

Labor Relations, 16mm Film and Euston Films

Max Sexton, Birkbeck College, University of London

Film as a technology has been used, adapted and implemented in particular ways within television. This article provides examples of this process along with its complexities and demonstrates how a system of regulated labor on British television during the 1970s shaped the aesthetic form that 16mm film was used to develop. The questions of how far the production process was guided by institutionalized conventions, however, is one that the article seeks to answer in its analysis of the function and form of the filmed television series produced by Euston Films, a subsidiary of Thames Television.

Charles Barr (1996) has discussed the legacy of live television that seeks to develop analyses of the developing formal systems of early television. For example, the telerecordings of most of the *Quatermass* serials were only "television films" because they were recorded on film, but were not constructed or edited as film, although they may have used some film inserts. According to Barr, television drama may have been shot on film, but it was different from film. It was only later in the 1960s and 1970s that shooting on film meant that the studio drama was replaced by shooting on location on 16mm. Barr notes that in Britain, unlike in the US, if a growing proportion of drama was shot on film, dramas were still referred to as "plays." Consequently, the TV plays-on-film were distinct from "films." However, as this article demonstrates, the development of the 16mm film from the 1970s complicates some of the notions that television drama was either live or continued to be planned, shot and edited as a live play.

At the same time, Jamie Sexton (2003) has examined the relationship between aesthetic innovation and technological change, in particular the impact of 16mm filmmaking. Sexton argues that film was only gradually introduced into the television production process because it was believed by many working within the industry to be a "live" or immediate medium. That is to say there was no time gap between the "capture" of an image and its transmission, unlike cinema images, which are recorded to be shown later. From the 1960s, the adherence to liveness was gradually transformed by the increasing use of film, especially 16mm film, within television production. For Sexton, the use of 16mm brought television drama closer to documentary in many respects. The use of 16mm also marked a resistance to dominant occupational ideologies about the use of film borrowed from the cinema. The use of 16mm marked not so much a shift to a cinematic mode, but a desire for a greater immediacy, leaving

the cinematic mode behind. Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked that by shooting on film there was a clear separation between shooting and editing or between production and exhibition to the spectator. The use of film within the popular drama of the crime series made by Euston Films also left the aesthetic of liveness behind, which marked television's confinement to the studio. Mobility became an important aesthetic quality as well as immediacy. However, shooting on film with an experienced crew was to be very different from shooting in the television studio.

Euston Films was the first film subsidiary of a British television company (Thames Television) that sought to film entirely on location. The early to mid-1970s was a transformative era in the history of British television. Not only did this period witness the introduction of color and the removal of restrictions on broadcasting hours, but also encountered a change in the organization of labor, which, eventually, would have major long-term effects. The neglect of industrial relations in research ignores how they can crucially determine television production. Until the 1980s, most British TV drama made within the BBC or ITV companies used a complete in-house "factory" service of studios, camera crews, technicians and design people, and this was the situation at Teddington Studios, owned by Thames Television, in south-west London. Into this permanently staffed factory came the freelance actors who performed in the particular productions. A few of the drama producers and directors were also freelance or "jobbing." However, inside the Teddington television studio, the dominant employment pattern was of strongly unionized staff technicians and outside freelance artists, a pattern established in the 1950s and 1960s when much TV drama consisted of "single-plays."

The importation of the American telefilm series in the late 1950s and early 1960s whetted British audiences' appetite for a style of entertainment that depended on a commitment to mass entertainment and high production values. Moreover, it was the imposition of quotas on foreign material that stimulated the production of the filmed series for television in the UK. In the 1960s, Lew Grade first began to finance the production of the Incorporated Television Company (ITC) film series under the BFPA (British Film Producers' Association) agreements. This was after convincing the television unions that the arrangement would not affect the production of television programmes within ITV but would allow him to break into the American market and provide an additional source of employment.

The method of working at ITC and shooting on 35mm film would contrast with the situation at Associated British Corporation Television (ABC-TV) and its successor company, Thames Television, as well as at the other ITV companies during the 1960s and 1970s in which everything and nearly

everyone would be “in-house.” [1] It affected production at Thames because conditions for the technical and production staff were controlled by the studio-based union, ACTT (Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians), unlike staff at ITC, whose employment was based on conditions under the BFTPA. [2] The crucial difference was that the BFTPA contracts were short-term and given to freelance film crews working in the film industry, where employment had been mostly casualized. The ACTT, however, represented both members in the film industry and those who were permanently employed by the ITV companies that were themselves represented by the employer organization the Independent Television Companies Association (ITCA). It had been by only using BFTPA contracts that the technical crew working at ITC had been employed for the duration of a project. The idea that its adventure shows, the most famous being *The Saint* (1962-1969), were actually “films” to be exported and not meant primarily for the British television market had helped to persuade the ACTT not to call for a halt to ITC’s production, but the union remained acutely suspicious of any move that might threaten the permanently employed status and livelihoods of its membership working in television.

An assessment of filmmaking for television generally, and Euston Films specifically, depends on an understanding of the strictly demarcated and protected labor relations and production methods of the time. Euston Films was a member of the BFTPA and all contracts were offered under their terms. Therefore, a tension existed between the staff working at Euston Films and at Thames Television, the latter employed under contracts agreed between the ITCA and the ACTT. It would be an exaggeration to claim that the powerful ACTT union had forced the ITV companies into uncompetitive practices since their launch in 1955-1956, practices that had become steadily more onerous. Yet the assigning of the technical crew to a production was strictly controlled by rotas managed by union stewards. This practice could lead to staff being replaced in the middle of an assignment, with no reference to a program’s needs. For many within management, the business of production seemed to be run mainly for the benefit of staff working in them. Nevertheless, a set of highly regulated work practices has to be balanced by the fear of unemployment, the probable consequence of any dismantling of the agreements between unions and management. This fear became acute in the 1970s amidst a turbulent British economy that sought to grapple with the twin problems of rising inflation and the stagnation of its traditional heavy manufacturing industries.

At this time, union membership was critical to working in film as well as television production. A location manager who later became an assistant director on Euston’s shows, including *The Sweeney* (1975-1978) and *Minder* (1979-1991), has explained how important membership was at

the time. For Stephen Pushkin, membership was a necessity in order to work. He had taken his first job amid the chemical fumes of the developing fluids of the processing lab because it was one of the very few places where it was possible to work in “filmmaking” without a union card. However, once he had obtained a card, he was very well looked after, he recalls:

There were regulated fees and work was from 8 in the morning to 5:30. If filming needed to go on after 5.30, there was the “calling the quarter,” in which another fifteen minutes could with the agreement of the [union] rep be allowed. If more time was required after that pay would be time and half. It was also possible that the electricians [members of another union] would refuse to go on and pull the breakers and go home ending production for the day. (Pushkin, 2011)

Moreover, the worlds of film and television were strictly demarcated. The film production staff never came into contact with anyone working in Teddington. Shooting on film at Euston Films and working in television were distinct worlds. Yet within the regulated system of television production, there was still a growing sense of frustration felt by management towards the end of the 1960s. A memo by Jeremy Isaacs, the Head of Features at Rediffusion [3] about the company’s Film Section, prior to ABC-TV’s merger with Rediffusion to form Thames Television in 1968, sheds light on future plans by management. The memo reveals why the new company would no longer film “in-house” but, four years before the setting-up of Euston Films, preferred a quasi-independent subsidiary:

1. The new company [Thames] might naturally consider Rediffusion’s film section as an unqualified asset. Potentially it is; but as at present constituted it is more of a liability. Rediffusion’s success in feature and documentary programmes has been accomplished in spite of the film section, rather than because of it.
2. Rediffusion, unlike other ITV companies, has set up a film section from its inception. The staff recruited came from the feature film industry, and inherited its techniques and attitudes. For years after everyone else was shooting film for TV on 16mm, Rediffusion continued to shoot on 35mm. Although 16mm cameras were eventually purchased it is only today that the dubbing theatre is being equipped to handle 16mm [...].

3. Rediffusion has consistently refused to allocate particular crews to particular programmes. They have preferred to schedule film-crews on an hourly basis, switching them from current affairs, to drama, to series, to schools, like pegs on a board. This works with studio crews, who complete individual productions. It is fatal with film camera crews, who can't see programmes through to the finish. The result: at Rediffusion film section labour relations are bad, morale poor.
4. Rediffusion has offered film technicians security of employment at basic rates of pay, thus ensuring that it retains some technicians of mediocre standard, who are unwilling to risk their talent on the freelance market. Other ITV companies (ATV, Granada) hire freelance film effort as required. This has enabled them, of recent years, to make better films, faster and cheaper than Rediffusion.
5. The new company [Thames] will need film for current affairs, documentary, actuality type programmes. It will not need film for drama or dramatic series, intending to make these entirely in the studio, or, under a different union agreement, entirely on film.

THIS MAJOR CHANGE OF REQUIREMENT MUST GOVERN FROM THE OUTSET THE SHAPE AND ORGANISATION OF THE FILM UNIT EMPLOYED. (emphasis in original) (Isaacs, 1967: 67-73)

The desire to abandon filming on 35mm film and the disbanding of the film section at Rediffusion as it became Thames would produce a considerable cost saving. Film crewing in television companies varied, but by 1968, a film crew using 16mm would have consisted of four technicians, a cameraman, assistant cameraman, sound recordist and assistant recordist, plus the production staff, i.e. the director and his or her P.A. This was known as 2+2 crewing and was invariably less than BFTPA crewing. Crewing for 35mm required 4+4 minimum crewing, traditionally four crew on camera and four on sound. The cost of television film ventures such as the whole of Euston Films' output would be considerably reduced once television film crewing, i.e. 16mm, had been adopted for television film fiction. Moreover, by the early 1970s, with new and lighter equipment, there was also no reason why a 16mm camera could not be operated single-handed, without the need for an additional operator. The cameraman could become his own focus puller. The new self-blinded cameras, the BL Arri or new Bolex, were designed for solo operation. In fact, the controls on the camera were so placed as

to be difficult for an assistant to use without getting in the way. New equipment would lead to further pressures to shoot not only on 16mm outside the confines of the studio, but use the latest “hand-grab” cameras.

The mobility of the new 16mm cameras was matched by the flexibility of the BFTPA agreements. Under the ITCA agreements, at least 96 hours’ notice had to be given to changes in rostered working hours, and staff could only be asked to work a maximum of 38 hours per week (Alvarado and Stewart, 1985: 26). Ted Childs, a producer at Euston Films, explained that:

I had a strong feeling that Euston Films could only survive while we remained economically viable. [...] So we had very flexible arrangements, we would often get a writer in at the last minute to change something or change the schedule to keep within the ten day cycle of production. We could do this, but it would be very difficult to do in a studio with the strict rules about rostering and the use of equipment across a wide range of programme areas. We were a law unto ourselves so we had a much easier time in many ways than a producer trying to make a comparable show in a BBC or ITV studio structure. (Alvarado and Stewart, 1985: 28)

The ITCA agreements did allow for irregular scheduling of the workforce to suit the production requirements of television, except in the case of ACTT’s Schedule III film personnel, for whom conditions of service, similar to those specified under the British Film Producers’ Association Agreement with that union, were laid down. But this made filming for productions such as drama and light entertainment very expensive outside normal Monday-to-Friday office hours, attracting premium payments of varying degrees. As a result, such arrangements were generally avoided.

In 1973, Howard Thomas, the managing director at Thames Television, had announced that the company would spend £5.5 million on drama over the next two years (Anon., 1973a). Part of this package had involved the setting up of a new company called Euston Films, which would turn out films for television. Euston Films Limited was registered on 9 March 1971, but did not commence production until September 1972 because of discussions between Thames management and the union shops of Thames’s drama department at Teddington Studios. The union sought assurances that Euston Films would not mean a diminution of the work at Teddington and that work that could be done at Teddington would not be done by Euston Films, now based at an old school building in Colet Court, Hammersmith, west London.

The Euston Films subsidiary was originally to make 90-minute films that were essentially television plays with a bit of action, for a series called embryonically *Armchair Cinema* (1974-1975). These included *Regan*, which would become the pilot episode of *The Sweeney*. [4] However, the challenge of shooting on location might have been seen as daunting even by producers of film-for-cinema because of the vagaries of the British weather and the problems of obtaining the necessary permissions for shooting in a small, densely populated country. No one had ever tried to deal with the English climate on a regular basis without recourse to a studio. It was, therefore, realized that it was necessary to minimize the risks involved in the production of its first gritty crime series, *Special Branch* (1973-1974). Donald Cullimore explained what Euston had done: "we have chosen a good, straightforward, almost safe formula for the series [*Special Branch*] but we have to find out the teething troubles around shooting a TV drama series wholly on location" (Anon, 1973a). In this venture, the studios at Teddington, increasingly equipped with expensive electronic hardware, had been prepared for daytime production after restrictions on the number of broadcasting hours had been lifted in January 1972. The television studio was becoming the site for producing light entertainment, and "gritty drama" would be shot on location on film.

While plans were being made for shooting on 16mm for television drama entirely on location, the British film industry by the early 1970s was experiencing a deep historical shift in the nature, production and marketing of film material. Technological and aesthetic development had led to a massive increase in location filming. Large studio film production, it was believed, was drawing to an end. The sudden decline in the production of the shot-on-film TV series on 35mm in 1969-1970 had deepened unemployment already created by the massive withdrawal of American investment in British feature films (Murphy, 1992; Smith, 2008), and which the ACTT blamed for the deepening crisis of casualization in the film industry. In 1972, there were nineteen features in production: none studio-based and ten on location (Sapper, 1973). By 1973, investment in feature films had dropped 45 percent below the figure for 1971 (Sapper, 1973). It was felt that "irreplaceable national assets" would soon disappear, unaided by an underfinanced NFFC (National Film Finance Corporation), which had ceased to play an important role in providing investment capital for new film production. By 1974, nine out of ten of the 6,000-plus membership of the ACTT's Film Production Branch were working as casual freelancers – a situation that the union felt was intolerable (Sapper, 1973). To become casualized meant a union member would face job insecurity and ineligibility for state benefit when out of work. Yet the big studios at Shepperton and Pinewood were argued to be a "dinosaur overtaken by technological change and the vogue for realism. Lightweight cameras, fast films,

electronics, and the hard economics of a contracting industry have dictated the evolution of the all-location picture" (Bennett, 1974: 8-9).

During the same period, television continued to grow in a spectacular fashion due to the introduction of color to BBC1 and ITV in November 1969. In only three years, the sales of color television sets had quintupled. If the number of sets had been believed to have reached saturation point by the end of the 1960s, the introduction of color had added another million new sets, so that there were 17.25 million by 1973 (Sapper, 1973). This had meant a valuable new source of revenue for television.

This was the industrial background to Euston Films starting to make films for television and signalled future resistance by the ACTT to the "four-waller," a film that was not shot or based in the big film studios (Pinewood, Shepperton or Twickenham) or at Elstree, and did not require any set construction (Anon., 1974). Unlike the ITC telefilms of the 1960s, because Euston Films was using 16mm film and shooting solely on location, it was seen to be attacking the contracts of ACTT members. In 1973, a year marked in Britain by industrial strife, the ACTT leadership was preparing to halt the shooting of "four-wallers" wherever they might be.

In 1973, the first year of production for Euston Films, the Executive Committee of the ACTT had decided to "black" (avoid contact with) the production of *Special Branch* at its site at Colet Court. The decision to order union members not to work at Colet Court had been a result of unsafe and unhygienic conditions, because it was not a purpose-built studio but rather a semi-derelict old school. [5] However, a General Council meeting was met by a demonstration of over a hundred members outside the ACTT's Soho Head Office, protesting against the decision to black Colet Court (Anon., 1973b). After a full discussion in which the representatives of the Euston Films Shop participated, it was decided to allow shooting of *Special Branch* to continue once it had been confirmed that management at Euston Films had agreed to ensure that research was conducted into the feasibility of the alternative of Euston Films being based at EMI's Elstree Studios in Borehamwood.

Yet the belief by many union members of a hidden agenda by its union leadership helps to explain the reaction of the protesters. At the outset of the meeting, a move had been made to exclude the Euston Films' members from the General Council on constitutional grounds. This was lost when a majority of General Council members had supported their right to be present as representatives of their shop, regardless of the fact that they belonged to the Freelance Shop. The never-far-from-the-surface fear of casualization and the desire to protect film jobs in the film-

based studios was becoming a tangled web, including the loss of earnings by rank-and-file members as well as a feeling that the union was out of touch with its membership. After the leadership of the ACTT had called for the nationalization of the film industry in 1973, one writer was provoked into saying that “the great majority of us find [...] these policies as unacceptable as well as unrealistic [...] a reflection of the manner in which so much trades union decision-making is carried out [...] quite independently of the bulk of the rank and file membership” (Bennett, 1974). The freelance membership’s desire to work and keep earning was to lead to splits between different shops in the ACTT representing freelance staff mostly working on location, shooting on film, and permanent staff working inside the television studios at Teddington.

One unforeseen consequence of the confrontation between the ACTT and its freelance members working for Euston Films was its creation of a greater unity among people working at Euston Films, since they felt that their livelihoods, never certain because of their status as freelancers, were threatened by a union leadership out of touch with its members. Unlike the anonymity of working in the television studio within a large organization, the idea of a “family” working at Euston Films meant that, according to Ted Childs, a producer of *Special Branch*, because of the opposition by the ACTT, Euston Films was able to “weld us all very close together. The team working with me at the time were all freelance. There was no obligation to stay around, but it did bring us very close together and I think that was one of the factors which led [...] to the kind of uniqueness and, within all its limitations, the quality of the product” (Alvarado and Stewart, 1985: 54). Trevor Preston, a writer at Euston Films throughout the 1970s, echoes this sentiment when he describes the difference in attitude between the crew and technicians at Teddington and those working for Euston. At Euston Films, crew and technicians would not necessarily see what they were doing as a job, an effort rewarded purely in financial terms, but when working on a program “they gave it their all” (Preston, 2011). Jim Goddard, a “jobbing” director for Euston Films in the 1970s and 80s, describes the difference between directing for television in the electronic studio in the 1960s and early 1970s and filming for Euston:

At Euston there was a lack of management on your back. Verity [Lambert] was a very good producer. If things were going all right she’d let you go and run with it. On the other hand, if I knew how I was going to do it, I’d be a hack. I have to respond to what’s happening. [...] Producers should watch it as a television audience rather than eight people in a studio asking why he’s doing that, when he’s going to do this. [...] The way I’m going to direct is the sum total of my life. [...] Television has the wrong sort of control. Television

people tended to criticize the creative process rather than the end product because it is under their auspices, in their studios. When you're in film, the producer looks at the rushes at the end of the day, he says that doesn't work, change it. Film allows the director to have the authority to maintain the style of the show. (Goddard, 2011)

Collectively, these attitudes led many freelancers to accept "four-waller" productions as a necessary and logical means of providing employment. It was believed that Euston Films would be part of the solution of maintaining and expanding British film production. As a victory for the new Freelance Shop leadership, the leader of the ACTT, Alan Sapper, had by 1974 agreed that the problem of the new methods of using 16mm film on television could not be solved by the strict application of a formal policy to prevent "four-wallers" (Anon., 1974).

Nevertheless, the persistent threat of casualization in the film industry and the perceived threat to jobs in television meant that the ACTT at Teddington continued to make forceful representations to Thames management. According to the union, too many of the most interesting and prestigious programs, such as *The Sweeney*, were being done on location and on film, and as such there might not be enough future work at Teddington for its permanently employed staff. Jeremy Isaacs, now Director of Programming at Thames, would explain:

We may gradually increase the output of Euston Films over the years without diminishing the output that comes from Teddington. [...] Equally [...] they are extremely talented people and they are not to be deprived of work just because it is possible to do things on film. One of the trickiest things I have to do over the next few years is to make sure that however much we do on film there is still plenty of interesting work to be done at Teddington. (Alvarado and Stewart, 1978: 39-40)

On the other hand, Isaacs makes the point that it might be more interesting to say:

Look you've done that long enough in the studio, we're taking it out because we can give it more life on film, and we're going to give you something else marvellous instead. [...] Things like *Callan* **[6]** were done in the studio and were highly successful though they were done at a time when ITV was not doing chase series or investigative series on film. As soon as you do it on film you provide a whole new pace

and zip. It makes it that much more difficult to do anything similar in the studio. (Alvarado and Stewart, 1978: 40)

Tensions between the main television unions, the ACTT and the Electricians Union (EEPTU), as well as between them and management at Thames about the type and volume of work being offered, continued to rumble on. This situation would impact both tangentially and directly on production at Euston.

It was the decision to shoot *Van der Valk* (1972-1992) on film in 1976 after two earlier videotaped series mostly shot at Teddington that retrenched the schism between production staff working freelance and those within the "closed shop" of television. The decision to shoot *Van der Valk* on film had been motivated by a desire to incorporate more of the gritty realism that Euston Films had used in *The Sweeney*. This choice of style, it was believed, would fit more the theme of a detective at odds with the rest of society and would, like *The Sweeney*, be a break from the escapist action thrillers of the past. Like Jack Regan in *The Sweeney*, the character of Van der Valk would battle against his own superiors almost as much as with the underworld. However, the third series to be shot on film was almost abandoned because of the opposition from the EEPTU Union shop. The EEPTU had demanded work for its members on the new series, although its members were "employed under television conditions" (Anon., 1976a). Frantic attempts had been made by freelance members of all the film and television unions to remove the objections to the production of *Van der Valk*, so as not to lose work. The dispute did not highlight simply the problems between unions and management, but the developing split between freelance and permanent staff. Yet in order to counter criticism, the freelance staff would explain that:

The people at Euston Films do not wish to take away the jobs of others. They are not fly-by-night fortune seekers. They are all good union members of long standing who, just like you, simply want to go on doing their jobs, as they have at Euston Films for the last four years. They want to earn a living. Freelance Film Technicians already have to accept long periods of unemployment through no fault of their own [...] forced into the dole queue by a small group of permanently employed and fully secure electricians. (Anon., 1976b)

Members were concerned that they were losing work they considered to be attractive. Eventually, it was agreed that Euston Films should make nine hours of product. compared to Teddington Studios making four series per annum. This meant that in the view of the ACTT, Euston Films should

only be making one drama series this year. Therefore, they had agreed to Euston Films making 20 percent of Thames's drama production but not more.

The issue of labor relations was to play a major determining role in the look of Euston Films within a significant strand of drama in the 1970s, because the use of 16mm film had made it possible to challenge the "in-house" production of British television. Until the destruction of the "closed shop" in the mid- to late 1980s, the roles and function of staff remained highly demarcated, and the highly structured production organization in the television studios felt itself threatened by work practices at Euston Films. In this way, the forms and modes of separate television series on Thames Television and at Euston Films that might have shared generic and narrative similarities were, in different ways, demarcated and regulated and can be distinguished as much by their production processes as aesthetic ones. The use of 16mm film on television marked the beginnings of a movement away from drama shot entirely inside the studio to a production that was shot on location as professional filmmaking ideologies resisted the use of video and the world of the televisual, preferring instead the world of film. However, to fully understand the use of film on television, it is necessary to examine how technology is the ensemble of practices circulating through a historical situation, and this includes the regulation of labor.

British television has not used a single, highly differentiated model in all its drama. Instead, as we have seen, a more complex picture can be formed in which rival discourses about the function of television in Britain have continually shaped programs. Using the example of the use of 16mm by Euston Films, some of these discourses have been examined. They reveal that an approach that examines television's production economies can reveal how a program is subject to many factors, including professional ideologies within an industrialized medium.

Notes

[1] On the other hand, the Teddington site had originally been operated by a subsidiary company called Iris Productions in 1963. The regulator, the Independent Television Authority, had not liked this arrangement because ABC-TV had to buy-in its productions. They had told ABC to either bring it within the ABC fold or dispense with Iris Productions altogether. This attitude towards "outsourcing" can be compared to one 20 years later when Muir Sutherland was to set up Grand Central Productions. This subsidiary company belonging to Thames would make programs for the US market. In no way would the company take work or even resources away from Thames in the United Kingdom, it was claimed. It was described as an independent company, but its directors were Bryan

Cowgill, Muir Sutherland and Mike Philips, all senior managers at Thames. The ACTT union was concerned that Grand Central would sell its films in the UK, which would mean less work at Thames. In this way, Thames was moving work to its subsidiaries without protest from the new regulator, the IBA. (See British Film Institute, Thames Television Collection, IR 86 1982/3 Specific Issues, Film Editing Meeting, Friday, 25 June 1982; and IR 86 ACTT Specific Issues, May 1985 – March 1986, Notes of a meeting held on Thursday, 7 February 1985.) The Thames Television collection is a miscellaneous collection of loose papers not yet properly catalogued.

[2] Formerly the BFPA until 1981 when the word “television” was added. All references to the BFTPA in this essay use the post-1981 acronym for convenience. The BFTPA was an employers’ association representing producers of films for the cinema and for television.

[3] Associated Rediffusion was one of the “big four” ITV companies and existed between 1955 and 1968.

[4] *Armchair Cinema*, “Regan,” originally transmitted 4 June 1974.

[5] The conditions at Colet Court can be more than guessed at because it appears as a setting in several *Special Branch* episodes, including *Round the Clock*, originally broadcast 11 April 1973. Pat Gilbert offers a highly romantic view of filmmaking at Colet Court, but the lack of proper facilities was partially compensated by a “sense of comradeship,” he explains. See Gilbert (2010, p. 69).

[6] *Callan* was a spy series produced from 1967-1972 and shot entirely inside the television studio on videotape.

Bibliography

Alvarado, Manuel and Edward Buscombe (1978) *Hazell*. London: British Film Institute.

Alvarado, Manuel and John Stewart (1985) *Made for Television: Euston Films Limited*. London: British Film Institute in association with Thames Television International.

Anon. (1973a) A 60 Minute Movie Made on Location Every Ten Days, *Broadcast*, 13 April, p. 14.

Anon. (1973b) General Council Resolution on Euston Films Productions, *Film and Television Technician*, 39 (340), (November), p. 9.

Anon. (1974) Four-Wallers: Policy Defined, *Film and Television Technician*, 40 (345), (April), p. 16.

Anon. (1976a) The Medium, *Broadcast*, 13 September, p. 3.

Anon. (1976a) Van Der Valk – The Truth, Issued by the Ad-Hoc Action Committee (elected by all ACTT, FAA, EEPTU, EQUITY members working at Euston Films. 28 August. BFI, Thames Television Collection, IR 7.

Barr, Charles (1996) They Think It's All Over: The Dramatic Legacy of Live Television, in John Hill and Martin McLoone (eds.), *Big Picture, Small Screen: The Relations between Film and Television*. Luton: John Libbey Media, pp. 47-75.

Bennett, John P. (1974) Those Old Studios, *Film and Television Technician*, 40 (343), (February), pp. 8-9.

Cooke, Lez (2003) *British Television Drama: A History*. London: British Film Institute.

Gilbert, Pat (2010) *Shut It: The Inside Story of The Sweeney*. London: Arum.

Goddard, Jim (2011) author interview, 20 January.

Hill, John and Martin McLoone (eds.) (1996) *Big Picture, Small Screen: The Relations between Film and Television*. Luton: John Libbey Media.

Isaacs, Jeremy (1967) Rediffusion Film Section, 24 July. British Film Institute, Thames Television Collection, IR 36, Film Department, 67-73.

Murphy, Robert,(1992) *Sixties British Cinema*. London: British Film Institute.

Preston, Trevor (2011) author interview, 15 February.

Pushkin, Stephen (2011) author interview, 24 February.

Sapper, Alan (1973) Film Production's Silent Majority, *Film and Television Technician*, 39 (340), (November,) pp. 5, 20.

Sexton, Jamie (2003) Televerite Hits Britain: Documentary, Drama and the Growth of 16mm Filmmaking in British Television, *Screen*, 44 (4), pp. 429-444.



Labor Relations, 16mm Film and Euston Films

Smith, Justin (2008) Glam, Spam and Uncle Sam: Funding Diversity in 1970s British Film Production, in Robert Shail (ed.), *Seventies British Cinema*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 67-80.