

This is a repository copy of *Archaeology on television, 1937*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/142984/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Perry, Sara Elizabeth orcid.org/0000-0002-9694-000X (2017) *Archaeology on television, 1937*. Public Archaeology. pp. 3-18. ISSN: 1465-5187

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2017.1283932>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Archaeology on Television, 1937

Sara Perry
University of York, UK

The birth of archaeologically-themed television programmes is intimately linked to the birth of television itself. Yet little is known of the earliest broadcasts owing to both the fragmentary archival record and the longstanding hype surrounding later archaeology TV productions. This article examines two of the first such shows, likely the earliest in the English-speaking world for which records survive, focused on the British Iron Age site of Maiden Castle and on the reconstruction of prehistoric pottery. While noting the role of Mortimer Wheeler in their development, I also highlight several key women who produced the programmes, starred in them, and otherwise held critical posts in the establishment of professional archaeological practice in Britain, including Margot Eates, Ione Gedye and Delia Parker—all based at London's Institute of Archaeology (IoA). These BBC TV broadcasts were specifically deployed to showcase the sites and methods of the burgeoning discipline of archaeology. More importantly, however, they were subtle players in the building of intellectual and institutional capital for both the IoA and the BBC. Augmented by other graphic media produced by the IoA itself, the earliest televised archaeology shows generated income, exposure, capacity and clout for these two very different but pioneering organisations.

Keywords: television, media, visual representation, histories of archaeology, professionalization, public engagement, BBC

Introduction

The recent public release of the Archaeology at the BBC digital archive (BBC, 2013) has done little to challenge the persistent – but unfounded – assumption that archaeological television programming started in the UK in the 1950s with *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* (hereafter AVM). No obvious effort has been invested in verifying the claim that 'archaeology first came to screen in 1952' through AVM (Fox, 2013), perhaps because the show has been so frequently touted as the origins of the genre, both by its host (the archaeologist Glyn Daniel), and by disciplinary professionals and broadcasting agencies alike (e.g. Daniel, 1954: 205).

Yet the BBC's own paper archives reveal that archaeology programmes began production almost immediately after the launch of Britain's public TV service in the late 1930s. While the archival record is patchy and often vague, it clearly testifies to the fact that archaeologists were actively involved in the conception, development and circulation of television broadcasts from at least 1937. London's Institute of Archaeology played a particularly pivotal role in shaping some of these broadcasts, supplying much of their content, supplementary visual materials, and presenters.

After a brief introduction to the history of TV programming and archaeology's earliest investments in moving-image media and radio, I outline the scant documentary evidence on televised archaeology, then introduce two TV broadcasts which appear to be the earliest archaeology-themed programmes in the English-speaking world for which records survive. As I posit, it is not a coincidence that the IoA is deeply implicated in these productions. Founded around the same time as the genesis of public TV in Britain, the Institute was a savvy exploiter of media for economic, political and intellectual gain.

Ultimately, I make the argument that television was actively drawn into early discipline-building efforts in archaeology, as well as institution-building efforts within the BBC. As part of a suite of visual media and performances harnessed in the name of professionalisation, these TV shows introduced viewing audiences to the science of archaeological practice, positioned the BBC at the forefront of innovation (both technically and conceptually), and provided income and visibility for the fledgling IoA.

'Have you have seen a television screen?' The Advent of TV and Televised Archaeology

The birth of TV is an interesting phenomenon, particularly given its manifestation during what is otherwise understood as the age of radio. Television appears to slip somewhat surreptitiously into the international broadcasting repertoire in the early 20th century, variously an obscure and a disquietingly controversial medium. While the British Broadcasting Corporation was developing what would become the world's first standard public TV service, key members of its staff demonstrated clear indifference towards such work (Bell, 1986: 66). According to Briggs (1985: 155), the BBC's trailblazing activities in television were generally overlooked in the early days 'except by a handful of prophets'. Even into the 1950s, the BBC's own officials continued to

express contempt for the medium, with the Head of Television Programmes writing that ‘Just to keep it [TV] going is a headache’ (McGivern, 1950: 142). General commentators also voiced largely negative appraisals, often culminating in the assertion that nothing was likely to supplant sound broadcasting (e.g. Moore, 1950). These pronouncements, however, contradicted others (e.g. the BBC’s Deputy Director-General), who declared that ‘The thing [TV] is so big that we do not need to magnify its approach’ (Carpendale, 1936: 5).

Such fluctuating, but predominantly conservative reactions, are intriguing in light of the fact that Britain’s television programming was unprecedented. While the US, like the UK, was involved in experimental broadcasts throughout the 1930s, and while Germany launched the earliest public television facility in March 1935, it is Britain which, on 2 November 1936, officially unveiled the world’s first, regular, public, ‘high-definition’ TV service. BBC TV’s programming consisted, at the outset, of a one-hour long retail-oriented demonstration film each morning from 11:00-12:00, and exactly two hours of broadcasting per day, six days per week, between the hours of 15:00-16:00 and 21:00-22:00, compiled by a staff of approximately four producers. Shows were performed live (as facilities for recording television were non-existent until 1947), on rigidly fixed schedules, primarily indoors in the BBC’s Alexandra Palace studios in London, owing particularly to the cumbersomeness of the large-sized cameras of the era (Boon, 2008: 192-194). As Hutton (1950: 194) and Bell (1986: 75) make clear, the ‘handicaps’ of early TV were many: insufficient time, unreliable and crude equipment, lack of colour, and only a single service provider supplying a limited variety of programmes.

It is into such a constrained and fledgling environment that archaeology was introduced to the television viewership. This is critical because histories of archaeology seem generally to be ignorant of any televisual engagement with the discipline prior to the 1950s. Rather, the key international literature on the development of archaeological TV (e.g. Clack & Brittain, 2007; Daniel, 1954; Jordan, 1981; Kulik, 2005, 2007; West, 1988) begins with the series *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* (1952-1958; hereafter AVM), therein implying its status as the worldwide originator of televised archaeology. As Glyn Daniel (1954: 205) misleadingly stated, ‘Archaeology had a good start because of *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?*’ Indeed, it is he who arguably played the most pivotal role in conjuring up erroneous perceptions of the originality of the show, as he relentlessly recounted across multiple publications—often using identical language—its genesis and

influence (e.g. Daniel, 1953, 1954, 1986). Even the American literature is bereft of reference to the fact that AVM was a *spin-off* of the University of Pennsylvania-hosted *What in the World?* television series, which aired experimentally in 1949, then regularly and nationwide on the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) beginning in 1951 (Vogt, 1955). Similarly, it is almost impossible to find reference to the Canadian derivative of AVM, the Royal Ontario Museum-hosted *Who Knows?*, broadcast on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) in 1959, and revived in the 1970s as *What on Earth?* (TVarchive.ca, n.d.).

Where the origins of archaeological television are traced beyond AVM, it is frequently only to 1946 with the initiation of the British radio series *The Archaeologist* (another Daniel-hosted programme), which is seen to offer the foundations for televised broadcasts (Norman, 1983). But such information is inaccurate, as relevant radio shows extend back at least to the mid-1920s, with Dina Portway Dobson-Hinton's popular talks on prehistoric archaeology airing from 1926 (Daniel, 1953: 91), Leonard Woolley's six-part series *Digging Up the Past* playing in June and July of 1930,¹ and Cyril Fox's archaeological programmes at the National Museum of Wales running from the 1930s (Brittain & Clack, 2007: 14). Some evidence suggests that in the US, anthropological radio talks also had their origins around the 1930s with university-based series such as the *University of Chicago Roundtable* hosting archaeological scholars (Eiselein & Topper, 1976).

Commentators appear to dismiss these early radio shows as rare and inconsequential examples of pre-war broadcasting (e.g. Daniel, 1986: 245). However, in reality, the BBC's archives indicate that between October 1936 and June 1939, archaeological programmes for which scripts still remain were delivered by Louis Leakey, Gordon Childe, Stuart Piggott, John Garstang, and Dorothy Garrod among others; and even during the war various individuals, including Philip Corder and Cyril Fox, presented shows on archaeology and wartime bombing, and Welsh archaeology respectively.² So too is Maiden Castle featured in a 5-minute broadcast on 25 October 1936, presented by Colonel Charles Drew, the excavation co-director (alongside Mortimer Wheeler and Tessa Verney Wheeler) and curator of Dorset County Museum.³ Thus while Daniel (1954: 201) argued that in the early 1950s he had been 'assured...that dull subjects like archaeology with dull professional exponents could not recommend themselves to the B.B.C. planners of programmes', the actual line-up of broadcasts suggests that such programmes were neither scarce, nor considered dull.

More still, archaeological film was well-established before this timeframe, with Stern (2007) dating the earliest filmic production of the subject to 1897, and Beale and Healy (1975: 889-890) reviewing a series of films made in situ in the 1920s through 1940s which stand as ‘visual ethnographies of the archaeology of a bygone era’ (e.g. at Mt. Carmel with Garrod in the early 1930s, and at Olduvai Gorge with Leakey in 1931). The Filming Antiquity Project similarly documents early archaeology films, including footage of Henry Wellcome’s excavations at Jebel Moya, Sudan in 1912/13 (Saward, 2015). For Daniel and others to suggest, then, that there is no precedent or incentive for archaeological broadcasting prior to the 1950s is untenable.

The Earliest Archaeology TV Shows

Television programming came into being at the same time that archaeology as a discipline was being institutionalised around the world. In the UK, that institutionalisation played out over decades, with departments like the University of London’s Institute of Archaeology launching a variety of very visible campaigns to secure space, intellectual endorsement, public approval and financing for their foundation (Perry, 2011). Mortimer Wheeler, the first director of the IoA, was one among several key players in such campaigns—and it is seemingly through him that the suggestion of televising archaeology was vetted, when one of the miniscule body of BBC Talks producers, Mary Adams, contacted him to this effect in May 1937. Writing to Wheeler at the London Museum (now the Museum of London) where he was then also its director, Adams explained:

I don’t know whether you have seen a Television screen, but it is obvious that archaeological material has great possibilities for us. I would very much like to interest you in our work here, and to discuss with you what might be done.

As an experiment, I would like to arrange a Television demonstration of the Maiden Castle excavations. We can show models, objects of all sorts (provided they are not too small), drawings, photographs, and of course films. I was looking at the section model of Maiden Castle in Regent’s Park [i.e., the Institute of Archaeology] the other day, and thought it would televise well.

Of course we should be delighted to show you something of our Television programmes, wither here or at Broadcasting House. If you had time to come to Alexandra Palace, I could show you the studios and tell you something of our technique.⁴

Adams was in communication with Wheeler just six months after the launch of Britain's television service, and only two weeks after the official opening of the IoA. Moreover, her letter testifies to the fact that not only had she already visited the Institute, but she was familiar with the televisual potential of its excavation programmes partly as a result of seeing the IoA's visual media on display there (i.e. Maiden Castle's section model; see Figure 1). It was seemingly Adams, then, who called for the earliest TV broadcast of archaeology.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

This call is significant not least because, typically, the implicit assumption in modern retellings of the era is that Wheeler instigated his own television career as part of an egomaniacal propaganda campaign. Piggott (1977: 640), in describing Wheeler's TV aura, noted, 'His artistry always included a keen sense of drama, and he was a natural showman with more than a little vanity...The British public found him irresistible'. But in fact, Wheeler did not star in any of the earliest television broadcasts, and in reflecting on his TV presence to David Attenborough in 1953, he was clear to cite Adams as its instigator:

I feel sure you will understand that having been lured into this business by the wiles of Mary Adams (bless her), I was amused to have some small share in it during the formative stage. But going on with it indefinitely now that it seems to be more or less established is another matter.⁵

Indeed, it appears to be Mary Adams' scientific training at University College Cardiff and Cambridge, and her position as adult education officer at the BBC, that drew her to specific subject matters like archaeology (Haines, 2001). Bowler (2009: 212) suggests that Adams was motivated by an interest to make scientific methodology intelligible to

the public, and to initiate a collective conversation about its social consequences (cf. Jones, 2012). Indeed, Adams' job seems to have entailed locating appropriate academic subjects and accredited representatives to provide to viewers 'information with an informal approach' (Haines 2001: 3); or as Adams (1949: 203) herself put it, to spotlight educational topics most likely to 'profit' from the television: 'the more practical ones, such as science or craftsmanship, or those in which the visual sequence is itself sufficient for the lesson'. In this sense, archaeology aligned perfectly with the BBC's dual agenda to both entertain and educate its audiences, and so too did the discipline's very visual nature satisfy the primary interests of TV producers.

Maiden Castle Broadcast

Just four weeks after Adams' letter to Wheeler, a short television segment on the 25th anniversary of the London Museum aired on 9 June 1937, hosted by its Assistant Keeper, Martin Holmes, and scripted and coordinated with Wheeler's direction.⁶ More pertinently, Adams was referred to Kathleen Kenyon at the Institute of Archaeology and, ultimately, to the IoA's Assistant Secretary and Maiden Castle volunteer/press assistant, Margot Eates, who on 14 July 1937 hosted a 15-minute talk on Maiden Castle (see Figure 2).

INSERT FIGURE 2

This talk arguably represents the first archaeological TV programme in the world for which records survive. Only four other shows with archaeological-esque topics were aired around the same time, including an 8-minute talk on 7 January 1937 by the antiquary G.F. Lawrence titled 'Underneath London'; a 12-minute talk on 22 June 1937 by J.M. Marshall entitled 'Into the Stone Age of 1937' (a dubious account of modern indigenous New Guineans); and two very brief features on the BBC's weekly *Picture Page* segments of 7 July 1937 and 15 December 1937 on, respectively, A.M. Blackman's archaeological expedition to Egypt and Frank Cottril's demonstration of Roman pottery from Edgware. Effectively no information survives about such shows,

although BBC records are clear that none were as substantial in terms of time as the IoA's Maiden Castle broadcast (BBC, 1937-38).

While the script for this IoA broadcast seems to have been lost, and while the live-to-air nature of early television negated recording of the show, various pieces remain of Eates and Adams' detailed preparatory correspondence, alongside BBC notes on camera angles and display materials. Based on these records, the talk acted not just as a showcase for Maiden Castle's archaeology, but also as a spectacle of and financial investment in the IoA's products. Adams provided specific directions on the appropriate graphic content for the show, and Eates engaged the Institute's staff (including its photographer Maurice 'Cookie' Cookson, and its Repair Laboratory assistants Ione Gedye and Delia Parker) to produce such content:

On mature consideration, I feel that two models at least would be of the greatest help in making the successive civilisations that have passed over Maiden Castle, clear to the Television audience. These are a section through a Neolithic square-bottomed ditch, with, perhaps, the figure of a man using a deer-horn pick such as I shall show, and a section through an Iron Age dwelling pit, with a model of a dog inside, to represent the dog skeleton that was found.

May I, therefore, have your written authorisation to ask Miss Parker and Miss Gedye to proceed at once with the making of these?

The production of a contoured model of a corner of the fortifications does not seem very practicable in the time and within the means at our disposal, and I suggest that we should rely for the general plan and layout on some of our excellent official photos. I will enquire of our official photographer the price of suitable enlargements...⁷

The BBC, in fact, then fed directly into the economic wealth of the IoA, as Eates' final fee of £15 15s 0d included funding for the Institute's production of the 'making of special models, and provision of other illustrative material including photographic enlargements'.⁸

The significance of such outputs cannot be overstated. When it became apparent that some of the visualisations originally promised to the Maiden Castle programme would be denied in the final broadcast, Adams wrote to Eates:

Our first consideration, as you know, is to secure adequate visual material. I was a little disappointed to hear that Dr. Wheeler had decided against a specially constructed model of a neolithic ditch. I understand, however, that he sees no objection to a simple reconstruction of an Iron Age Dwelling Pit – with, let us hope, a model of a dog inside. That means that we have two models in all, and that we shall have to rely for the general picture on photographs and the diagram you showed me.⁹

This exchange is meaningful on multiple levels, particularly given that, in what appears to be the only published archaeological acknowledgement of the TV show, Hawkes (1982: 167) suggests Wheeler was unconcerned about television, perceiving it to be a likely ‘waste [of] his time’, and hence offloading its responsibility onto Eates. But, just as with Holmes’ London Museum broadcast wherein Wheeler was implicated in script and collections advisement, he did indeed appear to have some control over the Maiden Castle transmission, revealing himself as an adjudicator of both its oral and visual content.

As Eates noted on 27 June 1937:

a plan of the best way to present the available material most attractively in conformity with the medium has occurred to me, and I will get on at once with the script, which Dr. Wheeler is anxious to see as soon as possible. I will incorporate in the script the list of the visual material and let you have it as soon as Dr. Wheeler has seen it.¹⁰

And one day later:

The model of the Pit Dwelling is well in hand, and Dr. Wheeler suggested that we might include the figure of a man as well as of the dog. My script is now with Dr. Wheeler with whom I shall discuss any alterations on Thursday, and you shall have it at the earliest possible moment.¹¹

Arguably, what differs between this broadcast and later productions such as AVM is that the former stands uniquely as a spectacle of disciplinary visual presentation rather than of disciplinary personality. The Maiden Castle show was a literal procession of graphic media, as testified to by the planned camera shots for the broadcast (see Figure 3).

INSERT FIGURE 3

The programme seemingly opened on the line, ‘You are looking at a model of the ramparts of Maiden Castle in Dorset’, and the model (resting on a turntable) figured as the sole focus of the first shot.¹² As a result, Eates was immediately situated as subordinate to the archaeological visuals. Indeed, amongst the 16 total anticipated camera shots, 10 were oriented exclusively towards graphic materials (i.e. three models, two air photos, a map, chart of dates, a diagram of stratification, one ground photo and one artefact photo), two were concentrated on Eates’ physical exhibition of over a

dozen artefacts from the site, and only four appeared to prioritise Eates herself. So significant was this material that the BBC was willing to insure it for more than £75, as well as to invest in the special shipping of a model prehistoric loom weight to the television studio, and to pay £16 to the Institute to repair a deer-horn pick that was broken along a pre-existing mend-line during transportation.¹³

Such privileging of graphic media was to be expected given that it was then the priority of the BBC. As Adams (1949: 202-3) proclaimed about the earliest educational TV shows, ‘A dominating personality sometimes takes interest away from the details of an experiment or demonstration. There is little value in watching a man talking...The speaker can often best act as an unseen impersonal catalyst...’. This description contrasts with later shows like AVM which, although ostensibly about museum objects, had evolved to become far more concerned with character and charisma. As Gathercole et al. (2006: 156-157) note of AVM, ‘Much depended on the verve of the chairman and on the personalities of the panel, especially the flamboyant Sir Mortimer Wheeler. The significance of the objects and the seriousness of the particular museum’s challenge came last.’ While Eates may have been known to the public owing to her role in providing on-site media briefings about Maiden Castle (Hawkes, 1982: 166), the planned layout of the BBC television broadcast was clearly attuned not to her, but to the archaeological record and its visual representation. In so doing, this foundational TV show had important ramifications for the Institute of Archaeology, feeding into work for its staff, money for its administrative operation, and visibility for its vast graphic repertoire and expertise.

IoA Demonstration Broadcast

Four months after the Maiden Castle talk, Eates and Adams were again in communication about the production of further television programmes, such that by 16 December 1937 the IoA starred in what appears to be the world’s first practical televised broadcast of archaeological methodology (see Figure 4).

INSERT FIGURE 4

Representing another 15-minute presentation hosted by Eates, the show was officially catalogued under the description:

EXPERIMENTS IN SCIENCE (VI)—Reconstructing the Past: A Demonstration of the reconstruction of prehistoric fragments of pottery from Maiden Castle by MARGOT EATES of the Institute of Archaeology, assisted by DELIA PARKER and IRENE [sic] GEDYE, with photographs and representative pieces of pottery (BBC, 1937-38).

Neither the script, nor visual footage, nor most of the organisational correspondence for the broadcast survive, however it is nonetheless evident that the show functioned as a showpiece for the IoA's way of practice. As Eates wrote to Adams:

Here is the 'story', which I promised to Mr. Miller Jones the other day. I found, as I went along, that it developed into something very like a script, because of the accurate timing needed for the transition between the processes. Miss Parker and Miss Gedye and I have given it two rough rehearsals...

Mr. Miller Jones suggested that we might arrive at the studios before the actual rehearsal, and go over the thing in your office, but it is a very messy and slightly complicated business, and we feel, after our trial trips, that it might be better if you or Mr. Miller Jones could come over here in about a week's time, and have a fairly full rehearsal of the processes at least in the laboratory, where the mess doesn't matter. You could then make any alterations you wished in the sequence and timing, before actually making your continuity [i.e., planning the camera shots], and at the same time I could offer you a better selection of similar photographs to choose from that I can submit to you by post.¹⁴

The broadcast appeared to aim at replicating a laboratory experiment on television—and, critically, that experiment exactly mirrored the activities of the Institute's Repair Lab, whose central concern was for 'the repair of pottery, the treatment of archaeological objects of all sorts and the construction of archaeological models' (IoA, 1938: 20). Indeed, the Repair Lab's only two personnel, Gedye and Parker, became stars of the programme alongside Eates, and the nature of the broadcast—in terms of its focus on the reconstructive process and its exposure of the messiness of such process—seems to have been uncannily reminiscent of student memories of the Lab itself under Gedye's tutelage (circa 1950) (see Perry, 2011).

Such demonstration of procedure, as recollected by alumni, was a critical part of becoming an archaeologist in the mid-20th century. So too was it the foundation of the BBC's science and educational programming of the time (see Adams, 1949; Jones, 2012). Eates' BBC broadcast on pottery reconstruction therefore represented both an extension and a sanctification of the procedure – and of the IoA itself – beyond the classroom. In other words, via the show, the Institute and the BBC furnished viewers

with a technical lesson on archaeological methodology which was unparalleled in that era.

Indeed, given its novelty, the show had the potential to redefine the boundaries of archaeological practice, and to legitimate the Institute as a key expert in such practice. For the broadcast was effectively about the presentation of a visual methodology, and therein it presaged programmes like *Time Team*, which are often assumed to be amongst the first television shows to attend to methods/objectives ahead of finds (e.g. Ascherson, 2004: 155-156), by nearly 60 years. In so doing, it provided graphic testimony to the IoA's institutional mission and proficiencies.

Moreover, the BBC broadcast enabled the IoA and the subject of archaeology to push itself outwards, directly into the homes of the viewing public. This accessibility is important because even though viewership was incredibly limited at the time, with just 2000 television sets sold in the UK by the end of 1937 and reception available only within a 40-mile radius of London (Bell, 1986: 66; Briggs, 1985: 168), TV represented an entirely new mode of engagement. As Ellis (2004) frames it, unlike the standard cinema-going experience, which would have been far more familiar to audiences of the 1930s than would television, TV viewing was not necessarily anonymous, impersonal, silent, immobile and bathed in darkness, but rather more casual and direct. The opening line of Eates' original Maiden Castle broadcast perfectly encapsulates such directness, as the narrator speaks immediately to her viewers: 'You are looking at a model of the ramparts of Maiden Castle in Dorset'. This style of presentation is effective precisely because it relates to viewers personally, as if in an active discussion. Viewers, then, do not have to leave their home to enter the IoA and subscribe to its scientific method of archaeology. Unlike the lecture or exhibition, the television broadcast—in this case, the literal visual replication of the IoA's Repair Laboratory—is brought directly to the personal spaces of the public.

Such laboratory-oriented TV exposure for the Institute was especially pertinent given that Eates' 16 December 1937 'Reconstructing the Past' broadcast was the last in a series of six shows on 'Experiments in Science', a heterogeneous set of 15-minute programmes airing just after 21.00 every second Thursday from 7 October 1937. The series culminated in Eates' pottery demonstration, and was a testament to the evolution of (not to mention the BBC's championing of) new lines of scientific enquiry. While, again, no archival records survive concerning the origins and intent of the overall series, the programme line-up suggests it functioned as a forum for experimental performances

of emerging—and, in some cases, now discredited—empirical research paradigms. Indeed, each of the shows was fronted by revolutionary, often controversial, scholars of the time, including Sir Cyril Burt (a founder of the discipline of educational psychology), Winifred Raphael (a pioneer of occupational psychology), the baronet Sir Richard Paget (famous for his development of the Paget Gorman Signed Speech method—a system of communication for those with speech and language impairments), and Charlotte Wolff (a groundbreaking chirologist). These specialists were notable for the novelty and/or instability of many of their respective disciplinary pursuits: the gestural theory behind Paget’s research was unprecedented, as were Wolff’s questionable psychological diagnoses based on hand reading; and not only was archaeology still solidifying intellectually and materially in the first half of the 20th century, but so too was occupational and educational psychology.

Arguably, the BBC’s ‘Experiments in Science’ series stood itself, then, as an experiment in acclimatizing the public to novel interpretive regimes. Each episode appeared to allow the technical components of these regimes to be laid bare to viewers via physical demonstration of the scientific processes underpinning them. Such experimental replication harks back to what Shapin (1988) and Shapin and Schaffer (1985) saw at work in 17th century British scientific circles where creditable knowledge-making hinged upon its performance within venues facilitating visibility and witnessing. Intellectual claims reaped their legitimacy, here, through shared exposure; as Shapin (1988: 404) puts it, acceptance of the validity of experimental practice was premised upon ‘public familiarity with the phenomena or upon public acquaintance with those who make the claims.’

Broadcasts such as ‘Experiments in Science’ were important precisely because they seemingly enabled *both*: that is, familiarity with the essence of the science, *and* with its producers. They briefed viewers on the procedural realisation of new knowledge claims, and they did so by calling upon the actual originators of that procedure—the innovators and intellectual capital holders themselves.

The IoA obviously stood to gain academically from such expert posturing, but so too did the BBC. The Corporation was prepared to cite its new television service as a highly innovative experiment-in-progress open to assessment by public witnesses. As per the Deputy Director-General, audiences outside of London would have to ‘Wait and see’ how this service would impact upon them, but ‘If you can afford a television set,

and if you live near enough to Alexandra Palace, the next few months will be full of interest. You will be watching the beginnings of a new art' (Carpendale, 1936: 5).

Indeed, the first official *Radio Times* 'Television Supplement' was clear to position the BBC at the forefront of innovation, and, in the same breath, to hint at the Corporation's own conceptual agendas: 'the coming of television has opened up prospects exciting even in this age of scientific marvels. Those who are following its growth are seeing the development of an amazing extension of human powers, the end of which we can hardly foresee' (*Radio Times*, 1937: 1). In this way, the BBC parallels the IoA at the time, investing in media—and subject matter—that could further its reach and interests. Both were concerned to employ television to insinuate science (archaeological science in the case of the Institute) into public culture.

But the IoA profited from the medium on political and economic grounds as well. In its 'Reconstructing the Past' broadcast, the IoA enrolled three of its employees in representing the organisation on the air. In so doing, it set in place a mass of expertise, for roughly 40% of its total staff thus figured in the show. The Institute's remuneration increased by almost £6 over that for the July 1937 Maiden Castle programme. In full, it earned £21 for 'the services of self [Eates] and all persons taking part, supply of visual material and insurance and transport of same'.¹⁵

Such income was significant given that Eates was apparently employed at the IoA at a rate of just £3 per week (Hawkes, 1982: 226), and the Institute's entire expenditure on salaries for the year 1937-1938 was only £203 5s 0d, including National Insurance coverage (IoA, 1939: 23). Moreover, the payment included provision for extra graphic aids, and as per Eates' correspondence with Adams, these seemed partly comprised of the IoA's photography. As such, not only did the Institute's staff and methods take starring roles, but so too did its related visual outputs. These outputs were a key form of sustenance for the IoA, and arguably, had they not been available for exploitation by the BBC, the discipline—and the IoA's work in particular—might not have been subject to such early televising.

Conclusion: Media as Capital

These interdependencies hint at the embedded and accumulative potential of graphic products, as one catalyses the creation of another, and the discipline (in this case

through the Institute) then profits in an escalating manner from such interactions. Indeed, these media are ripe with institution-fuelling momentum. Eates' television broadcasts provide an apt example, for akin to Boon's (2008: 9) observations on early scientific moving pictures, they are locations where 'several different kinds of scientific and technological activity coincid[e].' They demonstrate the science itself, the technical instrumentation behind its manifestation, and the expert bodies at the heart of the practice. But so too do they represent currency for the IoA, both in monetary terms and via public endorsement by a national corporation (the BBC) utilising a cutting-edge scientific technology (TV) accessible to an expanding audience. To invest in them then, was to invest in resources with reverberating added value. Indeed, the Repair Lab went on to become the Technical Department and subsequently the Conservation Department, with Gedye and Parker training amongst the earliest cohorts of accredited conservation professionals in the world. What is critical is that this value was recognized by archaeologists and broadcasters from the onset of television, setting the stage for later series such as AVM and *Time Team*, not to mention the continued growth of the discipline.

Acknowledgments

This article is indebted to many individuals and institutions, only a fraction of whom I am able to mention here. My great appreciation goes to the BBC Written Archives Centre, the Museum of London, UCL Special Collections, UCL Institute of Archaeology, Rachael Sparks, Ian Carroll, Pamela Jane Smith and especially Stephanie Moser, Andy Jones, Sam Smiles and Ian Kirkpatrick, who variously provided access to the archival record and much constructive criticism and debate.

Bibliography

Adams, M. 1949. Television and Education. *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 97: 195-203.

Ascherson, N. 2004. Archaeology and the British Media. In: N. Merriman, ed. *Public Archaeology*. London: Routledge, pp. 145-158.

Beale, T. & Healy, P. 1975. Archaeological Films: The Past as Present. *American Anthropologist*, 77(4): 889-97.

Bell, E. 1986. The Origins of British Television Documentary: The BBC 1946-1955. In: J. Corner, ed. *Documentary and the Mass Media*. London: Edward Arnold, pp. 65-80.

Boon, T. 2008. *Films of Fact: A History of Science in Documentary Films and Television*. London: Wallflower Press.

Bowler, P. 2009. *Science for All: The Popularization of Science in Early Twentieth-Century Britain*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Briggs, A. 1985. *The BBC: The First Fifty Years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brittain, M. & Clack, T. 2007. Introduction: Archaeology and the Media. In: T. Clack and M. Brittain, eds. *Archaeology and the Media*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 11-65.

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). 1937-38. *BBC Television Programme Records*, Volume 1. London: BBC.

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). 2013. *Archaeology at the BBC*. [online] [accessed 28 October 2013]. Available at:
<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/collections/p018818x/archaeology-at-the-bbc>>

Carpendale, C. 1936. The Coming of Television. *Radio Times (Television Number)* 53(682): 5.

Clack, T. & Brittain, M. eds. 2007. *Archaeology and the Media*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Daniel, G. 1953. Archaeology on the Air. *BBC Quarterly*, 8(2): 89-95.

Daniel, G. 1954. Archaeology and Television. *Antiquity*, 28(112): 201-205.

Daniel, G. 1986. *Some Small Harvest: The Memoirs of Glyn Daniel*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Eiselein, E. & Topper, M. 1976. A Brief History of Media Anthropology. *Human Organization*, 35(2): 123-134.

Ellis, J. 2004. Broadcast TV as Sound and Image. In: L. Braudy and M. Cohen, eds. *Film Theory and Criticism*. 6th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 395-404.

Fox, R.L. 2013. Robin Lane Fox Introduces the Archaeology Collection. [online] [accessed 6 December 2016]. Available at: <
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/1JlpjtFWKR4kLht2rXvINkm/robin-lane-fox-introduces-the-archaeology-collection>>

Gathercole, P., Stanley, J. & Thomas, N. 2006. Cornwall Archaeological Society – Devon Archaeological Society joint symposium 2003: Archaeology and the Media. In: G. Kirkham and P. Herring, eds. *Cornish Archaeology*, 41-42. Truro: Cornwall Archaeological Society, pp. 149-158.

Haines, C. 2001. *International Women in Science: A Biographical Dictionary to 1950*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Hawkes, J. 1982. *Mortimer Wheeler: Adventurer in Archaeology*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hutton, G. 1950. The Challenge of Television. *BBC Quarterly*, 5(4): 193-199.

Institute of Archaeology (IOA). 1938. *University of London Institute of Archaeology First Annual Report, 1937*. London: University of London, Institute of Archaeology.

Institute of Archaeology (IOA). 1939. *University of London Institute of Archaeology Second Annual Report, 1937-38*. London: University of London, Institute of Archaeology.

Jones, A. 2012. Mary Adams and the Producer's role in Early BBC Science Broadcasts. *Public Understanding of Science*, 21: 968-983.

Jordan, P. 1981. Archaeology and Television. In: J.D. Evans, B. Cunliffe and C. Renfrew, eds. *Antiquity and Man. Essays in Honour of Glyn Daniel*. London: Thames and Hudson, pp. 207-213.

Kulik, K. 2005. Mediating Archaeology: The Relationship Between Archaeology, the Media and the Public in Britain (1996-2002). PhD thesis, University of Southampton.

Kulik, K. 2007. A Short History of Archaeological Communication. In: T. Clack & M. Brittain, eds. *Archaeology and the media* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 111-124.

McGivern, C. 1950. The Big Problem. *BBC Quarterly*, 5(3): 142-9.

Moore, R.W. 1950. Television: A Cautionary Approach. *BBC Quarterly*, 5(1): 8-12.

Norman, B. 1983. Archaeology and Television. *Archaeological Review From Cambridge* 2(1): 27-32.

Perry, S. 2011. The Archaeological Eye: Visualisation and the Institutionalisation of Academic Archaeology in London. PhD thesis, University of Southampton.

Piggott, S. 1977. Robert Eric Mortimer Wheeler, 10 September 1890-22 July 1976. *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, 23: 623-642.

Radio Times. 1937. Untitled. *Radio Times (Television Supplement)*, 8 January, p. 1.

Saward, A. 2015. A Cinematographic Record: A Day at Jebel Moya, 1912-13. [online] [accessed 6 December 2016]. Available at: <<http://www.filmingantiquity.com/blog/a-cinematographic-record-a-day-at-jebel-moya-1912-13>>

Shapin, S. 1988. The House of Experiment in Seventeenth-Century England. *Isis*, 79 (3): 373-404.

Shapin, S. & Schaffer, S. 1985. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stern, T. 2007. 'Worldwonders' and 'Wonderworlds': A Festival of Archaeological Film. In: T. Clack & M. Brittain, eds. *Archaeology and the Media*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 201-219.

TVarchive.ca. n.d. Who Knows? [online] [accessed 28 October 2013]. Available at: <http://www.tvarchive.ca/database/19030/who_knows/details/>

Vogt, E. 1955. Anthropology in the Public Consciousness. *Yearbook of Anthropology*, 1: 357-74.

West, A. 1988. Archaeology and Film: The Unequal Partnership. MA dissertation, University of South Carolina.

Acknowledgements

This article is indebted to many individuals and institutions, only a fraction of whom I am able to mention here. My great appreciation goes to the BBC Written Archives Centre, the Museum of London, UCL Special Collections, UCL Institute of Archaeology, Rachael Sparks, Ian Carroll, Pamela Jane Smith, and especially Stephanie Moser, Andy Jones, Sam Smiles, and Ian Kirkpatrick, who variously provided access to the archival record and much constructive criticism and debate.

This work was supported by a generous Doctoral Fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2007-2010) and an Overseas Research Student Award from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (2007-2010).

Notes on contributor

Sara Perry is Director of Studies of Digital Heritage and Lecturer in Cultural Heritage Management at the University of York, UK. Her research centres on the development, circulation and evaluation of analogue and digital media for archaeology and heritage sites. She directs a series of international heritage interpretation programmes at the University of York in England, at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük in Turkey, and at the UNESCO site of Memphis, the capital of ancient Egypt. She is also a primary investigator on the EU-funded EMOTIVE Project, which crafts digital experiences for visitors to cultural sites using ubiquitous dramatic tropes (mystery, romance, comedy, etc.).

Correspondence to: Dr Sara Perry, Department of Archaeology, University of York, King's Manor, York, UK YO1 7EP. Email: sara.perry@york.ac.uk

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9694-000X>

Twitter: @archaeologistsp

Blog: <http://saraperry.wordpress.com>



Figure 1. Models and related objects on display in the foyer of the Institute of Archaeology's first home, St. John's Lodge in Regent's Park, London. Although taken in the 1950s, alumni testify to the long history of exhibiting the IoA's visual products in this entrance space (see Perry, 2011). Image courtesy of UCL Institute of Archaeology.

ROGRAMMES

WEDNESDAY JULY 14 VISION 45 Mc/s
THURSDAY JULY 15 SOUND 41.5 Mc/s

Wednesday

3.0 'PYRAMUS AND THISBE'

A most lamentable comedy contained in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, by William Shakespeare

Bottom.....Wilfrid Walter
Quince.....Charles Lefcaux
Flute.....Don Gemmell
Snout.....Eric Chitty
Snug.....Herbert Lees
Starveling.....Hubert Leslie
Theseus.....John Rudling
Philstrate.....Kenneth Villiers
Hippolyta.....Jillian Sandilands

Produced by Jan Bussell

3.15 Film 'DEEP SEA THRILLS'

This film shows a very unusual form of angling—swordfishing. The sport is thrilling and sometimes dangerous; the rod is often strapped to the angler's body. Much spectacular work has to be done before the fisherman can fly the flag that denotes a catch.



3.25 A REVIEW OF REVUES

Produced by Dallas Bower
The BBC Television Orchestra
Leader, Boris Pecker
Conductor, Hyam Greenbaum

In this retrospective show Dallas Bower will present excerpts from some of the television revues he has been responsible for in the past. As far as is possible, the artists who took part in the original productions will be seen today.

3.50 GAUMONT BRITISH NEWS

4.0 CLOSE

9.0 A RECITAL

by MARITA FARELL (soprano)

Accompanied by Cyril Belcher

9.10 MAIDEN CASTLE

Margot Eates

Centuries before the Romans came to Britain, Maiden Castle was a fortified town. Experts think that its age is probably not less than four thousand years. It is certainly the finest specimen of earthwork in the British Isles, with its banks and ditches and labyrinthine entrances at each end. Its total area is 115 acres. Excavations in the last few years have brought to light hundreds of pit dwellings. This week archaeological work has been re-commenced under the direction of Dr. Mortimer Wheeler, who will not be present in the studio today. Instead, a talk will be given by Margot Eates, Official Lecturer on Maiden Castle Excavations, Honorary Lecturer to the London Museum, and Relief Lecturer to the British Museum.



The son of a famous family, BERNARD TUSSAUD, at work on a model of His Majesty. He will demonstrate his methods on Thursday.

Thursday

3.0 ANTON DOLIN

(by permission of the Markova-Dolin Ballet)

in 'BOLERO'

to music by Ravel
with
The BBC Television Orchestra
Leader, Boris Pecker
Conductor, Hyam Greenbaum

3.15 THE WAXWORKS

'Behind the Scenes'
A Demonstration by Bernard Tussaud

Bernard Tussaud is a direct descendant of Marie Gresholtz, who in 1795 married the famous 'Duke of Wellington'.

3.35 'DAMON AND PHYLLIDA'

by Mr. Gay

Arcas.....Robert Holmes
Mopsus.....Franklyn Kelsey
Cimon.....Geoffrey Dunn
Aegon.....Quentin Tod
Corydon.....Frank Birch
Damon.....Wilson Barrett
Phyllida.....Joan Collier

The BBC Television Orchestra
Leader, Boris Pecker
Conductor, Hyam Greenbaum
Dances arranged by Quentin Tod
Produced by Stephen Thomas

4.0 CLOSE

9.0 ANTON DOLIN

(Details as at 3.0)

Figure 2. Detail of schedule advertising Margot Eates' 15-minute television broadcast on Maiden Castle at 9.10pm on Wednesday 14 July. From the Radio Times Television Supplement, 9 Jul 1937. Image reproduced by kind permission of Radio Times (and annotated by author).




Figure 3. Anticipated camera angles for Eates' 14 July 1937 broadcast (BBC WAC, T32/243). Image courtesy of BBC.

RADIO TIMES, ISSUE DATED DECEMBER 10, 1937 21

TELEVISION of the WEEK

Transmission by the Marconi-EMI system. Vision, 45 Mc/s. Sound, 41.5 Mc/s. All timings on this page are approximate.

From 11.0 a.m. to 12.0 noon each day, films intended for demonstration purposes will be shown.

MONDAY, December 13

3.0 RONALD FRANKAU

3.10 NEWS FILM : British Movie-tonews

3.20-4.0 THE VIC-WELLS BALLET COMPANY (by permission of the Old Vic) in Act 2 of 'Le Lac des Cygnes'. Music by Tchaikovsky. Choreography by Marius Petipa. Produced by Serguéeff. Costumes designed by Hugh Stevenson. Décor by Peter Bax.

Alexandra Palace's Swan-Lake

'A lake in a mountainous part of the country.' That is how the scene of Tchaikovsky's *Le Lac des Cygnes*, to be televised on Monday, is described. On the stage this setting offers a grand opportunity for 'atmosphere', a mood of extreme beauty oppressed by sinister gloom and a fate that will not be denied. It is not so easy, this atmosphere business, in the television studio, where stereoscopy is still a dream and the cameras have a colour prejudice against every tint but grey. Despite all this, Peter Bax, for the first time in television, has designed a setting with the express intention of conveying a mood instead of merely a back-

found Lilian Baylis, for all her reputation of being 'difficult', a charming person to work with.

There have been inquiries as to the origin of the trumpet fanfare at the beginning of the demonstration film presented at 11 a.m. every morning. The music has no history, other than that it was composed by A. J. Hartley, who looks after the music side of television. Hartley's office is now next door to the studio. He shares it with the announcers and conductor Hyam Greenbaum, but the main reason for its largeness is that it is the home of hundreds of musical scores and gramophone records.

3.30-4.0 'PROLOGUE TO KING LEAR', a comedy by Ferenc Molnar, adapted for television and produced by Eric Crozier

9.0 EVELYN DALL in Songs

9.5 EXPERIMENTS in SCIENCE, No. 6. Reconstructing the Past. A demonstration conducted by Margot Eates, of the Institute of Archaeology

9.20 NEWS FILM : British Movie-tonews

9.30-10.0 'GENIUS AT HOME', by Elizabeth Drew, with Joyce Bland as Jane Carlyle, Walter Fitzgerald as Thomas Carlyle, Yvette Pienne as Geraldine Jewsbury. Production by Royston Morley

FRIDAY, December 17

3.30-4.0 'PROLOGUE TO KING LEAR', a comedy by Ferenc Molnar, adapted for television and produced by Eric Crozier

9.0 EVELYN DALL in Songs

9.5 EXPERIMENTS in SCIENCE, No. 6. Reconstructing the Past. A demonstration conducted by Margot Eates, of the Institute of Archaeology

9.20 NEWS FILM : British Movie-tonews

9.30-10.0 'GENIUS AT HOME', by Elizabeth Drew, with Joyce Bland as Jane Carlyle, Walter Fitzgerald as Thomas Carlyle, Yvette Pienne as Geraldine Jewsbury. Production by Royston Morley

Figure 4. Detail of schedule advertising Margot Eates, Delia Parker and Ione Gedye's 15-minute television demonstration of prehistoric pottery reconstruction, EXPERIMENTS in SCIENCE, No. 6, airing at 9.05pm on Thursday 16 December.

From the Radio Times Television Supplement, 10 Dec 1937. Image reproduced by kind permission of Radio Times (and annotated by author).

Endnotes

¹ BBC Written Archives Centre (hereafter BBC WAC), S322/109.

² BBC WAC, Archaeology, Scripts Only, Cue Cards.

³ Dorset County Museum 1321, Correspondence Box 4.

⁴ BBC WAC, TVART1, Wheeler Personal File, 13 May 1937.

⁵ BBC WAC, TVART1, Wheeler Personal File, 8 Sep 1953.

⁶ Museum of London, DC4.

⁷ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File, 27 Jun 1937.

⁸ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File, 28 Jun 1937 invoice.

⁹ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File, 28 Jun 1937.

¹⁰ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File.

¹¹ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File.

¹² BBC WAC, T32/243, Opening Announcement, 14 Jul 1937.

¹³ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File.

¹⁴ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File, 20 Nov 1937.

¹⁵ BBC WAC, TVART1, Eates Personal File, Invoice for Experiments in Science No. 6, 2 Dec 1937.