportive efforts provided by the film industry, the 1950s and 1960s saw the growth of the CFF’s film production and distribution. During this period, its films were popularly accepted by British children as well as international audiences. As such, film exhibitors expanded the Saturday matinee shows and sought to obtain the CFF’s films. Moreover, the CFF succeeded in acquiring critical acclaim in the international market and at film festivals (Shail 2016). The initial growth of the CFF was underpinned by close cooperation with the film industry through regular contracts with diverse film producers and companies as well as a constant supply of films through domestic cinema chains. The quality and variety of CFF films were highly evaluated in its first two decades, which resulted in film producers and exhibitors welcoming offers from the CFF to supply special films for children. The CFF commissioned several genres of film, including
educational shorts, comedies, serial films, and features, adapting to children’s responses. To investigate its outcomes, the CFF, under the leadership of Mary Field, continued audience research in the 1950s and reviewed its production policies based on research reports. Simultaneously, the CFF continued to highlight and emphasise the moralistic messages of films by reiterating similar storylines in which virtues and fairness were underlined. A comprehensive list of CFF films is provided by Shail (2016).

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the early history of a series of children’s film policies: the CFD, the CEF, and the CFF, and their advocacy coalitions, which were developed in the 1940s and 1950s. The CFD, which originated from the Rank Organisation’s private enterprise in 1944, had transformed into the CFF by 1951. Notably, the CFF’s development was underpinned by firm and broad support from an advocacy coalition involving stakeholders that included diverse associations from the film industry and public authorities that provided financial aid and instruments for the production and exhibition of children’s films. The expansion of the advocacy coalition for the CFF was the achievement of the policy entrepreneurs’ efforts to institutionalise and legitimatise children’s film production in Britain. The founders of the CFD, Mary Field and Arthur J. Rank, facilitated promotional events by inviting educationalists and journalists while communicating with representatives of the film industry and state institutions to obtain their understanding and support. Consequently, the diverse associations of the film industry recognised the popularity and potential of children’s film production and exhibitions. Thus, a cooperative relationship between the CFF and the entire film industry was established. Such cooperation was pivotal for the CFF because it made it possible for the Foundation to commission film production and exhibit these programmes.
in major cinema chains. Moreover, relevant debates in Parliament and governmental agencies reflected a cooperative climate to appreciate the importance of children’s film and the CFD/CEF’s contributions to providing better films for children, which resulted in financial aid for the newly created CFF from the Eady Levy.

The Advisory Council of the CFF played a pivotal role in formulating and expanding the advocacy coalition by involving diverse stakeholders, particularly the educational and social workers associations. The Council invited public figures with educational backgrounds and civil servants as members to supervise and discuss the quality of CEF films. As the archival record of minute papers and exchanged letters showcases, the Advisory Council members, including Lady Allen of Hurtwood, regularly and closely cooperated with both the Rank Organisation and public and educational authorities to facilitate the promotional exhibitions of CEF films and explain the importance of children’s films. In this vein, the Advisory Council also increased the sophistication of audience research methodologies, which helped to legitimise the CEF/CFF’s children’s films by demonstrating their popularity as well as their educational and moralistic characteristics. Such audience research reflected the novel idea that children’s films should be entertaining and that audience preferences should be empirically investigated by carefully combining new methods such as audience observations, manager interviews and questionnaires.

The significant difference between the CFF and the other two case studies—the BBFC in the 1910s and the BFI in the 1930s—was that the CFF was committed to film production and supplied its own film contents to realise its educational and cultural goals. The CFF film programme successfully attracted young audiences and earned critical acclaim at international film festivals. The CFF’s success was underpinned by cooperation with the film industry as well as the debut of new and sophisticated audience research techniques implemented by the Advisory
Council and educationalists. More directly, the production of a film costs more than the evaluation or circulation of the provided film works (as the BFI in the interwar period managed to achieve) and the box office in children’s film program was inadequate to fully cover the cost (CFF 1953). Thus, the CFF required financial aid from the Eady Levy and support from the public sector, which made the advocacy coalition essential to the activities of the CFF.

In the 1970s, the CFF experienced several handicaps, including the decline of child audiences at cinema shows and the reduction of public aid from the Eady Levy (Shail 2016). The Thatcher government, formed in 1979, further reduced public financing for the CFF. This resulted in the CFF being unable to continue producing films for children, because its primary mission was to deliver films with educational value rather than commercial success to cover its production costs. While all stakeholders in the film industry and public sector, such as the CEA and the Board of Trade, recognised the social importance of the CFF, they were reluctant to cover the financial burdens that the CFF shouldered during its economic hardship in the 1970s and 1980s. The CFF attempted to adapt to these new political and economic conditions and renamed itself the Children’s Film and Television Foundation (CFTF) in 1983. Although the BBC screened CFTF films on television in 1984, the Foundation was forced to effectively halt production in 1986 since it could not find ways to cover costs. Since then, the CFTF has played only consulting and advisory roles for children’s film programmes since it lacks adequate financial backing for its own productions, as per the BFI in the 1930s. The organisation was later renamed the Children’s Media Foundation (CMF) in 201267.

---

67 As Shail (2016) discusses, the change of the name to ‘media foundation’ reflects the CMF’s aim to commit to all forms of children’s media beyond film and television. Significantly, the CMF was a response to ongoing pressures of commercialisation and marketisation in children’s media, and it aims to enrich the children’s media production against such pressures.
The three case studies presented in this thesis: the BBFC, BFI and CFF, similarly demonstrate the presence and significance of the advocacy coalitions involving the film industry, educationalists, and public authorities. However, the structures of the coalitions and the processes of coalition-making were diverse. The next chapter discusses the similarities, differences, and historical development of the advocacy coalitions for educational and cultural film policy in Britain.
Chapter 6

Discussion

6.1 Introduction

In previous chapters, I investigated the creation and initial development of three key institutions: the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC) in the 1910s and 1920s, the British Film Institute (BFI) in the 1920s and 1930s, and the Children’s Film Foundation (CFF) and its predecessors, the Children’s Film Department (CFD) and Children’s Entertainment Film (CEF), in the 1940s and 1950s. These historical case studies delineate why and how diverse participants, such as public authorities, the film industry, and educationalists, interacted and formulated coalitions to discuss, advocate, and implement educational and cultural film policies. In doing so, I applied the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) to trace how these institutions were created by the coalitions of policy advocates. Going forward, this chapter summarises the key findings drawn from the research on advocacy coalitions and discusses emerging themes to conceptualise efficient state-market-civic partnerships concerning educational and cultural film policies in Britain.

To summarise and discuss historical research on the three institutions, this chapter consists of two parts. Section 6.2 provides an overview of the advocacy coalitions’ key stakeholders, processes, and impacts. The section also addresses the limitations and merits of applying the ACF in relation to exploring the history of educational and cultural film policies in Britain. Following this, Section 6.3 explores the emerging themes identified in comparative research on educational and cultural film policy from the 1910s to the 1950s. This section considers how an efficient state-market-civic partnership can be institutionalised by the balanced representation and involvement of the stakeholders (6.3.1) and how underlying beliefs regarding children and the cinema transformed from the pre-war to the post-war periods in Britain (6.3.2). This section also outlines
the previously underestimated contributions of the private sector to forming the educational and
cultural policies (6.3.3) addressed in this thesis.

6.2 The Advocacy Coalitions for the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF

6.2.1 Stakeholders in the advocacy coalitions

As the case studies from Chapter 3 to Chapter 5 discuss, the BBFC, the BFI and CFF were based
on the consensus of the stakeholders forming the advocacy coalitions from the state (public
authorities), the market (film industry), and civil society (educationalists). Table 6.1 outlines the
key backers from the public, business, and civic sectors that committed to establishing the BBFC,
the BFI, and the CFF.

Table 6.1 Stakeholders from the state, market, and civil society in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State (Public Sector)</th>
<th>Market (Business Sector)</th>
<th>Civil Society (Civic Sector)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BBFC (1910–20s)</td>
<td>• The Home Office</td>
<td>• Film-industry organisations</td>
<td>• Educationalists and religious figures commenting on censorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local municipalities implementing their own censorship before</td>
<td>(the KMA, the KRS, the CEA)</td>
<td>• The Cinema Inquiry Commission on the National Council of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accepting BBFC decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Morals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Film-industry organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual business owners and film producers (H. Bruce-Woolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educationalists and religious figures commenting on censorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The educationalists in the Commission on Educational and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Films (e.g., Association of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committees, Association of Directors and Secretaries for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education, National Union of Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BFI (1920–1930s)</td>
<td>• Home Office, The Board of Education, The Board of Trade and</td>
<td>• Film-industry organisations</td>
<td>• The educationalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Office (governors of the BFI)</td>
<td>(the KRS, the CEA and the Federation of British Industries,</td>
<td>in the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Colonial Office, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries,</td>
<td>Film Group)</td>
<td>on Educational and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Education and Scottish Education Department (in the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Films (e.g., Association of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission on Educational and Cultural Film)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Committees, Association of Directors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The BFI Advisory Council (e.g., the Board of Education and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaries for Education, National Union of Teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Colonial Office, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trade, Ministry of Labour, Scottish Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department in the Education Panel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The CFF (1940–1950s)

- The members of the CEF Advisory Council (the Board of Trade, the Board of Education and the Scottish Office)
- The Parliamentary Committee on Children and the Cinema, established by the Home Office
- The Rank Organisation
- Film-Industry Organisations (the British Film Producers’ Association, the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association, the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, and the Association of Specialised Film Producers)
- The cinema circuit and its managers (the ABC, the Gaumont, and the ODEON)
- Educationalists attending the Advisory Council of the CEF

Mapping and comparing these stakeholders in relation to the creation of the three institutions is useful in identifying a wide variety of relevant stakeholders and understanding the dynamics of the coalition-building effort. The table reveals the continuous involvement of the key stakeholders in the public sector (such as the Home Office, the Board of Trade and the Board of Education) and in the business sector (such as the CEA and the KRS) from the 1910s through to the 1950s. Continuous involvement made these stakeholders more influential members of the policy coalition, as they were constantly consulted regarding new policy ideas. In the meantime, broad associations of educationalists in these institutions were involved in different committees/commissions.68

Although educationalists played crucial roles in reforming policies with their idealistic proposals,

---

68 The Cinema Commission of Enquiry in the National Council of Public Morals included the directors of education from Liverpool and Newcastle, the National Union of Teachers, the Head Mistresses’ Association, schoolmasters (including from schools such as Eton), LCC Elementary Schools, and the Education Committee of the London County Council.

The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films in 1930 included a variety of educationalists: Professor of Ancient History at the University of Oxford, the Secretary for Education, City of Oxford, the Chairman of the Education Committee of the Corporation of the City of Edinburgh, the Honorary Secretary, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, and the Director of Education, County Offices, Northampton.

Additionally, both the governing board and the Advisory Council of the BFI included several educational figures and organisations: the Association of Education Committees, the Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education, the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutes, the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland, the Association of Assistant Mistresses in Secondary Schools, the Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, the Association of Headteachers, the Association of Headmistresses, and the National Union of Teachers.

The Advisory Council members in the CEF in the 1940s were civil-sector figures with educational interests, such as its chairman, Lady Allen of Hurtwood as well as representatives from the National Union of Teachers, the National Association of Girls’ Clubs, the National Association of Boys’ Clubs, the Library Association, and the National Federation of Women’s Institutes.
the absence of key organisations continuously engaging in film policies made the educational associations less influential in governing the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Moreover, as the case studies of the BBFC and the BFI reveal, the educationalists’ beliefs regarding educational and cultural film policy were more varied and less coherent than those held by the film-industry organisations and public authorities. The educationalists could not therefore establish influential and representative organisations capable of playing a crucial role in policy discussions and coalition-making.

6.2.2 Process of coalition-building

Comparing the three case studies, this thesis reveals that the process of creating an advocacy coalition can be divided into three phases: (1) the policy entrepreneurs’ initiatives concerning new policy ideas and institutions; (2) the formation of the advocacy coalitions comprised of participants from the film industry and the educational sector, facilitated by policy brokers; and (3) the expansion of the institutions by involving public authorities in the advocacy coalitions. Table 6.2 outlines how the BBFC/BFI/CFF advocacy coalition developed over these three stages.

Table 6.2 The Process of Advocacy Coalition-Making in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Agenda setting by policy entrepreneurs.</th>
<th>Phase 2: Coalition-making facilitated by policy brokers.</th>
<th>Phase 3: Coalition expansion by involving more stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BBFC (1910–20s)</td>
<td>The film-industry organisations (KMA, KRS, CEA) established the BBFC.</td>
<td>The BBFC overcame the opposing state-censorship movement of the Home Office and the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BFI (1920–1930s)</td>
<td>The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films proposed the creation of a national film institute.</td>
<td>The educationalists in the Commission and film-industry organisations formed the advocacy coalition and created the BFI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CFF (1940–1950s)</td>
<td>The Rank Organisation established the CFD and</td>
<td>The Advisory Council of the CEF cooperated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The formation of the advocacy coalitions began with initiatives by policy entrepreneurs, whom Weible and Ingold (2018) describe as having the ‘willingness to bear the transaction cost of finding information, building networks and strengthening coalition ties, making agreements and sometimes monitoring and enforcing those agreements’ (p. 65). The entrepreneurs responsible for the educational and cultural film policies explored in this thesis included: (1) the film-industry associations for the BBFC in the pre-war period, (2) the educationalists in the Commission on the Educational and Cultural Films for the BFI in the interwar period, and (3) the Rank Organisation (particularly Arthur Rank and Mary Field) for the CFF in the post-war period. These entrepreneurs led policy discussions by bearing the costs of proposing new film policies (for the BFI) or by establishing new institutions with their own resources (for the BBFC and the CFF).

These entrepreneurs, with motives that were both proactive and reactive, held firm beliefs regarding the necessity of enacting these policies. The BFI and CFF entrepreneurs were motivated to establish innovative organisations without preceding initiatives or external pressures because they believed these institutions were necessary for improving British film culture and education. In contrast, the BBFC entrepreneurs began their initiative in response to the changes caused by the Cinematograph Films Act of 1909 and censorship by local municipalities. The resources that entrepreneurs brought to policymaking were also varied. As entrepreneurs, film organisations and the Rank Organisation were able to create the BBFC and CFF from their own funds. Due to restricted budgets, however, the educationalists behind the BFI could not establish the National
Film Institute without cooperation from the film industry. The involvement of the film industry therefore became materially essential to the creation of experimental organisations.69

Following the policy entrepreneurs’ initiatives, the advocacy coalitions were built by the policy brokers, who mediated agreements between conflicting stakeholders and coalitions to achieve compromise and cooperation. The policy brokers for the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF were (1) the Home Office, the film-industry organisations, and governors of the BBFC; (2) the educationalists in the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films for the BFI; and (3) Rank and Field, as well as the members of the Advisory Council, for the CFF. These actors fostered mutual understanding and initiated the formation of the advocacy coalitions. Although rarely discussed in the literature on public policy, the historical research into British film policy in this thesis amply demonstrates that the roles of entrepreneur and broker occasionally intersected.

The policy brokers’ most common approach to fostering mutual understanding and compromise between stakeholders was to organise conferences and informal meetings. The BBFC and the BFI governors organised consultations with public authorities to promote a more accurate grasp of the objectives and contributions of the BBFC and the BFI. The members of the Advisory Council of the CFD and CEF as well as participants in the BFI Advisory Council and its specialist panels actively exchanged letters with external stakeholders and hosted press shows and conferences to demonstrate the achievements of their children’s film productions. Brokers also used public enquiries and research committees as opportunities to communicate with the public sector and civil society and to demonstrate the legitimacy of their organisations.

69 The BBFC and the BFI were inspired by similar institutions for censorship and national film promotion in other countries (BBFC 1913, The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1929). However, CFF entrepreneurs stressed that the CFF was an innovative organisation, as similar film policies could not be found in other countries (CFF 1960).
After the creation of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF by policy entrepreneurs and brokers, their advocacy coalitions expanded further by involving public authorities as latecomers to the advocacy coalitions, which affirmed and legitimised these institutions. Several years after the BBFC’s founding, its advocacy coalition expanded by tightening cooperation with the Home Office after overcoming the state-censorship movement. The Home Office facilitated dialogue between local municipalities and the BBFC, thereby encouraging local governments to trust and accept the BBFC’s censorship. One of the most influential practices the Home Office conducted was the publication of model conditions for appropriate film censorship. Additionally, the Home Office organised conferences with educationalists and local municipalities to showcase the legitimacy and usefulness of the BBFC’s censorship. For the BFI, the involvement of the public authorities (the Board of Education, the Scottish Office, and the Home Office) on the governing board in 1936 was a critical turning point. These authorities regularly attended meetings and events (such as the children’s film conference) and confirmed public aid for these new initiatives. The children’s film production pioneered by the Rank Organisation and its CFD/CEF dramatically expanded by receiving public finance from the Eady Levy granted by the Board of Trade.

6.2.3 Impacts of the advocacy coalitions for the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF

The BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF could not have been established by a single stakeholder; these institutions required the cooperation of stakeholders and a combination of resources, (i.e., knowledge, funding, and networks). Since their policy goals were essentially multidimensional, they also needed to cooperate closely to effectuate more coherent national censorship, greater support for educational and cultural films, and a wider circulation for children’s films. While these institutions aimed at developing film for educational and cultural purposes, the production,
distribution, and exhibition of these films were commercial matters managed by the film industry. To implement these policies effectively, therefore, cooperation and communication were critical to overcoming the boundary between commerce and culture. Table 6.3 outlines the achievements of such collaborations between stakeholders within the advocacy coalitions. As the listed outcomes demonstrate and detailed discussions in the case studies delineate, these significant achievements— influencing both the film business and film culture more broadly—were achieved through cooperation between the public, business, and civic sector actors.

Table 6.3 The impacts of the advocacy coalitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The BBFC (1910–1920s)</th>
<th>1. Decrease in local municipality censorship and popularisation of the BBFC censorship as a common standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Development of the film-industry organisations and cooperation among them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The BFI (1920–1930s)</th>
<th>3. New ideas and policies proposed in the BFI Advisory Council and its specialist panels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Promotion of children’s films</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CFF (1940–1950s)</th>
<th>5. The growth of children’s film production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The development of audience research and the improvement of children’s films in Britain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.2.4 Reflection on the ACF**

Comparing the three cases from the pre-war, interwar, and post-war periods, the ACF enables one to identify and theorise remarkably similar patterns in the formulation of educational and cultural film policies in Britain. Nevertheless, the ACF’s limitation lies in how it exclusively underscores the roles of the stakeholders within the coalitions. By doing so, the ACF can potentially underestimate two significant factors in policymaking: the stakeholders outside the coalitions and cultural and political trends outside the selected cases. First, the activities and the influences of the external critics excluded from the advocacy coalitions were not fully identified and discussed in
the ACF. In this thesis, I indicate the presence of external critics who challenged the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF and called for radical reforms of those institutions. These external critics included the advocates of state censorship (such as the Home Secretary, Harbert Samuel), a journalist, Walter Ashley, who denounced the BFI as a trade-controlled agency, and a cultural sociologist, J. P. Mayer, who criticised children’s film production initiated by the private sector. This thesis examines these external critics and the rationales of their opposition in order to understand their beliefs regarding educational and cultural film policies (such as the desired roles private business and public authorities should play and the critics’ evaluations of educational and children’s film). After reviewing key archival resources published by various agencies (see Chapter 1), I concluded that the influences and opinions of these external critics were far less impactful than those within the advocacy coalitions. However, it remains possible that the process of selecting relevant archival materials and applying the ACF may have caused me to underestimate or overlook the roles of external stakeholders in educational and cultural film policy.

Second, as the ACF focuses on the groups of stakeholders on specific policies (in case of this thesis, the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF), the ACF could not fully capture the relationship between these policies and other significant policies or cultural/political movements occurring in the same territory. Substantive historiographies on British cinema have illustrated the emergence of significant film-culture movements in Britain from the 1910s to the 1950s, such as the film society movement (e.g., Sexton 2002) and the emergence of middlebrow cinema (e.g., Napper 2009). These movements influenced general beliefs on the educational and cultural values of film, defined by Harper and Porter (2003) as ‘a shift in the nation’s cultural mood and tastes’ (p. 1). Moreover, the British government implemented impactful legislation and policies outside the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, such as the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 (Street and Dickinson
the documentary film movement (Anthony 2011), and the Empire Marketing Board (Grieveson and MacCabe 2011; Rice 2011; Windel 2011). The archival materials I examined did not document how the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF were influenced or intertwined with these policies, and the creation of the BBFC, the BFI and the CFF can be fully analysed through the selected materials. However, to enrich understanding, it would be beneficial to explore the relationship between these institutions and the other film policies and movements.

Moreover, while the ACF helps me to effectively illustrate the advocates’ coalitions and collaborations, it could not fully capture potential conflicts between the coalition members. In the ACF, the dissolution of the coalitions is related to the policy changes. Therefore, the tensions between the stakeholders in sustaining advocacy coalitions are not fully discussed in this framework. It is because this thesis focuses on the early histories of the BBFC, the BFI and the CFF and the processes through which they were formed by advocacy coalitions. However, research into the later histories of these institutions may capture the frictions within them that cannot be fully illustrated by the ACF and prompt a revision of the analytical framework.

Despite such limitations, the analytical framework and research methodology in this thesis enabled a broadening of understanding of the making of film policy in several ways. The ACF enables one to map diverse stakeholders in the state, market, and civil society while investigating their roles and interactions in forming educational and cultural film policies. Prior research tended to focus on institutional insiders or civic/public actors. The ACF framework, however, allows exploration of the influences of other stakeholders, such as the commercial film business, and the influential individuals mediating these stakeholders, such as the members of the CFD/CEF Advisory Council.
6.3 Emerging Themes in the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF Historiography

6.3.1 Equal and balanced representation of the stakeholders

The historical research on the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF in this thesis elucidates how the balanced involvement and equal representation of stakeholders was crucial to the state-market-civic partnership regarding educational and cultural film policy in Britain. One of the most evident examples was that the governing board of the BFI contained three representatives from the film industry, three from the educationalists, and three from the public sphere (later to include representatives from the civil service). This equality satisfied the commercial, public, and civic actors and succeeded in resolving their concerns that the BFI might fall under the control of any one of these groups. The CFF also included representatives from the film industry associations in its governing board, while politicians and educationalists were included as members of the CFD/CEF Advisory Council. Including representatives from the film-industry associations resulted in the CFF being conceptualised as a semi-public foundation representing not only the interests of the Rank Organisation but also those of the diverse backers in the industry. The governing board of the BBFC did not include these representatives because the board was minimal and worked towards being autonomous rather than inclusive. Rather, the BBFC appointed presidents with experience in politics and education to distance itself from the market and balance the film industry and other sectors.

In addition to balancing the stakeholders from the state, market and civil society, the balancing of the stakeholders within the film industry was also crucial in building their consensual involvement and support. The BFI balanced the production, distribution, and exhibition sectors of the industry by appointing their organisations to the BFI governing board equally. Similarly, the CEF and CFF included the representatives from the film industry organisations and dominant
cinema chains in the governing board and the Advisory Council to balance the interests of these major cinema chains. However, cooperation between the film policymakers and the film industry was occasionally challenged when different sectors raised concerns regarding inequalities among them. For instance, when the BBFC was created, the CEA (representing the exhibition sector) feared that the KRS and KMA had more influence on the BBFC and that they could consequently harm the exhibitors. Such concerns had to be overcome before the CEA could accept BBFC censorship.

Such balanced representation was possible because the British film industry was highly organised. The industry institutionalised key associations representing disparate sections of the industry, and these organisations closely communicated via trade journals and regular meetings. As this thesis’ case studies of the 1910s, the 1930s, and the 1950s reveal, the film industry organisations efficiently responded to the changing industrial structure and established new organisations. For instance, when the film industry was further complicated by the emergence of independent film producers and labour unions in the post-war period, associations representing these sub-sectors (such as the Federation of Film Unions and the Association of Independent Cinemas) were created. Moreover, the CFF communicated with these organisations and involved them in the CFF’s film productions (see Appendix 5.7).

Significantly, following the establishment of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, the policymakers and stakeholders concluded that balancing the diverse stakeholders was not only necessary but also desirable. The shifting evaluation on the BBFC exemplifies how the balanced involvement of the stakeholders came to be judged as an ideal approach. As Chapter 3 outlines, the BBFC was institutionalised as an organisation independent of the leadership of the state and beyond the influence of commercial interests. That status was initially evaluated as compromising
and was exposed to criticism. Opponents of the BBFC began a campaign in 1916 to substitute the BBFC with state censorship, as they believed censorship should be managed by public authorities rather than the BBFC, which had originally been proposed by the film industry. The Home Office, however, could not institutionalise state censorship due to a lack of support from the film-industry organisations and its inability to legislate new laws for developing a state-censorship board. The BBFC was therefore evidently not an outcome of the dominant influence of specific stakeholders but rather a result of compromise between disparate stakeholders.

However, in the public investigations from the interwar period, the compromise between stakeholders that so characterised the BBFC came to be, interestingly, evaluated as a desirable trait. In the 1930s, the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films appropriately described the BBFC as combining ‘the minimum of direct official interference with the maximum of voluntary effort’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 33). The Commission also appreciated that such a system was ‘a typically British growth, a mixture of irrelevance, compromise, and common sense’ (Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 40). Later, in the 1950s, the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema reached a similar evaluation of the BBFC’s status. Describing the balancing act of the BBFC as ‘ingenious balance of responsibility’ between the stakeholders, the report evaluated that the current format was more desirable than state censorship:

A Board which was differently constituted (e.g., a Board appointed jointly by the government and licensing authorities and including representatives of social welfare organisations) might be expected to eliminate much of the vulgarity, violence and immorality.

…

We are not, however, in favour of any system of censorship which might, like a censorship by an officially appointed Board, be subject to political influence…we appreciate that the present machinery has been in operation for many years and is acceptable to the industry,
whose interests obviously cannot be disregarded (Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950, pp. 57–62).

In these quotations, the BBFC was conceptualised as a model based on compromises and balances between pertinent backers and state leadership, and it was appreciated as a more appropriate approach than others. The development of the BFI and the CFF was also characterised by what was termed ‘a typically British growth’ involving relevant organisations from the state, market, and civil society and the compromises among them. The extant literature on British cultural policy (e.g., Ridley 1987; Upchurch 2016) tends to focus on autonomy from public authorities (arm’s length principle) in cultural policy and emphasise relations between the public authorities and cultural sectors. My thesis further substantiates understandings of the ‘British’ model of cultural policy by exploring the autonomy of and balancing among state, market, and civic stakeholders. The autonomy of the institutions implementing cultural policy was realised through the support from and involvement of private business and civil-society associations, and the state-market-civic triangular collaboration both conditioned and developed the cultural policy in Britain.

Balancing the interests and influence of the stakeholders was critical because these stakeholders tended to support organisations that were autonomous and independent of the control of any other stakeholder. The efficient cooperation identified in the BBFC and the BFI demonstrates the importance of such balance and autonomy. Support from the Home Office and the film-industry organisations was crucial to the development of the BBFC because these stakeholders promoted the BBFC as a national standard and negotiated with local municipalities to abolish regional censorship. To attract support from the municipalities, the Home Office and film-industry organisations needed to confirm that the BBFC was independent of both state control and commercial domination. The municipalities’ support for the BBFC began only after the Home
Office abandoned the state-censorship proposal (Home Office 1917), and the film industry confirmed that the BBFC was entirely independent of private business (National Council of Public Morals 1917). The Home Office and film industry both appreciated and stressed that BBFC censorship was independent and determined by internal governors. Similarly, the BFI was formed through the cooperation of educationalists and the film industry, and it had to be confirmed and emphasised that the BFI was independent of both to ensure their collaboration. The process of coalition-building discussed in Chapter 4 demonstrates that the trade-educationalist cooperation was an outcome of their discussions and mutual understandings concerning the status of the new institute. As the collaboration of multiple stakeholders in these organisations demonstrates, balancing interests and influences was not only practical but also pivotal in implementing educational and cultural film policies involving diverse stakeholders.

6.3.2 Changing beliefs on children and the cinema

From the 1910s to the 1950s, the views on children and the cinema significantly transformed among the stakeholders discussing educational and cultural film policies. This thesis successfully reveals the shift in the views on children and film in different periods using historical resources that are ideal for exploring these issues. Such materials include reports of inquiries held by semi-public committees, such as the Cinema Commission of Inquiry in the National Council of Public Morals (1917), the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films (1932), the Conference on Films for Children (1936), and the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema (1950). In these inquiries, the views of various witnesses and commentators were documented and reflected in the discussions and recommendations of the reports. These publications therefore exhibited the common views on children and film when they were published.
The initial shift identified between the BBFC in the 1910s and the BFI in the 1930s was from restriction to encouragement. When the BBFC introduced the categories of censored film—the U category (universally accessible, including children) and the A category (adult only)—the Board aimed to classify films that could negatively impact children and inhibit children from watching them. In other words, the films the BBFC classified as U were merely those permitted for children rather than those recommended for them. Similarly, in the 1910s, there were few comments revealing ideas and beliefs that films should be recommended for children or that children could be positively influenced by the exhibited films. For instance, the comments from the witnesses in the Cinema Commission of Inquiry by the National Council of Public Morals rarely referred to the educational and cultural value of film for children. Rather, the comments included several concerns regarding the negative impacts of film. The Headmaster of Eton, for example, remarked that ‘the influence on adults is not good, but on children it is positively bad’ (The National Council of Public Morals 1917, p. liii). The Executive of the National Union of Teachers also declared: ‘I do not think that there is any educational value in the film worth mentioning at present’ (p. lv).

Later, in the 1920s and the 1930s, when the BFI was proposed and established by the trade-educationalist coalition, the agenda for children’s films shifted from ‘how to identify bad films for children’ to ‘how to produce and promote good films for children’. In 1932, the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films pointed out that the educationalists had not seriously considered the potential of film for educational purposes but had only spotlighted its negative influences, commenting that teachers ‘who thought about film (with a few notable exceptions) were concerned almost exclusively with attempts to restrict the attendance of children at public cinemas’
(Commission on Educational and Cultural Films 1932, p. 59).\textsuperscript{70} The Commission members, however, concluded they should discuss the promotion rather than the restriction of film for children and proposed that a national film institute (later the BFI) be created to promote film for educational and cultural purposes. The Home Office also proposed the shift from restriction to promotion as a recommended policy for children’s films in the interwar period. In its report on its conference on Films for Children (1936), the Home Office commented that censorship could exclude only undesirable or unsuitable content for children. Nonetheless, the Home Office did not intend by that statement to suggest that the remaining films classified as U were recommendable for children. Instead, the Home Office suggested that the cooperation between the educationalists and the film industry should be accelerated to supply more suitable films for children (BFI 1936b). These statements reflect the beliefs of the Home Office and the Commission that special films for children should be promoted, and the BBFC was unsatisfactory for that purpose because the exclusion of undesirable films for children did not necessarily improve the quality of the films.

In the post-war period, when children’s film production was expanded by the Rank Organisation and the CFF, it had become a commonplace that cinemagoing for children was a significant cultural activity and film’s educational value was substantive. The Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema (1950), for example, noted that children’s cinema ‘has almost unrivalled power to enrich and delight the mind, and can be a great cultural medium as well as a source of fun and entertainment’ (p. 8). The keyword in this statement was ‘entertainment’, as the Committee’s participants reiterated that the recommended children’s films were not only instructive and educational but also entertaining and attractive. Based on such standards, the Committee examined the impact of film on children and concluded that the

\textsuperscript{70} Kuhn (2002) illustrates how concerns about children’s filmgoing was expressed at that time.
production of special films for children by the CEF in the Rank Organisation should be expanded and supported by public aid. Agreeing with the Committee’s view, the CFF, the CEF, and its Advisory Council reiterated that children’s films should be entertaining for children and that the foundation should produce what children wanted to see. The CFF’s belief that children’s film should be entertaining and approach to encourage the children’s participation in cultural film programs by producing entertaining films seems to resonate with the idea of democratisation of culture (broadening public access to cultural activities) as well as that of cultural democracy (appreciating free individual choices on what they prefer and enjoy) (Evrard 1997; McGuigan 2004).

At the same time, however, entertainment was not the only principle the CFF aimed to pursue. The Foundation aimed to combine both the educational and entertaining elements of film, as the following production policy statement describes:

> While it has been repeatedly stated that the Foundation’s first duty is to entertain its audience, it does not follow that the films made are only of the sort which the children say they like the best. With growing confidence that there is a knowledge and understanding of the audience, it is becoming possible to break away more and more decisively from “cops and robbers” and “chase stories”.  

> …

> Since one of the objects must always be to maintain and improve the attendances at children’s performances, the production programme concentrates on popular appeal; it

---

71 Resonating with that, the BFI in the interwar period also attempted to approach classroom films to make them more attractive. The BFI Governors expected that a partnership between commercial and educational interests could ‘have a humanising effect on education’ (BFI 1934). To achieve this goal, the BFI encouraged the involvement of private business in producing classroom or lecture films for educational purposes. To attract the production companies, the BFI was expected to realise ‘the building up of the new market’ (The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, January 5, p.3). It is estimated that ‘every reputable film producer was anxious to make educational films and good films for entertainment, if he could be assured of a market for them’ (The Kinematograph Weekly 1933, March 23, p.4). However, the commitment of the private business with the classroom film was not activated then because its market was not attractive and the BFI’s promotion was suspended during the Second World War.

72 Here, the CFF problematises that the film production before the Foundation was based on simple and reiterated plots such as good polices chasing bad criminals without complicated dramas. The Foundation argued that such simple story and scenario came from the underestimations of children’s tastes and capacities to understand complicated stories (Field 1952, CFF 1969). The CFF challenged such preceding stereotypes of children audiences by actively implementing audience research and making films with more entertaining stories.
The Foundation’s confidence in delivering entertaining films was based on audience research conducted by the CEF and the Advisory Council (Chapter 5). Detailed analysis of this audience research prompted the production of more varied and complex stories for children. Moreover, the foundation’s belief that children’s film should be both entertaining and educational derived from its confidence that children can distinguish between good and bad films. Moreover, based on audience research and communication with children attending the children’s film programmes, it was determined that children can choose tasteful films with moral messages (CFF 1960; Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema 1950). As discussed in ACF literature and scholarship on the roles of ideas in cultural policy, these shared beliefs facilitate the cooperation of stakeholders by effectively highlighting the importance of film and film policy and reinforced the advocacy coalitions including varied stakeholders (e.g., Fischer and Gottweis 2012; Weible and Moore 2010).

The examined archival materials also indicate how these changing views both emerged and were broadly accepted due to the achievements of experimental film productions. When the committee reports commented that film should be promoted for children (in the 1930s) or that children’s films should be entertaining (in the 1950s), they justified their views by referring to several examples of successful film productions. The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films, for example, chose several films as evidence that film can contain educational and cultural values.73 The Committee on Children and the Cinema also referred to the quality of the CEF film

---

73 For instance, the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films (1932) introduces desirable children’s films produced until the 1930s, such as US film *The Silent Enemy* (1930) shown by British Instructional Films Limited as ‘films of the right kind’ (p. 74) and the Commission claimed that similarly attractive films could and should be produced in British countryside.
programmes and the increase in children’s cinema clubs and child audiences in the 1940s as evidence to support its view that children’s films should be entertaining.

6.3.3 Reconceptualising the roles of private business

One of the intentions of this thesis is to explore the roles of private business in shaping educational and cultural film policies. Prior research tended to neglect the presence of commercial businesses or to negatively describe the film industry as an opponent of educational and cultural film policies. One of the earliest researchers to present such a view was Low (1979), who stated:

[T]he trade bodies in this country saw no need for self-improvement. Instead, they managed to confine the Institute to a sort of education half-world, where it was tolerated with everything from vague good will through indifference to contempt as long as it did nothing to interfere with the commercial film (Low 1979, p. 198).

Subsequent scholarship has shared the same view of the BFI and the film industry and largely concluded that the film industry caused the BFI’s constraints in the interwar period (Dupin, 2006). However, the historical research on the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF in this thesis reveals that the commitments of the film industry to these institutions were more nuanced and largely constructive.

Overall, the film industry offered two categories of support for the institutions: (1) direct support, such as through funding; (2) indirect support to render the activities of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF more efficient and impactful. The BBFC was created and developed by film-industry organisations (the KMA, the KRS, and the CEA). These organisations supported the BBFC by installing its censorship as a common standard and making its decisions more universal. The organisations also conferred with public authorities and the educationalists to explain the BBFC’s merits and its autonomy from commercial interests. The BFI involved the industry organisations by including the CEA, the KRS, and the Film Group of the Federation of British Industries as
equal representatives. These industry organisations were also involved in the specialist panels in the BFI’s Advisory Council to discuss, evaluate, and plan the BFI’s policies aimed at the improvement of entertainment and educational film. Additionally, the owners of major film companies appeared as opinion leaders in both national newspapers and trade journals. People such as Simon Rowson of Ideal Film Company, Oscar Deutsch of the ODEON cinema chain, and H. Bruce-Woolfe, the managing director of British Instructional Films, helped to navigate the negotiations between the business circles and the educationalists regarding the shaping of the advocacy coalition.\footnote{One of the most significant contributions the film industry made for the BFI was the support for creating the national film library. In the making of the BFI national film library created in 1935, the trade sector provided with skills and knowledge about how to permanently store the domestic films. In preparing for a new plan about the national film library, the BFI governors asked for technical advice from the British Kinematograph Society, a private organisation specialising in the professional skills needed for filmmaking. The Society accepted its invitation and set up a Special Committee to publish a report entitled \textit{The Report of Social Committee set up by the Kinematograph Society to consider means that should be adopted to preserve Cinematograph Films for an indefinite period} (1935). The report explains that the contribution made by the British Kinematograph Society was based on the belief that new library ‘will prove helpful not to the British Film Institute in carrying out the particular task of setting up a film repository, but to all who are concerned with films both on the commercial and on the cultural side’ (BFI 1934, p.5)}

The connection between the CFF (and its precedents, the CFD/CEF) and the film industry was also substantial. The CFF originated from an experimental initiative by a commercial film company, the Rank Organisation. Under this initiative, films were produced by contracting commercial film directors, and the CFF’s films were shown in the ABC, the Gaumont, and the ODEON cinema chains. In its Advisory Council, the CEF also involved representatives from the film industry, including the GBI Children’s Film Department, the Gaumont-British Junior Clubs, and the Odeon National Cinema Club. Furthermore, when the Rank Organisation relinquished the CEF and its film production, the CFF was then created as a public organisation to inherit the mandate of the CEF and to continue supplying special films for children. In doing so, the CFF’s governing board was established to include the major industry organisations, such as the British
Film Producers Association, the CEA, the KRS, and the Association of Specialised Film Producers.\textsuperscript{75}

The industry organisations became more important and influential from the 1910s to the 1950s. The growth of their influence was reflected in how the film industry organisations were involved with semi-public inquiries regarding educational and cultural films. In the 1910s, the film-industry organisations initially had no connections with public or civic actors. Thus, they needed to establish the Cinema Commission of Inquiry by contacting the National Council of Public Morals and had to ask relevant public and civic authorities to cooperate. Later, when the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films was established in 1932, no industry organisations were offered membership. While the film-industry organisations tended to be neglected in these commissions throughout the 1920s, industry representatives became influential in the 1930s. In the BFI’s conferences (e.g., Children’s Cinema Conference in 1936) and regular meetings of the BFI Advisory Council and specialist panels, the film industry organisations were invited as key members. More explicitly, when the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema was established by the Home Office in 1944, the film industry organisations were invited as key consultants to discuss the current position of children’s cinema and its potentials. These shifts evidently indicate that the film industry organisations were becoming more important actors for

\textsuperscript{75} The film industry representatives in the CFF governing board included: Vice-Chairman of the Association of Specialised Film Producers, Chairman and managing director of Ealing, President of British Film Producers Association, Past President of Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association and cinema exhibitor, Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Association, Vice Chairman of R.A.F. Cinema Corporation and a member of Royal Naval Film Corporation, Past Assistant Secretary of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, Film Producer in Wallace Production and Associated British Pathe, Cinema Exhibitor, Army Kinema corporation, and Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Managing Director of the A.B.C. Television Ltd. Film producer associated with British-Pathe Ltd., Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, The Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Kinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, Past Deputy Chairman of British Lion Film Corporation Ltd. and President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society, Past Secretary of the Association of Specialised Film Producers.
their counterparts in the civic and public sectors regarding the discussion of educational and cultural films. For the policymakers and governors of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, whose central offices were in London, communicating with local cinema businesses across the rest of the country proved immensely difficult. In facilitating consensus among their local branches, therefore, the industrial organisations were crucial in building advocacy coalitions based on the national consensus of the film industry. Therefore, a key factor in forming a successful advocacy coalition was the existence of a highly organised film industry and the development of this structure has its origins in the coalition-making for the BBFC and the negotiations with public and civic stakeholders in the 1910s.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the findings of previous chapters and the themes that emerged from the historical research on the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Applying the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), this chapter explored several elements: who constituted the advocacy coalitions as stakeholders in the public, business, and civic sectors; how the advocacy coalitions for the three institutions were initiated, established, and expanded; what impacts these advocacy coalitions effected through state-market-civic collaborations; and the implications and limitations of the ACF as an analytical framework. The ACF enabled us to identify reiterating patterns of advocacy coalition-making and explore the dynamics between various stakeholders, including public authorities, the film industry, and educationalists. The BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF could not have implemented effective action without the support of numerous state, market, and civil participants. The educationalists and the film industry offered their professional skills and knowledge, resources to design educational and cultural films, and organised campaigns (such as
film exhibitions in cinemas, classrooms, and conferences) to promote and disseminate educational films. The public authorities' involvement and funding were also pivotal for developing and legitimising the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Intertwining these webs of support from diverse stakeholders resulted in the growth of new initiatives regarding educational and cultural film policy in Britain. However, the ACF is not flawless, as it primarily focuses on the dynamics of the stakeholders influencing the coalition-building effort. Policies and stakeholders outside these advocacy coalitions are therefore rarely addressed in this thesis. Additionally, potential tensions within policy coalitions cannot be fully explained by existing analytical frameworks of ACF.

Drawing on the comparative historical research on the three case studies, this chapter also identified several emerging themes characterising efficient state-market-civic partnerships in relation to the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. First, this alliance was constructed and facilitated by the balanced representation of public, business and civic stakeholders, as well as the equal involvement of the film industry’s sub-sectors. Critics occasionally denounced the involvement of such diverse interests as compromising and called for leadership by state authorities (e.g., Ashley (1937) and the Home Office (1917)). However, these institutions, which were characterised by balanced representation and the absence of dominant stakeholders, brought about the active commitment of various organisations. The affirmative views on the BBFC by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films and the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema reflect the shared understanding that the balanced and inclusive involvement of the state, the market, and civil society contributes to efficient institutional arrangements.

Second, from the 1910s to the 1950s, common beliefs regarding children and the cinema transformed and came to be shared by the diverse stakeholders forming advocacy coalitions. The supporters of film censorship in the 1910s shared the belief that children's access to film should be
regulated and film policy should aim to exclude inappropriate films through censorship and regulation. In contrast, the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films argued in the 1930s that such a restrictive policy was inadequate. The commission stated film policy should promote recommended films with educational and cultural values rather than regulate undesirable ones, resulting in the proposal and creation of the BFI. The BFI targeted children's films as one of the most significant subjects to promote. Hence, the Institute hosted conferences and meetings to facilitate dialogue and cooperation between the film industry and educationalists. The CFD, the CEF, and the CFF in post-war Britain formulated the concept of children's film further. These Foundations' success was based on their belief that special films for children should not be exclusively defined by the tastes of adults. Instead, children's films should be entertaining and represent what children would pay to watch. Such a new concept of children's films brought about the growth of the production and exhibition of special films for children.

Finally, this thesis' historical research elucidates private businesses' contributions to devising and developing educational and cultural film policies in Britain. Despite the common conceptualisation of the film industry as indifferent or hostile to promoting the educational and cultural aspects of film, this thesis identifies considerable support from film-industry organisations in this regard. Such commitments from business included direct funding for the BFI and the CFF, cooperation and consultancy with the BBFC and the BFI, and advice on public inquiries to investigate the conditions of the film industry and film culture. Consequently, as they were invited to public inquiries and new institutions as regular members, industry organisations became increasingly influential in the governance of educational and cultural film policies. Indeed, the influence and commitment of film organisations became pivotal to discussing, institutionalising, and expanding the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF.
In conclusion, this thesis has explored how educational and cultural film policies were formed by a state-market-civic partnership in Britain. By doing so, it widens the understanding of British cultural policy, which has been frequently characterised by the arm’s length principle and a non-interventionist approach (Ridley 1987; Upchurch 2004, 2016). The government’s non-interventionist approach was common in film policies from the 1910s to the 1950s. However, the private-sector advocates for new policies succeeded in involving public authorities as advocacy coalition members by efficient and close communication and by demonstrating the achievements and importance of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. As discussed in previous chapters, the involvement of the government made the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF more effective and legitimate organisations. Moreover, it has been discovered that the arm’s length model—which has been described as a British model —was effectuated by the shared understandings, compromise and cooperation of state, market and civic stakeholders. The autonomy of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF was also underpinned by the collaboration of these stakeholders. This thesis demonstrates that private business played a pivotal role in sustaining the autonomy of the three institutions and realising effective partnership in the state-market-civic triangle. Drawing on historical case studies and the ACF, this thesis makes an original contribution to the cultural policy scholarship. This is accomplished by elucidating how the British model of cultural policy has been underpinned and formulated by state-market-civic partnerships that overcome dichotomic understandings of the state versus the market or the economy versus culture.

76 See also Vestheim (2009) and Lee (2022)
Chapter 7

Conclusion

This thesis explores the history of state-market-civic partnerships in British film policy (particularly the BBFC in the pre-war period, the BFI in the interwar period, and the CFF in the post-war period). Britain in the first half of the twentieth century witnessed the rapid growth of the commercial film business and the emergence of a diverse film culture. Responding to the increasing economic, educational, and cultural importance of film, new public policies became necessary to regulate, intervene in, and support film culture and business. This thesis focuses on film policy for educational and cultural purposes (educational and cultural film policy) and investigates the cooperation between public authorities, the film industry, and educationalists in establishing and developing three key organisations: the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. It examines how the stakeholders in the public, business, and civic sectors collaborated in forming these organisations and the impacts their advocacy coalition brought about. The three case studies in the thesis closely trace the process of how these stakeholders raised new policy ideas to develop film for educational and cultural purposes. It also investigates how participants overcame their diverse beliefs and interests to form advocacy coalitions to establish, sustain, and develop new institutions. Moreover, this thesis discusses several cross-cutting themes that emerged from the case studies: the British model of film policy characterised by the equal and balanced involvement of state-market-civic stakeholders, the transfer of shared beliefs concerning children and the cinema, and the pivotal commitments of private business in supporting educational and cultural film policies.
7.1 Summary of Findings

This thesis is built on comparative historical research on diverse historical materials collected in digital databases and National Archives in Britain. The archival resources include internal papers of the BFI and the CFF stored in the BFI Special Collection in Berkhamsted and the University of Warwick Modern Records Centres. The resources are also comprised of various publications, including the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF’s annual reports and publications, national newspapers, trade journals, educational journals, and film magazines. By employing these resources, I demonstrate that the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF were fruitful outcomes of the cooperation between public authorities, film industry-organisations, and educationalists interested in film.

The BBFC was established by film-industry organisations in 1912 in response to local municipalities’ censorship. These film-industry organisations were established in the 1910s to represent the interests of the production, distribution, and exhibition sectors of the industry and cooperated to collectively establish the BBFC. The BBFC appointed its own staff and censors and conducted censorship independent of both commercial interests and the public authorities’ control. However, in 1916, the Home Secretary and educationalists problematised the BBFC’s censorship and proposed that national censorship replace the BBFC. This oppositional movement ceased in 1917 due to counteractions by the film-industry organisations. The Home Office, as a member of an advocacy coalition, then decided to solve the limitations of the BBFC by facilitating cooperation between local municipalities and the BBFC. The Home Office aimed to integrate the BBFC’s censorship with local censorship and establish national censorship based on the BBFC. To make the BBFC more influential, the film-industry organisations actively negotiated with the local municipalities and educationalists, and the industry associations collectively accepted BBFC censorship as a coherent national standard. The educationalists also became supportive and grew
to appreciate the activities of the BBFC, as its censorship had become more influential through the support of the film-industry organisations and the Home Office while sustaining its independence. The BBFC’s advocacy coalition resulted in the growth of the BBFC and prompted the broad acceptance of its censorship effectively replacing local censorship. Additionally, the formation of the BBFC was a significant trigger for the film-industry organisations to cooperate in protecting their interests from the public authorities’ interventions and the public educationalists’ demands for stricter controls on cinema.

The BFI was established by an advocacy coalition involving both the educationalists and the film industry. The proposal for a national film institute originated from a group of educationalists in the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films. These educationalists communicated with the film industry to overcome their indifference and anxieties regarding the roles of the film institute. The educationalist-industry coalition established the BFI in 1933 after agreeing that the film institute would be autonomous and balance the interests of the educational and commercial sectors. The BFI governing board equally represented the film industry, educationalists, and the general public (later, public authorities) to balance their interests, and the BFI further involved representatives of public authorities on its governing board in 1936. The BFI involved diverse stakeholders and acquired their support through including them on specialist panels of the BFI Advisory Council, such as the Entertainment Panel and the Education Panel. Both the BFI and its Advisory Council offered a platform in which representatives from the public authorities, the film industry, and educational and religious workers discussed new policy ideas. These actors also implemented various policies, such as a conference on children’s film in 1936. The conference invited participants such as the Home Office, the film-industry organisations,
and local educational committees to discuss the educational and cultural importance of children’s film and how to promote it.

The CFF originated from the Rank Organisation’s initiative as a policy entrepreneur to produce special films for children in the CFD and the CEF. This thesis identifies and traces the significant roles the Advisory Council of the CFD and CEF played in mediating between the CFD/CEF and the external stakeholders. The members of the CFD/CEF Advisory Council as policy brokers facilitated communication with educational and social workers, who admitted the educational and cultural importance of children’s film. The CFD and CEF also closely communicated with public authorities and the film industry to facilitate appreciation and support for the achievements of the CFD/CEF. Following the initial success of the CEF’s film production and the withdrawal of the Rank Organisation from financing children’s film production, the CFF was formed as a semi-public organisation funded by public aid from the British Film Production Fund (Eady Levy). The CFF broadly involved the film-industry organisations in its governing board and closely cooperated with both educationalists and businesspeople in the industry, resulting in the growth of children’s film production and the popularity of CFF films in post-war Britain. Moreover, state-market-civic cooperation also brought about the development of audience-research methodologies to empirically study children’s tastes and reflect them in film production. The audience research in the CFD/CEF/CFF shaped and evidenced a shared belief that children’s film should be not only educational but also entertaining because children have established tastes to distinguish such films and choose them.
7.2 Contribution to Knowledge

This thesis has fulfilled the goal of the original research project in investigating how public, business, and civic stakeholders committed to educational and cultural film policy in Britain and detailing how they communicated and cooperated. After reviewing the preceding literature, I argue that film policy scholarship tended to rely on a dichotomous conceptualisation of commerce vs. culture and categorised stakeholders and film policies as commercial or cultural. There is a relative lack of empirical research on the interactions of stakeholders and film policies that can overcome these divisions. My doctoral thesis introduces new perspectives into the research on British film policy by investigating stakeholders getting involved with both commercial and cultural aspects and by enriching the historiographies concerning the selected case studies of educational and cultural film policies.

More importantly, drawing on historical findings from British film policy, this thesis contributes to substantiating and broadening understandings of the ‘British’ model of cultural policy. Prior research has tended to highlight the arm’s length principle and the non-interventionalist approach as central to traditional cultural policy in Britain and criticised the emergence of initiatives and influences of the private sector from the perspective of privatisation, marketisation and neoliberalisation. However, this thesis demonstrates that the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF were underpinned by the balanced and equal representation of stakeholders from the state, market, and civil society. Moreover, their constructive partnership brought about the autonomy of these organisations from both state control and the commercial market. The state-market-civic partnerships in these institutions were also conditioned and reinforced by the shared beliefs of the stakeholders regarding the educational value of film and the importance of children’s cinema, beliefs which transformed from the 1910s to the 1950s. In demonstrating effective
partnerships and the growth of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, this thesis reveals that private business offered diverse and crucial supports in enhancing cooperating with the public and civic sector actors and institutionalising these organisations. The well-structured industry organisations that emerged and developed in response to the BBFC in the 1910s were continuously critical to augmenting cooperation between the state, the market and civil society, as well as among the sub-sectors of the industry. Last but not least, my research also discovered that the implicit but notably effective roles played by the government in institutionalising those three organisations (especially the roles of the Home Office in developing the BBFC). This finding challenges the dominant belief among cultural policy researchers in the UK that the British state’s intervention into cultural affairs have been characterised with hesitation and reluctance.

Regarding the analytical framework, this thesis is the first academic work to apply the ACF in relation to both British film policy and cultural policy more generally. The analytical toolkits offered by the ACF, including the ideas of policy entrepreneurs, policy brokers, and coalitions, contribute to systematically mapping relevant stakeholders and their interactions in creating the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. Applying the ACF, this thesis theorises a model of state-market-civic partnerships and a process of policymaking. Ambitious policy entrepreneurs in the film industry or educational sector initiated policy discussions and proposed the creation of new agencies or research projects to be funded from internal resources. The proposal of these new entities was further underpinned by the policy brokers, who mediated conflicts and concerns between stakeholders who had been sceptical, disinterested, or hostile to new initiatives. The successful brokerage brought about advocacy coalitions involving multiple actors. In this process, the committees of public enquiries offered important platforms in which actors expressed their views and reached consensus regarding the conditions of British film and the need for new film
policies. The BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF could not, however, complete their own goals and implement effective action without the support of numerous state, market, and civil participants. The educationalists and film industry organisations offered their own professional skills and knowledge, resources to examine and design educational and cultural films, and infrastructure to promote and disseminate educational films. The public authorities’ involvement and funding were pivotal for creating and legitimatising the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. As historical research in this thesis identifies, the intertwining of these webs of support from diverse stakeholders resulted in the growth of new initiatives regarding educational and cultural film policy in Britain.

As a research project on the history of educational and cultural film policies in Britain, this thesis also provides original contributions to the research on the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF. This is accomplished by revealing previously overlooked stakeholders and their relations with the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF, which can by fully captured by the study of state-market-civic interactions and advocacy coalitions. First, this thesis uncovers how the censorship policy and discussion caused the development and cooperation of the film-industry organisations representing production, distribution, and exhibition. These organisations realised the importance of collective political action to both protect the BBFC and in negotiating with civic and public authorities. This realisation resulted in the unity of the trade organisations and prompted their emergence as stakeholders that have remained important to initiating policymaking until the present. These film-industry organisations opposed the state-censorship campaign and, later, actively cooperated with the Home Office to make the BBFC censorship more impactful and legitimate. Second, this thesis closely investigates the cooperation between the film industry and educationalists in forming the BFI by delineating how they overcame their initial tensions and reached consensus. This thesis also details what their cooperation brought about through the initiatives of the BFI governing board
and the BFI Advisory Council (particularly the Entertainment Panel and the Education Panel). The study of the BFI’s advocacy coalition demonstrates that the film industry was pivotal in creating the BFI, and the relationship between the film industry and the other stakeholders was more constructive than the existing literature thinks it to be. Third, this thesis identifies the role of the CFD/CEF Advisory Council in mediating between diverse stakeholders and enhancing their cooperation regarding children’s film production. To analyse the activities of the CFD/CEF Advisory Council, this thesis employs new archival records from the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre and the BFI Special Collection for the first time in relation to academic research on the CFF, and offers catalogues of these archival sources.

7.3 Further Research Areas

This doctoral thesis focused on specific periods when selected film-policy organisations were established from the 1910s to the 1950s. There are, however, relevant themes and subjects for future research that can further develop the original scholarly investigation I have begun with this thesis. First, this thesis focused on the early history of the BBFC, the BFI, and the CFF by featuring how these institutions were created. However, the dissolution of or severe shocks to advocacy coalitions have been under-researched in both this thesis and relevant scholarship. As film policy scholars have pointed out, the 1980s witnessed radical reforms of British film policy under the pressure of neoliberal and marketising forces, including the shrinkage of the children's film foundation and its budgets. The rationale of public aid for educational and cultural activities (with non-commercial returns) was severely attacked in such a political climate. Therefore, to explore how these institutions and their advocacy coalitions were challenged, transformed, or sustained
during such external pressures and political upheavals will broaden understandings of the resilience and influences of film policymaking coalitions.

Second, applying the ACF to examine state-market-civic interactions is a fruitful approach to investigating film policy in disparate periods and regions. This thesis demonstrates that the ‘British’ style of cultural policy was underpinned by the interplay of state-market-civic stakeholders and implicit but effective intervention by the government. It calls for more nuance is required to conceptualise the ‘British' national model of cultural policy. Therefore, the same approach may be promising in revising and articulating diverse models of national film policy (e.g., the statist model of French film policy and the market-oriented model of US film policy). Moreover, it may also be promising to compare and theorise state-market-civic relations regarding cultural policies from a comparative perspective and to discuss the dynamics on different institutional formats of supporting cultural activities. More specifically, a variety of media policies in Britain, such as the institutional development of the BBC Radio and Television, may represent significant research agendas to be further developed by applying this thesis’ analytical frameworks, as these policies involve public, business, and civic actors with diverse beliefs and interests.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 3.1: The table of key events in the history of the BBFC in the 1910s and 1920s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>The KMA was established as an industry organisation representing the producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 January</td>
<td>The Cinematograph Act 1909 came into force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>The CEA was established as an industry organisation representing the exhibitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 February</td>
<td>Three trade organisations (the CEA, the association of renters, and the KMA) sent a deputation to the Home Office proposing the creation of the BBFC (Low 1949, p. 87). (HO 45/10551/163175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 November</td>
<td>Reginald McKenna, the Home Secretary (Liberal Government) responded that the government could not commit to the censorship without new legislation (Low 1949, p. 87).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 November</td>
<td>The establishment of the BBFC was announced in the House of Commons (HO 45/22906).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 November</td>
<td>The trade organisations appointed George A. Redford to be the expected president of the new organisation (Kuhn 1988, p. 22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 November</td>
<td>The Secretary of the CEA and the KMA announced the creation of the BBFC in Bioscope (Low 1949, pp. 88-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 December</td>
<td>The CEA sent a deputation to the Home Office calling for the uniformity of local censorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>George Redford was appointed to be a BBFC president. Joseph Brooke Wilkinson was appointed to be a BBFF secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913 July</td>
<td>The Colonial Office received a complaint about film in South Africa and approached the Home Office (Brown 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 June</td>
<td>Civil actors called for state censorship (e.g., the Magistrates of Penzance) (HO 45/10551/163175).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>The KRS was established as an industry organisation representing the distributors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 April</td>
<td>The War Office expressed its dissatisfaction with the BBFC censorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 November</td>
<td>Some cinema business managers in Bioscope called for the censorship by the Home Office or endorsing official powers for the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bioscope reports severe criticism of the BBFC from the trade members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Thomas Power O’Connor was appointed to be a BBFC president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 January</td>
<td>Herbert Samuel was appointed as Home Secretary under the Asquith Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 April</td>
<td>Herbert Samuel organised a conference with representatives of the local licensing authorities to discuss the idea of state censorship (HO 45/11191). Samuel also proposed the state censorship model as an alternative for the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 April</td>
<td>The film industry organisations sent a deputation to the Home Office. (The Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly 1916, April 20, p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 May</td>
<td>The Home Office circulated a letter consulting with the local authorities on whether they would support the ideas of official censorship (HO 45/11191). However, the local authorities did not accept this proposal because they refused to abandon their legal powers to implement the censorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 July</td>
<td>The Bioscope reported that exhibitors may support the idea of unified and centralised censorship by the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 August</td>
<td>The National Council of Public Morals (unofficial body founded in 1904) established the BBFC Advisory Committee proposed by Samuel on behalf of the Home Office and started a survey on the film business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 July</td>
<td>The County Councils Association sent a letter to the Home Secretary, Herbert Samuel, about the new censorship scheme. He replied with the idea about the model condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 August</td>
<td>The trade members expressed their opposition to the state censorship proposal in the Bioscope (August 31, 1916, p.772). To fight against this scheme, the trade associations agreed to cooperate with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 October</td>
<td>It was announced in the Cabinet that official censorship would be launched in the following year; however, this idea was abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 October</td>
<td>The Bioscope details the discussion of the new censorship committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 December</td>
<td>The Asquith government was transferred into Lloyd George’s Coalition government and Herbert Samuel resigned as the Home Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 January</td>
<td>The Home Office sent a letter to the trade associations stating that ‘Sir George Cave (new Home Secretary under the Conservative government) will not proceed with the scheme’. The Home Office abandoned its state censorship proposal due to severe criticisms from the film industry and transfer of the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>O’Connor visited the Home Office and asked for its formal support (HO 45/11191 Memoranda on the History of Film Censorship). The Cinema Commission of Inquiry instituted by the National Council of Public Morals published The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future Possibilities. It highly evaluated the censorship conducted by the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 December</td>
<td>The Home Office held a meeting with local authorities to discuss general rules and procedures regarding film censorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 January</td>
<td>The CEA agreed that all the members should only exhibit films tested by the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 August</td>
<td>Middlesex County Council made a condition of offering licenses to films only if approved by the BBFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921 October</td>
<td>Colonel Levita, Chair of the Theatre and Music Halls Committee of the London County Council, discussed the issue of film censorship (These two exemplify the support from the local authorities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921 December</td>
<td>The representatives of the producers, renters, and exhibitors and the BBFC set up a meeting with Colonel Levita and explained the works of the BBFC and plans for its reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 May</td>
<td>A conference was held between the local authorities to discuss the LCC conditions of censorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 July</td>
<td>The Home Office circulated a letter suggesting that all authorities should accept the LCC conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Home Office stated it was satisfied with the performance of the BBFC in its internal document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925 October</td>
<td>In its memorandum, the Home Office explained that it evaluated the BBFC’s performance and achievements highly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>The National Association of Head Teachers held a meeting with the BBFC, stating, ‘If I say that the deputation was very much impressed indeed with the [BBFC’s] great care bestowed, and the effort made to render adequate justice to legitimate trade interests, it should suffice to quieten any professional fears.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 3.2: Extract from the BBFC censorship report**

The following is one of the first examples of censorship on scenario in the BBFC. It shows how censors in advance reviewed scenarios and gave feedback, including concerns about the expected outcome. It also indicates that the process of examination was interactive: film producers are given opportunities to talk with the BBFC members and discuss why and how the censorship decision was made.

**Title:** “Portrait of A Spy”  
Submitted by Gainsborough Pictures Ltd.  
Date November 26th 1930.

Book by Temple Thurston. Describes the life of Liane Sonrel, who subsequently becomes a spy. Liane, daughter of a French father and Dutch mother, was born in Java. Educated in a convent school. She was betrayed at the age of sixteen by a French priest, who gave her first Communion. This incident lays the foundation of her character. Henceforth she has lost all faith, and lives only for revenge on men in general, and the French as a nation. From the convent in Batavia, she drifted to India and became a nautch girl in a native Temple. The plaything of the priests. Escaping, she married an English soldier and had two children. One of whom died. Suspecting a servant of poisoning the child, she killed the servant and field of Pondicherry: drifts from there to Marseilles and then to Paris, where we find her doing a dancing turn at various cabarets clad in nothing but a snake. Date 1911. There she attracts George le Mesurier, a young English artist, whose mistress she becomes. He is devotedly attached to her and offers marriage, but she goes off casually with a German officer to Berlin. She is not seen again till the summer of 1915, when she takes Paris by storm as a dancer, Mada Garass, at the Folies Bergères. She is now the mistress of French fly officer, from whom she gets much important information until he is finally caught and shot. She then goes to Madrid, endeavours to get to Holland, but is brought into Falmouth and detained as a suspect, sent back to Madrid for lack of evidence. She gets reckless and goes back to Paris, where she actually becomes the mistress of the unfrocked
priest who first betrayed her, and who is now in the Intelligence Branch. She is finally arrested, tried and executed. The book is very clearly written. The concentrated hate that has warped her whole nature is skilfully drawn. The only other character of outstanding interest in the book is George, who is also cleverly portrayed. The sordid side of war is heavily emphasised in the descriptions of George as a private in the trenches.

I think it would not be possible to make an acceptable film of this book, and we can fall back on our own accepted principle that we do not allow the life and amours of a courtesan on the screen.

December 10 Mr Balcon called and interviewed Mr Brooke Wilkinson and myself with reference to this book. Mr Wilkinson outlined our general objections to the story and our recommendation that the subject was unstable for treatment on the film. He further suggested that if Mr Balcon was still desirous of proceeding with the idea, a detailed scenario and script should be prepared showing the scenes and dialogue before any expenses of production were incurred. After further conversation over details of the book, Mr Balcon stated that he would recommend to his firm that no further action be taken in the matter.

December 10 1930. Mr Balcon, in continuation of the previous interview, disused this book with Mr Brooke Wilkinson and myself (the BBFC anonymous censor). He first stated that Mr McPhail of his firm had originally dealt with this subject, but he was prepared to deal with our report. I read him my synopsis of the book with one or two extracts from the book. He agreed with our report.

Appendix 3.3: Members of the Cinema Commission of Inquiry (1917) in the National Council of Public Morals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Lord Bishop of Birmingham</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Principal Alfred E. Garvie</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir R. S. S. Baden-Powell</td>
<td>Lieutenant General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Carey Bonner</td>
<td>General Secretary, representing The Sunday School Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward W. Brabrook</td>
<td>President, Child Study Society, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Burgwin</td>
<td>Late Superintendent Special Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C.W. Crook</td>
<td>President, National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Adelaide Cox</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A P Graves</td>
<td>Chairman of the Representative Managers of LCC Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rabbi Professor H. Gollanetz</td>
<td>The Jewish Community on the National Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C W Kimmins</td>
<td>Chief Inspector under the Education Committee of the London County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3.4: List of witnesses in the investigation of the Cinema Commission of Inquiry (1917), the National Council of Public Morals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Gavazzi King</td>
<td>Secretary, Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kirk J. P.</td>
<td>Director of Ragged School Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sidney Lamert</td>
<td>Director, London Film Company, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend F. B. Meyer</td>
<td>The National Free Church Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend F. C. Spurr</td>
<td>The National Free Church Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. E. Newbould</td>
<td>Chairman, Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Director, Provincial Cinematograph Theatres, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T. P. O’Connor</td>
<td>Chief Censor (The British Board of Film Censors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Marie Stopes</td>
<td>The Incorporated Society of Authors, Playwrights and Composers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Edgar Jepson</td>
<td>The Incorporated Society of Authors, Playwrights and Composers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend W. E. Soothill</td>
<td>The Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverent James Marchant</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The National Council of Public Morals (1917)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverent Thomas Horne</td>
<td>Rector of Syresham, North Hants, and Senior Chaplain of the Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain and Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Cecil Leeson</td>
<td>Secretary of the Howard Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. Arthur Northam</td>
<td>Council of Kinematograph Manufacturers and the Renters’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>School Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F. W. Barnett</td>
<td>Probation Officer Westminster Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>School Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Garnett</td>
<td>Invalid Children’s Aid Society and Children’s Care Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Brooke Wilkinson</td>
<td>Secretary, British Board of Film Censors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Massey</td>
<td>Probation Officer, Old Street Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Pascall</td>
<td>Past-President of the United Billposters’ Association, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Hill</td>
<td>Past-President of the United Billposters’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverent W. E. Soothill</td>
<td>Religious and Morals Work Secretary, WMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Grant Ramsay</td>
<td>Principal of Institute of Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Henriques</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary Oxford and St George’s Girls’ Club, Commercial Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reverent Bishop Welldon</td>
<td>Dean of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. P. O’Connor</td>
<td>Chief Censor of Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Vickers</td>
<td>Holborn Local Association of Children’s Care Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. E. Newbould</td>
<td>Chairman of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association of Great Britain and Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. W. Kimmings</td>
<td>Chief Inspector Under Education Committee of the LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Percival Sharp</td>
<td>Director of Education, Newcastle-on-Tyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. A. Seddon</td>
<td>Organising Secretary, Cinematograph Exhibitors’ National Union²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. H. Fastnedge</td>
<td>Licensing Department, London County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leon Gaster</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary of the Illuminating Engineering Society, Editor of The Illuminating Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. P. Graves</td>
<td>Chairman of the Representative Managers of LCC Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverent Carey Bonner</td>
<td>General Secretary of the Sunday School Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The National Council of Public Morals (1917)

The Appendix 3.3 and 3.4 shows that both the members of the Cinema Commission of Inquiry and its witnesses include religious/educational figures as well as representatives of the film industry organisations (especially from the CEA). Compared with similar organisations in the following chapters (e.g., The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films in 1932 and the National Advisory Council for the Children’s Entertainment Films in 1949), the proportion of representatives with religious background in the Cinema Commission of Inquiry was much higher than the others.

²⁷ The Cinematograph Exhibitors’ National Union was intended to succeed the CEA and its activities and members were exactly the same to the CEA.
### Appendix 4.1: Constitution of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chairman</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Benjamin Gott</td>
<td>Late Secretary for Education, Middlesex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vice-Chairman</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor J. L. Myres</td>
<td>Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Honorary Treasurer</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. A. Hoare</td>
<td>Director of Educational Research in Western Electric Company, formerly Assistant Secretary, Education Committee, National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Joint Honorary Secretary</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Brown</td>
<td>Secretary of the British Institute of Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. C. Cameron</td>
<td>Secretary for Education, City of Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Members</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. H. Allan</td>
<td>Chairman of the Education Committee of the Corporation of the City of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. A. Bell</td>
<td>Principal, Battersea Continuation School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Blackwood</td>
<td>Educational Institute of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord David Cecil</td>
<td>Wadham College, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major A. G. Church</td>
<td>British Science Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Charles Cleland</td>
<td>Education Committee, Corporation of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Foxen Cooper</td>
<td>Technical Adviser (Cinematograph) to H. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. T. Cramp</td>
<td>General Secretary, National Union of Railwaymen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Winfred Cullis</td>
<td>Professor of Physiology, University of London, President of the International Federation of University Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Salter Davies</td>
<td>Director of Education for Kent, Carnegie UK Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. D. Dunkerley</td>
<td>Secretary, Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Ervine</td>
<td>Dramatic Critic of <em>The Observer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. E. Evans</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fairgrieve</td>
<td>Reader in Education, London Day Training College, Chairman of Syllabuses and Examination Committee of the Geographical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss E. M. Fox</td>
<td>Head Mistress, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Vice-Chairman of the Cinema Sectional Committee of the National Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir W. T. Furse</td>
<td>Director of the Imperial Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Gregory</td>
<td>Editor of <em>Nature</em>; Chairman of the British Association Committee on Educational and Documentary Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss G. E. Hadow</td>
<td>Principal of the Society of Oxford Home Students; Vice-Chairman of National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federation of Women’s Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G T. Hankin</td>
<td>His Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools, Member of the Governing Body of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Cinematographic Institute of the League of Nation; Chairman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film Inquiry Committee, Historical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor A. E. Heath</td>
<td>Professor of Philosophy, University College, Swansea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Frank Heath</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary, British National Committee of Intellectual Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Percy Jackson</td>
<td>Chairman of the West Riding Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Neville Kearney</td>
<td>Head of the Film Industries Department, Federation of British Industries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late H. M. Commercial Diplomatic Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. W. Kimmins</td>
<td>Late Chief Inspector in the Education Department of the London County Council;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman, Education Committee, League of Nations’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. S. Lambert</td>
<td>Editor, <em>The Listener</em>, BBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. E. Lowe</td>
<td>Director of the Museum and Art Gallery, Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Mitchell</td>
<td>Secretary, Carnegie United Kingdom Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Roxburgh</td>
<td>Head Master, Stowe School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor T. H. Sears</td>
<td>Head of Extra-Mural Department, University College, Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. B. Thomas</td>
<td>Coleg Harlech&lt;sup&gt;78&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. V. Vernon</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, Colonial Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Warre Cornish</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, Scottish Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Whytehead</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. H. Wood</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Bruce Woolfe</td>
<td>Representing Federation of British Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A. Yeaxlee</td>
<td>Principal, Westhill Training College, Selly Oak, Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. L. Beales</td>
<td>London School of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Bell</td>
<td>British National Committee of Intellectual Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Frances Consitt</td>
<td>St Gabriel’s College, London, S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Green</td>
<td>Workers’ Educational Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Hibbert</td>
<td>The Polytechnic, Regent Street, London W.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Holland</td>
<td>Director of Education, County Offices, Northampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss M. Locket</td>
<td>Education Manager, British Instructional Films Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Metcalf</td>
<td>National Association of Head Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Neville Rolfe</td>
<td>Secretary General, British Social Hygiene Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Swaine</td>
<td>East Ham Technical Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. C. M. Wilson</td>
<td>Queen Ann e’s Mansions, London, S.W.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>78</sup> Adult education institution in Harlech, Wales.
Appendix 4.2: Timetable of key events in the history of the BFI in the 1920s and 1930s

The table below summarises the key events in the inter-war history of the BFI until the beginning of the post-war period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925 December</td>
<td>The National Union of Women pointed out the exhibition of undesirable films for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 May</td>
<td>The Head Teachers Association raised concerns about the harmful effects of the cinema exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 May</td>
<td>The Commission on Educational and Cultural Films published the <em>Film in National Life</em> report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 June</td>
<td><em>The Economist</em> posted an article analysing the tensions regarding the idea of film institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 July</td>
<td>H. Bruce-Woolfe, a representative film producer, posted an article explaining the expected outcome of the institute. He aimed to address the misunderstanding that ‘the film trade of this country as a whole disliked the idea of an institute and resented the proposal being made’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>The Board of Education circulated a minute paper suggesting departmental organisations take distance from the BFI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 May</td>
<td>The Parliamentary Film Committee suggested the creation of the national film institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>The National Association of Head Teachers in its annual conference signposted the popularity and potential of the cinema exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 August</td>
<td>J. W. Brown and A. C. Cameron, Joint Honorary Secretaries of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films, posted a letter to the editor of <em>The Times</em>. It unpacks their scenario to create a national film institute and explains how a new institute would realise public interests without violating the trade autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 August</td>
<td>Simon Rowson, the owner of a production company named Ideal Film Company, posted a letter confirming that the film industry should be central in the film institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>In Parliament, Oliver Stanley, the Home Secretary, responded to the enquiry and clarified that the government was not in charge of the BFI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 January</td>
<td>Oscar Deutsch, chairman of CEA Birmingham and Midland Branch and the president of ODEON cinema chain, published an article to welcome the idea of a national film institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 January</td>
<td>A. C. Cameron made a speech at the University of London for the members of the Association of the University Women Teachers. His speech explains the plan of creating the BFI and how it would realise educational interests and help schoolteachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 January</td>
<td>The Commission members organised a conference in Manchester to present the concept of the Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 January</td>
<td>Oscar Deutsch posted an article suggesting that the Film Institute should not ‘fall into the hands of the “high-brow”’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 March</td>
<td><strong>Mr R. S. Lambert</strong>, a member of the Commission, declared a consensus between the trade and educationalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 March</td>
<td><strong>The Kinematograph Weekly</strong> preannounced the setting of the BFI and its institutional arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 March</td>
<td><strong>The Manchester Guardian</strong> cited comments that external critics ‘were afraid either that the scheme might turn out to be too narrowly educational, or that some kind of dictatorship over public taste in film was intended, or that amateurs would meddle with the legitimate business of the film trade’. This indicates that even after the insiders within the new institute reached mutual understandings, external critics were still sceptical to the usefulness of the BFI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 October</td>
<td><strong>The British Film Institute</strong> was created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td><strong>Walter Ashley</strong> published <em>The Cinema and the Public</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The BFI published its first annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 January</td>
<td>On behalf of <strong>the Board of Education</strong>, Mr Ramsbotham, sympathetically commented that ‘the Institute should receive any support that the Board could give’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 January</td>
<td>The Governors Meeting Agenda and Papers stated the principles and activities of <strong>the Entertainment Panel</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 July</td>
<td><strong>The BFI Governors</strong> were invited to attend a meeting with <strong>the Education Committee of the London County Council</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Sir Charles Grant Robertson, the president of <strong>the National Cinema Inquiry</strong>, outlined the role of the BFI as being to ‘strengthen in every way the demand for the supply of educational and cultural films’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The BFI</strong> published a second annual report, commenting that ‘the Governors wish to acknowledge the co-operation and assistance they have received in their works from … various commercial film companies’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr H. Ramsbotham, MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of <strong>the Board of Education</strong>, approached the Institute and suggested establishing a conference at the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Entertainment Panel</strong> helped the local cinema managers by supplying educational films and information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Entertainment Panel</strong> responded to a series of enquiries from local authorities to give comments on educational films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 November</td>
<td><strong>The Conference on Films for Children</strong> was organised to progress children’s film policy and enhance the partnership between industry and educationalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td><strong>Dr Emanuel Miller (Director of East London Child Guidance Clinic)</strong> emphasised the technical difficulties of investigating children’s tastes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Home Office, The Board of Trade, and The Scottish Office</strong> started to send their representatives to the BFI governing board because they appreciated the potential and significance of the BFI after reviewing its initial outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1938 | The Entertainment Panel was transferred into the Film Appreciation Panel in order to focus on the review and publication by BFI’s magazines. It also implies that the BFI withdrew from initiatives to influence the film entertainment in general.

1938 November -1939 November | The BFI organised a conference of Chairmen, Directors, and Secretaries of Local Education Authorities in Manchester, Yorkshire, Newcastle, and London.

1939 May | The BFI Advisory Council held a meeting in which the Entertainment Panel proposed new policies, including the creation of a Research and Statistics Unit.

1939 August | The Board of Education contacted the BFI to request its research and suggestion for the extensive use of the cinematograph in school.

1940 May | The Board of Education contacted the BFI to ask for its help in exchanging films with France.

1946 | The Board of Education asked the BFI to organise a conference to respond to UNESCO’s meetings.

1947 | The Dartington Hall Trustees on the Visual Arts, the Factual Film, Music and the Theatre published the Factual Film report, criticising the inefficiency of the BFI until then.

---

**Appendix 4.3: Advisory Council members in 1934**

- Association of Education Committees
- Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education
- Association of Teachers in Technical Institutes
- Association of Directors of Education in Scotland
- Association of Assistant Mistress in Secondary Schools
- Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools
- Association of Headteachers
- Association of Headmistresses
- British Association for the Advancement of Science
- British Association for Commercial and Industrial Education
- British Broadcasting Corporation
- British Drama League
- British Institute of Adult Education
- British Medical Association
- British Social Hygiene Council
- Boy Scouts Association
- Corporation City of London
- Carnegie United Kingdom Trust
- Dental Board of the United Kingdom
- Geographical Association
- Historical Association
- Institute of Amateur Cinematographers
• Juvenile Employment and Welfare Officers Association
• League of Nations Union
• Liberal Jewish Synagogue
• London County Council
• Mothers’ Union
• National Adult School Union
• National Council of Women
• National Federation of Women’s Institutes
• National Union of Students
• National Union of Teachers
• Royal Academy of Dramatic Art
• Royal Meteorological Society
• Royal Society of Arts
• Royal Veterinary College
• Science Masters Association
• Trades Union Congress General Council
• Westminster Catholic Federation
• Workers’ Educational Association
• YMCA
• Zoological Society of London

Government Departments
• Board of Education
• Board of Trade
• Colonial Office
• Department of Overseas Trade
• Department of Scientific and Industrial Research
• Dominions Office
• Foreign Office
• GPO (General Post Office)
• Home Office
• Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
• Ministry of Health
• Ministry of Labour
• Scottish Education Department
• Scottish Office

Dominions and Colonies
• India
• Commonwealth of Australia
• Newfoundland
• Northern Ireland
• Southern Rhodesia
• H. M. Eastern African Dependencies
• Government of Cyprus
• Irish Free State
### Trade Organisations
- British Kinematograph Society
- Cinematograph Exhibitors Association
- F.B.I. (Film Group)
- Guild of British Kinematograph Projectionists and Technicians Ltd.
- Kinematograph Renters’ Society Ltd.

### Trade Firms
- International Productions Ltd.
- Pathe Pictures
- Sound City (Films) Ltd.
- Visual Education Ltd.
- Wardour Films Ltd.
- Committee Sub-Standard Apparatus and Medicals manufacturers
- Western Electric Co. Ltd.

Source: The BFI Annual Report in 1934

### Appendix 4.4: Members of the Education Panel and Entertainment Panel in the BFI

#### Advisory Council, Specialist Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Panel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Winifred C. Cullis</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr George Peverett</td>
<td>National Adult School Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Isidor Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor J. L. Myres</td>
<td>British Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr J. W. Smart</td>
<td>Association of Education Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Wolseley Lewis</td>
<td>National Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. Eleanor Plumber</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss W. C. Owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. L. Fletcher</td>
<td>Association of Directors in Education in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. E. Foot</td>
<td>Science Masters Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Fairgrieve</td>
<td>Geographical Association and Royal Meteorological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. L. Whytehead</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. H. Wood</td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss M. Richards</td>
<td>Association of Assistant Mistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. E. Williams</td>
<td>British Institute of Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Morgan Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss E. M. Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kenneth Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Brown</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Gregory, Bart</td>
<td>Royal Meteorological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C. W. Kimmins</td>
<td>League of Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. N. Penlington</td>
<td>National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F. A. Ring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr. W. J. Gell  
Miss M. E. Martin  
Dr. I. I. Mattuck  
Mr Donald S. Van Den Bergh  
Mr E. Salter Davies  
Mr A. Clifford Hall  
Professor W. G. Constable  
Mr A. Clow Ford  
Mr F. A. Hoare  
Mr H. L. Beales  
Mr W. A. J. Lawrence  
T. M. Fitzgerald  
Dr W. W. Vaughan  
Mr R. V. Vernon  
Mrs Neville Rolfe  
Mr Moss Pym  
Mr A. S. Hoskin  
Mr J. V. Richmond  
Mr H. Warre Cornish  
Sir T. Percy Nunn  
Miss I. D. Marris  
Mr W. Chetham-Strode  
Mr C. Dowers  
Mr L. Gordon Lee  
Mr Geoffrey Whitworth  
Mr A. N. Bonaparte Wyse  
Mr H. Bruce Woolfe  
Mr S. W. Smith  
Professor A. E. Heath  
Mr J. Wale Smith  
Miss M. Locket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. J. Gell</td>
<td>Association of Headmistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss M. E. Martin</td>
<td>Association of Headmistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. I. I. Mattuck</td>
<td>Association of Headmistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Donald S. Van Den Bergh</td>
<td>British Association of Commercial and Industrial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr E. Salter Davies</td>
<td>Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and County Councils Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Clifford Hall</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor W. G. Constable</td>
<td>Courtauld Institute of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Clow Ford</td>
<td>Association of Headmistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr F. A. Hoare</td>
<td>Western Electric Company Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. L. Beales</td>
<td>Western Electric Company Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. A. J. Lawrence</td>
<td>Western Electric Company Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. M. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Western Electric Company Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr W. W. Vaughan</td>
<td>Association of Headmasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R. V. Vernon</td>
<td>Colonial Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Neville Rolfe</td>
<td>British Social Hygiene Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Moss Pym</td>
<td>British Social Hygiene Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. S. Hoskin</td>
<td>Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. V. Richmond</td>
<td>National Union of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. Warre Cornish</td>
<td>Scottish Educational Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir T. Percy Nunn</td>
<td>Scottish Educational Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss I. D. Marris</td>
<td>Mothers’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. Chetham-Strode</td>
<td>Committee of Manufacturers of Sub-Standard Apparatus and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C. Dowers</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L. Gordon Lee</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geoffrey Whitworth</td>
<td>British Drama League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. N. Bonaparte Wyse</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. Bruce Woolfe</td>
<td>F. B. I. (Film Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. W. Smith</td>
<td>National Federation of Professional Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor A. E. Heath</td>
<td>British Institute of Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Wale Smith</td>
<td>Juvenile Employment and Welfare Officers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss M. Locket</td>
<td>Juvenile Employment and Welfare Officers Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Entertainment Panel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. Rowson</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Henry Hadlane</td>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. Eleanor Plumer</td>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ogilvie Gordon</td>
<td>National Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R. E. Richards</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr J. E. Smart</td>
<td>Association of Education Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ralph S. Bromhead</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr F. H. Toyne</td>
<td>Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C. Hartley-Davies</td>
<td>BKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. E. Williams</td>
<td>British Institute of Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Arthur Taylor</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Alexander</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. J. Gell</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr I. I. Mattuck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Clow Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M. Neville Kearney</td>
<td>FBI (Film Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. A. Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. M. Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Vyvyan Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Moss Pym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major E. E. Austin</td>
<td>Zoological Society of London &amp; Society for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation of Fauna of Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Theo H. Fligelstone</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss I. D. Marris</td>
<td>The Mothers’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss E. M. Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C. W. Kimmins</td>
<td>League of Nations Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Furse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K. A. Nyman</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Pollard</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Dooner</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. R. Fuller</td>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The BFI Annual Reports (from 1933 to 1939).

In the tables displaying the specialist panels above, personal backgrounds of some members are omitted because they are blank in the original text.

Appendix 4.5: The list of newspaper/journal clippings in the BFI Special Collection

**Box 1: 1929-July 1932**

**Box 2: August 1932-November 1933**

Box 3: February 1934-August 1934.

Box 4: August 1934-January 1935.

Box 5: February 1935-May 1935.

Box 6: “The Film in National Life”

(Excluding 24 articles whose titles could not be identified.)
Appendix 5.1: The National Advisory Council Records in the University of Warwick

Modern Records Centre

MSS 121/Fl/1/1
- Minutes of First Meeting of Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films held at the Dorchester Hotel, Park Lane, W.1. on Tuesday, September 1944.

MSS 121/Fl/3/1/1-31
- 30th October 1944. Private telegram to from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 5th January 1945. From Hurtwood House, Albury, Guildford, Surrey. To Mr. Javal (I. Cremieu-Javal Esq., Film House, Wardour St., London, W.1.).
- 10th January 1948. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 13th January 1948. Private letter from Oliver Hill to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 13th January 1948. Private telegram from Herbert Morrison to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 26th January 1948. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 17th February 1948. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 8th July 1948. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 25th December (Xmas) 1948. Private letter to Lady Allen.
- 10th May 1950. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
- 10th May 1950. Private telegram from J. Arthur Rank to Lady Allen of Hurtwood.

MSS 121/Fl/4/1-8 ACEF publications
• Evidence submitted to the Committee on Children and the Cinema by the Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films.
• Appendix I: Estimate of Children’s Entertainment Film after viewing with a Child Audience.
• The Psychological purpose Underlying the Work Attempted by the Advisory Council on Children’s Entertainment Films.
• Entertainment Films for Children. 1946.
• Entertainment Films for Children. 1947.
• Entertainment Films for Children. 1948.
• Entertainment Films for Children. 1949.

**MSS 121/F1/7/2/1-5, MSS 121/F1/7/3/1**

• Lady Allen’s visit to Copenhagen
• Note for picture showings in foreign countries.
• Film and the Young Worker: Brief notes by Lady Allen of Hurtwood.

**MSS 121/F1/7/1/1-II.**

• Surbiton July 15th 1948.
• Glasgow May 18th 1946.
• Liverpool, November 23rd 1946.
• Children’s Films Norway. March 1946.
• Advisory Council September 26th 1944.
• Association of Psychiatric Social Workers. Saturday September 25th 1948.
• Conference on Children in the Cinema to be held at Bath on Thursday 22nd.

**MSS 121/F1/5/1-6/**

• Children and the Cinema by Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
• March 1948. British Films: Fact, Forecast and Opinion reprinted from various sources.

---

**Appendix 5.2: Trade representatives in the CFF governing board from 1951-1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Lord Rank J. P.</th>
<th>Chairman of Rank Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald F. Carter</td>
<td>Vice-Chairman of the Association of Specialised Film Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major R. P. Baker</td>
<td>Chairman and managing director of Ealing Films (one of the most traditional and the largest film companies at that time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Henry L. French</td>
<td>President of British Film Producers Association (and he is also civil servant and Secretary to Ministry of Food until 1946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry P. E. Mears</td>
<td>Past President of Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association and cinema exhibitor (he was also a Mayor of Bournemouth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir David E. Griffiths</td>
<td>Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Association, vice Chairman of R.A.F. Cinema Corporation and a member of Royal Naval Film Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier J. L. Heywood</td>
<td>Past Assistant Secretary of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Hill</td>
<td>Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.V. Curtice</td>
<td>Film Producer in Wallace Production and Associated British Pathe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Speakman</td>
<td>Cinema Exhibitor, Army Kinema corporation, and Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Davies</td>
<td>Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. Whincup</td>
<td>Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Thomas</td>
<td>Managing Director of the A.B.C. Television Ltd. Film producer associated with British-Pathe Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Godfrey</td>
<td>Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. T. Davis</td>
<td>The Cinema Exhibitor, Past President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. B. Ellis</td>
<td>Past President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir Arthur Jarratt</td>
<td>Past Deputy Chairman of British Lion Film Corporation Ltd. And President of the Kinematograph Renters’ Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.T. Edom</td>
<td>Past Secretary of the Association of Specialised Film Producers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Appendix 5.3: The founding members Advisory Council on the Children’s Entertainment Films in 1944**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Allen of Hurtwood</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss M. Clayton</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. Forsyth Hardy</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Derek McColloch</td>
<td>Scottish Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. Griffith</td>
<td>National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss H. Harford</td>
<td>National Association of Girls’ Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Randal Keane</td>
<td>National Association of Boys’ Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Benjamin Gregory</td>
<td>Christian Cinema &amp; Religious Film Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.4: Note on how the Advisory Council worked and how it critically discussed audience research (quotation from the Advisory Council Annual report 1949)

It is unwise to give too much weight to questionnaire which children fill in about films, it is very difficult even for adults to analyse their reactions to film and it is practically impossible for a child to say why it liked or disliked a picture. In answering questionnaires, children are either over ready to please or over anxious to shock.

CEF has always believed that the best way of judging the reaction of children to films is to sit among the audience and observe expressions, movement and sound. Members of the Advisory Council, the staff of CEF, scenario writers, producers, directors, composers, storytellers and actors are encouraged, whenever possible, to attend some of the regular Saturday morning film performances, where satisfaction or disappointment may be in store for them.

But as it is not possible for CEF staff or their collaborators to be present at exhibitions of their films all over Great Britain and in different part of the world, a special series of questions have been drawn up to enable cinema managers to report the reaction of children to the films specially produced for them. Managers are specially trained to observe the reactions of audiences impartially. Sixty-three selected managers working in different parts of Great Britain in cinemas catering for varying types of audience rural, suburban, industrial, and so on, return these questionnaires regularly. The questionnaires have been sent to Canada for use in the Dominion and have been translated into Dutch and Danish. Thus material is available on the reactions of children in many places to the same film. It may therefore be claimed that CEF reports are based on a mass of carefully collected evidence available to no other body.

Recently, a beginning has been made on photographing the children at the moment when a certain picture is on the screen and placing that picture and the photograph of the children side by side. By this means, it will eventually be possible to compare the reactions of children in every part of the world at the same point in the same film. Steps have also been taken to record sounds made by children while children’s films are being projected. These recordings, with the photographs referred to above, will provide common material for research workers, which will enable them to co-ordinate their findings. Many useful pieces of research have already been
done by individuals into the reaction of children to films, but all these activities are isolated. However, most of these valuable results have been gratefully received by CEF.

Children often like to write to CEF, and the individual views expressed in these letters are probably sincere and valuable indications of the responses of children to films. The children’s committees of cinema clubs fairly often suggest subjects for new films. In order to keep closely in touch with the interests of children all over the world, CEF subscribes to children’s magazines which are published in various countries. These magazines enable the Scenario Department to find the highest common factor of children’s leisure-hour interests in different parts of the globe.

Appendix 5.5: The table of key events in the history of the CFD/CEF/CFF in the 1940s and the 1950s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>The Children’s Film Department (CFD) was established in the Rank Organisation. The Advisory Council was established by the Rank Organisation. Mary Field was appointed to be a director of the CFD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>The CFD was renamed as the Children’s Entertainment Film (CEF). The Advisory Council held a conference on the promotion of children’s cinema in Belfast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>The CEF was dissolved due to the financial difficulties the Rank Organisation experienced. The Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema published a report titled Report of the Departmental Committee on Children and the Cinema (1950). The British Film Production Fund (also known as the Eady Levy) was installed initially as a voluntary funding based on agreement between the Board of Trade and the film industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The Children’s Film Foundation (CFF) was established. The CFF sent a letter to the film-industry organisations to ask their advice on the production policy of the Foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1953 | CFF film *The Dog and the Diamond* (1953) won the award for the best national selection at the 1953 International Film Festival for Children in Venice.

1955 | *The Home Secretary, Major Gwilym Lloyd George*, gave a speech in a CEA meeting to praise the achievement of the CFF.

1956 | In a **House of Commons** debate titled *Film Industry*, the achievements of the CFF were discussed.


1960 | *John Davis* was appointed as a chairman of the CFF.

1983 | The CFF was renamed as the **Children’s Film and Television Foundation (CFTF)**.

1986 | The CFTF ceased to produce original films and television programs.

2012 | The CFTF was renamed as the **Children’s Media Foundation (CMF)**.

**Appendix 5.6 memorandum of Association of CFF in 1951**

This document (memorandum of association of CFF of association of CFF), submitted to register the CFF as an association under The Companies Act, 1948, fully explains the aim, structure, members and activities of the CFF. Remarkably, the phrase ‘entertainment education by production of films’ captures the CFF’s purpose to produce children’s films with both educational and entertaining characters.

**Memorandum of Association of Children’s Film Foundation Limited**

1. The name of the Company (hereafter called “the Foundation”) is “CHILDREN’S FILM FOUNDATION LIMITED”.

2. The registered office of the Foundation will be situate [sic] in England.

3. The Foundation is established to promote, maintain, improve, and advance entertainment education and recreation of children particularly by the production of films and the encouragement of the arts. And, as ancillary to the foregoing objects:

   a. To Conduct and carry on in all parts of the world, in all their respective branches, the business of makers, producers, exhibitors, distributors, manufacturers, renters, exporters, importers, buyers, sellers, hirers and publishers of motion pictures and cinematograph and television films of all kinds, videocassette, videogram and videodisc and all other audio visual and sound recordings, gramophone records and tapes, theatrical and radio plays, dramas, comedies, operas, pantomimes, revues, ballets, concerts, novels, scenarios, and sketches; and in connection therewith to undertake and carry out all or any of the functions, operations, services or work ordinarily or which can be conveniently undertaken and carried out by persons engaged in such business to act as theatrical agents, cinematograph agents and general agents as may be considered conductive to promotion, maintenance improvement and advancement of the entertainment education and recreation of children and others.
b. To employ, or otherwise acquire the services of authors, journalists, playwrights, and other writers, artists, composers, instrumentalists, scenic and other designers, photographers, singers, actors, directors and producers of plays, motion pictures and radio and television programmes, and entertainers of all kinds; to assign, hire out, let, make available, dispose of exploit or otherwise turn to account any such services and the products thereof and the benefits of agreements relating thereto; to purchase, or otherwise acquire, hire, charge, convert, dispose of and deal with rights of copyright in journalistic, literary, musical, dramatic or pictorial works; film, motion pictures, television and performing rights, photographs, designs, options licences, claims, concessions, privileges pre-existing under the laws of any country.

c. To carry out business as proprietors of photographic studios and studios generally; to carry on business as film cameramen, film manufacturers, film editors, film printers, film distributors and renters, and as photographic material, gramophones, and other instruments to reproduce sound, whether to work in conjunction with cinematograph films or otherwise; and of, and in, furniture, fittings, plant, apparatus, accessories and equipment for cinemas, theatres, studios, halls and other buildings; as manufacturing chemists, cinematograph specialists, metal and alloy makers and workers, mechanical, constructional, and electrical engineers, builders, decorators, furniture makers, joiners and woodworkers, upholsterers and furnishers, out-fitters and contractors generally.

d. To conduct or promote or participate in tests, surveys, experiments or research work of any nature connected directly or indirectly with any of the objects of the Foundation.

e. To purchase or otherwise acquire, plant, machinery, furniture, fixtures, fittings, scenery and all other effects of every description necessary or convenient or usually or normally used in connection with or for the purposes of all or any of the objects of the Foundation.

f. To retain or employ professional or technical advisers or workers in connection with the objects of the Foundation, and to pay such remuneration for their services as may be considered expedient.

g. To establish, subsidise, promote, co-operate or federate with, affiliate or become affiliated to, act as trustees or agents for or manage or lend money or other assistance to any Association, Society or other Body, whether incorporated or not incorporated, and to co-operate with manufacturers dealers or other traders and also with the Press and other sources of publicity.

h. To purchase, take on lease or in exchange, hire or otherwise acquire and hold any real or personal property and any rights or privileges which may be considered necessary or convenient for the promotion of any of the Foundation’s objects, and to construct, maintain and alter any buildings or erections necessary or convenient for carrying out any of such objects.

i. To sell, let, mortgage, dispose of or turn to account all or any of the property or assets of the Foundation as many be considered expedient with a view to the promotion of its objects.

j. To undertake and execute any charitable trusts which may lawfully be undertaken by the Foundation and may seem directly or indirectly ancillary to any of its objects.
k. To revise payments donations and subscriptions from all sources and to borrow or raise money for the objects of the Foundation on such terms and on such security as may be considered expedient, and whether by the creation and issue of debentures or debenture stock or otherwise.

l. To invest the moneys of the Foundation not immediately required for its objects in or upon such investments, securities or property as may be considered expedient.

m. To establish, promote or assist any company or companies with objects all or any of which are similar to the objects of the Foundation for the purpose of acquiring and taking over any of the property, rights and liabilities of the Foundation, or for the purpose of carrying on any activity which the Foundation is authorised to carry on, or for any other purpose which may seem directly or indirectly calculated to benefit the Foundation in the furtherance of its objects.

n. To make any charitable donation, either in cash or assets, which may be considered expedient.

o. To establish and support pension, superannuation and other schemes for the benefit of persons employed by the Foundation, and to grant pensions or retiring allowances, to persons who have been employed by the Foundation or to their dependants.

p. To purchase or otherwise acquire and undertake all or any of the property, assets, liabilities and engagements of any one or more of the Associations, Societies or other Bodies with which the Foundation is authorised to co-operate or federate.

q. To pay out of the funds of the Foundation the costs, charges and expenses of and incidental to the formation administration and registration of the Foundation.

r. To do all such other things as may be incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects of the Foundation or any of them.

4. The income and property of the Foundation, whencesoever derived, shall be applied solely towards the promotion of the objects of the Foundation as set forth in this Memorandum of Association, and no portion thereof shall be paid or transferred directly or indirectly by way of dividend, bonus or otherwise howsoever by way of profit, to the Members of the Foundation:

Provided that nothing therein shall prevent the payment in good faith of reasonable and proper remuneration to any officer or servant of the Foundation in return for any services actually rendered to the Foundation, but so that no Director of the Foundation in return for any services actually rendered to the Foundation, but so that no Director of the Foundation other than the Consultant Member (which expression shall in this Memorandum of Association have the meaning ascribed to it in the Articles of Association of Children’s Film Foundation Limited) shall be appointed to any salaries office of the Foundation or any office of the Foundation paid by fees, and that no remuneration or other benefit in money or money’s worth shall be given by the Foundation to any Director other than the Consultant Member, except repayment of travelling, hotel and other expenses properly incurred in connection with the business of the Foundation.

5. The liability of the Members is limited.

6. Every member of the Foundation undertakes to contribute to the assets of the Foundation, in the vent of the same being wound up while he is a Member or within one year after he cease to be a Member, for payment of the debts and liabilities of the Foundation contracted before he ceases to be a Member, and of the costs, charges and expenses of winding up,
and for the adjustment of the rights of the contributories among themselves, such amount, not exceeding £ 1, as may be required.

7. If upon the winding up or dissolution of the Foundation there remains, after the satisfaction of all its debts and liabilities, any property whatsoever, the same shall not be paid to or distributed among the Members of the Foundation but shall be given or transferred to some other Institution or Institutions having objects similar to the objects of the Foundation and which shall prohibit the distribution of its or their income and property among its or their members to an extent at least as great as is imposed upon the Foundation under or by virtue of Clause 4 hereof, such Institution or Institutions to be determined by the Members of the Foundation at or before the time of dissolution and if and so far as effect cannot be given to the aforesaid provision then to some charitable object or objects.

We, the several persons whose names and addresses are subscribed, are desirous of being formed into a Company in pursuance of this Memorandum of Association.

NAMES, ADDRESSES AND DESCRIPTIONS OF SUBSCRIBERS
F. A. Hoare, Coombe Hollow, Langley Grove, New Malden, Film Producer.
D. W. Griffiths, Argyll, 54, Gunnersbury, Avenue, Ealing, Film Distributor.
H. L. French, 25 Berkeley Court, Marylebone Road, London, Director-General of Trade Association.
A. V. Curtice, 183, Goodhart Way, West Wickham Kent. Film Producer.
Dated the Sixth Day of July, 1951.

Appendix 5.7 Catalogue of the Children’s Film Foundation (CFF) folder in the BFI Special Collection

The BFI Special collection stores a special folder titled the CFF. This folder includes key documents to understand the activities of the CFF, including the memorandum of the CFF quoted above, and yet it has never been referred in the prior research. This thesis is the first academic writing to offer a complete catalogue of this folder and employ it to study the history of the CFF.

Box3 (memorandum & articles of Association, correspondence, minutes including the establishment of CFF)

- The Companies Act, 1948: nomination of directors of CHILDREN’S FILM FOUNDATION LIMITED
- Minute of the meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W.1 on Friday, 13th April, 1951, at 3:30 pm.
- Minute of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W.1, on Tuesday, 20th March, 1951, at 3 pm.
- Minute of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W.1, on Friday, 27th April, 1951, at 11 am.
• Minute of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W. 1, on Tuesday 15th May, 1951, at 3 pm.
• Minute of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W. 1, on Thursday, 7th June, 1951, at 3 pm.
• Minute of the Meeting of the Provisional Committee on Children’s Entertainment Films, held at 49 Mount Street, London, W. 1, on Thursday, 28th June, 1951 at 10:30 pm.
• 24th August 1951, A letter to Laurence G. Parker (Association of Specialised Film Producer)
• 20th August 1954, A letter from Association of Specialised Film Producers
• The Companies Act, 1948, notice of increase in numbers of members
• The Companies Act, 1948, Special Resolution of Children’s Film Foundation Limited. (Passed 14th October, 1959)
• The Companies Act, 1948, Special Resolution of Children’s Film Foundation Limited. (Passed 15th August 1951)
• The Companies Act, 1948. Memorandum and Articles of Association of Children’s Film Foundation limited.
• 21st September 1959, Children’s Film Foundation Ltd: Resolution.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to General Secretary, Cinematograph Exhibitors Association.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to Association of Independent Cinemas.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to Association of Specialised Film Producers.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to Kinematograph Renters’ Society Ltd.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to General Secretary, Film Producers Association.
• 27th October 1971. A letter to Federation of Film Unions.
• The Companies Act 1948 to 1967: Special Resolution of CHILDREN’S FILM FOUNDATION LIMITED passed 11th October, 1971.
• Children’s Film Foundation: Resolution, 25th August, 1967.
• Articles of Association, sent to CEA, AIC, KRS, FPA, ASFP, FFI, BFFA, National Westminster Bank, DOTI, 26th January 1973.
• 2nd January, 1973. A letter sent to Secretary, the British Film Fund Agency.
• 1st January, 1972. A letter sent to Association of Specialised Film Producers.
• 28th February, 1978. A letter sent to Secretary of CFF from Deputy Secretary.
• 16th January, 1980. A letter sent to Association of Independent Cinemas, Association of Specialised Film Producers, Cinematograph Exhibitors’ Association, Federation of Film Unions, British Film Producers Association, Society of Film Distributors Limited, National Westminster Bank Limited.
• The Companies Acts, 1948 to 1976: Special Resolution of Children’s Film Foundation Limited. (passed on 29th June, 1982).
• 30th June, 1982. Extraordinary General Meeting.
• 2nd June, 1982. Extraordinary General Meeting.
• Companies Registration Office: 24th September 1981.
• 7th August 1981. A letter sent to Companies Registrar Office.
• Companies Registration Office: 22nd May 1981.
• Companies Act, 1948: Application to the Department of Trade for exemption under Section 201(1).
• 26th February, 1981. A letter to Secretary, Children’s Film Foundation.
• 23rd February, 1981. A letter to Children’s Film Foundation.
• 20th February, 1981. Children’s Film Foundation: A letter from S T Taylor, Secretary.
• Department of Trade: Procedure for Applying for Exemptions from the Requirements of Section 201(1) of the Companies Act, 1948.
• The Companies Acts 1948 to 1976: Notice of Change in the Situation of Registered Office.
• 1st September, 1981. A letter sent to the Registrar of Companies, Department of Trade.
• 7th August, 1981. A letter sent to the Registrar of Companies, Department of Trade.
• 13th May, 1991. A letter sent from S. T. Taylor, Children’s Film and Television Foundation Ltd.
• Certificate of Incorporation on Change of Name.

Box6

• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd: Extension of Distribution Agreement. 29th June, 1965.
• The Rank Organisation World Film Distribution-Overseas Division.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd: Extension of Distribution Agreement. 18th October, 1963.
• Rank Overseas Film Distributors Ltd. Extension of Distribution Agreement. 11th May, 1961.
• Rank Overseas Film Distributers Ltd. Amendment to Distribution Agreement. 11th May 1961.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Distribution Agreement. 31st July 1959.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Extension of Distribution Agreement. 11th October 1971.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Extension of Distribution Agreement. 5th October 1970.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Extension of USA Agency. 18th October 1972.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Extension of Distribution Agreement. 18th October, 1972.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Extension of Distribution Agreement. 18th September, 1969.
• An agreement made the Nineteenth Day of August 1954, between Children’s Film Foundation Limited and J. Arthur Rank Overseas Film Distributors Limited.
• 24th January 1955. Children’s Film Foundation Limited and John Haggarty: Script writer’s contract for Shooting Script “Joey of Jasmine Street”.
• 30th November 1954. Children’s Film Foundation Limited and John Haggarty: Script writer’s contract for “Joey of Jasmine Street”
• 29th November 1954. Gaumont British Picture Cooperation Limited and Children’s Film Foundation Limited: Production Agreement for “MEBA the Saucer”.
• October 1954: British Films Limited and Children’s Film Foundation Limited: Production Agreement for “The Flying Eye”.
• 26th November 1954: Robert Martin and Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Assignment of Film Rights in two original published stories entitled “Joey of Jasmine Street” and “Joey and the River Pirates”.
• Agreement between the Gaumont-British Picture Corporation Limited and Children’s Film Foundation limited, 20th November 1954.

• CFF presents: Report of the Children’s Film Foundation LTD, for the period 19th July, 1951 to 30th April, 1952.
• CFF presents: Report of the Children’s Film Foundation LTD, for the period 1st May, 1952 to 31st October, 1953.
• Children’s Film Foundation: Third Report, 1955.
• Interim Report for the period 1st May to 31st December, 1952.
• CFF Interim Report for the period, 1st November 1953 to 31st March, 1954.

Box 75 (Press statements)
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. New Secretary Appointed.
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Press Statement. (19th July 1951)
• Children’s Film Foundation Ltd. Press Statement. (17th August 1951)

Box 69 (Children’s Films: A study of boys and girls in the cinema by Mary Field)
• Children and Films: A study of boys and girls in the cinema: A report to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees on an enquiry into children’s response to films by Mary Field, OBE, MA.