Introduction
Women's Work in Film Production
Concepts, Materials, and Methods

> I was working as a production assistant with an older male director who, in the office, praised my strong production skills and then, on set, would introduce me as his "assistant," which was not my job title but made him look better. It was extremely frustrating.
>
> —Anonymous woman, age 23, production assistant and writer, 2017

> When you're in an all-woman crew you don't realize you're a woman; you're just being you in your job. . . . It must be what men have a lot of the time.
>
> —Elaine Drainville, sound recordist, 2015

This book is about work, specifically work done by women in film production in the twentieth century. It is about what that work entailed and how value was attached to it by the industry, society, and film history. It shows how the skills women brought to the workplace were learned and not innate, and that if we look differently at their working lives, we can write histories that disrupt the present. There is much invested in doing this. Debates about low and unequal pay proliferate alongside ongoing concerns about gender and racial bias in the media industries. Women's contribution to contemporary film production (post-2000) is scrutinized by journalists, activists, and academics, and tracking surveys provide much-needed evidence of gender bias and segregation in Hollywood and Britain.[1] Much of this debate focuses on the more recent years, but this

book's historical perspective offers valuable insight into how workplace customs and traditions became gendered and what that meant for women's working lives.

One of the common misunderstandings of women in film production is that after the pioneering days of early cinema—when women directed and headed up their own production companies—they contributed little of substance to film production until the feminist developments of the 1970s. This book challenges that view as too limiting and instead offers a fresh assessment of women and their work in the British film industry in the decades following the introduction of sound. It focuses on the six decades between 1930 and 1989, when employment in the film industry was tightly regulated by the Association of Cine-Technicians (ACT), the country's leading film union. Mapping women's work by decade, and in fiction and nonfiction filmmaking, this book examines women's economic and creative contribution to film production in the many "below-the-line" roles (that is, craft/technical labor) in which they were typically employed. It draws on unique access to ACT trade union records to sketch a diachronic map of the range and breadth of women's work in this sixty-year period, and on oral history testimony to examine synchronically the concrete reality of women's labor at particular historical junctures. It also situates women's work in the wider context of changing social expectations around women and gender roles. Providing a much-needed examination of the range, complexity, and diversity of the work performed by women, this book recovers and celebrates the scale and quality of their collective achievements while laying bare the prejudices and constraints within which they were achieved. It builds on the excellent scholarship about "pioneer" women in early cinema while revealing how much there is to be learned from the sound period. It also highlights new lines of inquiry in the relationship between women and cultural production, reflects on issues of gender and creativity, and opens up fundamental questions about how we write film history.

Women and Work in Sound-Era Cinema

Thousands of women worked in the British film industry in the decades following the introduction of sound. They worked as "continuity girls," production secretaries, negative cutters, editors, costume designers, wardrobe assistants, makeup artists, publicists, sound wave operators, researchers, librarians, paint and tracers, in-betweeners, foley artists, animation artists, matte painters, and, very occasionally, as directors, producers, and writers. They cut film, answered the phone, booked stars, sourced

obscure props, painted sets, styled hair, designed and washed costumes, ran the rushes, painted cels, chauffeured directors, and massaged egos. In sum, no history of the British film industry is complete without an understanding of their work. And yet the experiences of women in these types of roles are almost entirely absent from existing histories of most national cinemas, British or otherwise. It is only relatively recently that academic scholarship has begun to engage with women's work of the historical sound era in any sustained way. Erin Hill and J. E. Smyth have in different and complementary ways extended knowledge of women's work in Hollywood's studios, with Smyth focusing on women in senior executive roles, particularly screenwriters, and Hill analyzing women's below-the-line labor.[2] Their research marks a step change in film history, showing what can be achieved and how much is left to be done. Building on these new developments, this research shows how the absence of women is explained by two interrelated factors: (1) the widely held view that work performed by women was of low status and required no particular skills and (2) established film historiographies. I interrogate these factors in turn before outlining what new approaches are needed to bring women's labor into view.

Concepts of Women's Work

Most women in the British film industry during the historical sound era were "movie workers," a phrase coined by sociologist Leo Rosten in his 1941 study of the Hollywood film industry.[3] Movie workers were referred to as "below-the-line" labor, an industry term used in production budgets where a "line" distinguishes those with creative or managerial responsibilities (typically stars, directors, producers) from craft/technical workers. Those above the line can negotiate salaries; those below the line are paid a fixed wage set by union rates. Commonly mapped onto this is a further distinction between creative and noncreative labor, where those above the line have creative autonomy while those below merely follow instructions. Women in these below-the-line roles make a significant contribution to film production, but, as film historian Sue Harper observes, "secretaries have at all times been the grease which oiled the studio machine, yet there is very little surviving evidence about their labor and its complexities . . . [as] few people thought to document them."[4] Why should this be so?

The answers to this question can be found in how women's labor has been conceptualized. Much of their work has taken place in roles deemed auxiliary, which support others in the workforce (predominantly but not exclusively men) and free them to concentrate on tasks ascribed greater

value. For example, continuity girls—a role held exclusively by women in the British film industry—were responsible for recording detailed information about scene setups and relaying this to relevant parties when asked, effectively freeing up directors, actors, and cameramen from the burden of remembering technical details. Similarly, editing—another role heavily populated by women—was commonly perceived as a supporting function, where the job holder acts as a sounding board for the director in the pursuit of his creative vision. Moreover, success in these supporting roles comes through the effacement of one's labor—that is, the benchmark for success is to make one's work invisible to the service of the production. Director Sally Potter describes this as the "invisible labor involved in cinema," and as Potter explains, this is gendered: "Women historically have usually done the invisible work in the home and the workplace."[5] In the production hierarchy, auxiliary roles have low status.

Supporting roles are rendered further inconspicuous by the misunderstanding of them—typically by men—as consisting of purely repetitive and low-skill functions. This (mis)conception is evident in trade magazines, which took the lead in defining the business and craft of filmmaking. These were principally authored by men, who rarely engaged with the work done by women and, when they did, dismissed or ridiculed it. Two examples illustrate the point. In 1940 Britain's leading trade journal, *The Cine-Technician*, described negative cutting as "routine stuff, done more often than not by girls with no pride or interest in their jobs."[6] Such assessments conveniently forget how poor negative cutting led to torn or snagged prints, which were the bane of exhibitors, and how the work of a skilled negative cutter added to a film's profitability. Similarly, descriptions by the fan magazine *Picturegoer* of the wardrobe mistress as "the housewife of the studios," whose principal duties were "cleaning and ironing," failed to capture the job holder's advanced skills in logistics, teamwork, and problem solving, which were especially valuable on location, where facilities often had to be improvised.[7]

Indeed, the common intertwining of the domestic with the professional in descriptions of women's work points to another of the key ways in which the work women do is often not recognized *as* work. The skills and competencies that women bring to their professional roles are often assumed to be natural, a product of their biology rather than the acquisition of a set of skills or a body of knowledge acquired through practice and training. As sociologists of gender and work have argued, "Feminized occupations have been devalued since they are constructed as low skilled, and they are designated as low skill because the skills required are those that women are assumed to possess by nature rather than through

recognized processes of acquisition such as apprenticeship."[8] For example, women are commonly assumed to be naturally patient and meticulous, with an aptitude for detail work, and to have highly developed skills in communication and empathy. In the context of the film industry, the assumption of natural attributes explains women's overrepresentation in what at first glance can appear to be very different types of jobs in film production. The continuity girl and production assistant, for example, undertake secretarial tasks that require the same kind of skills in patience and attention to detail that characterizes women's work in editing or paint and trace functions in animation studios. Likewise, the wardrobe mistress, described as someone who can effortlessly tackle "sewing, dressmaking [and] repair work," because these are merely an extension of her duties as a housewife, a role for which she is predestined by virtue of her sex.[9] It is in ways such as this that professional skills in note taking, dressmaking, and cel painting, learned through thousands of hours of practice, are reframed in dominant occupational discourse as natural feminine competences. The effect of this is that women's labor is not recognized as skilled labor and is devalued; as sociologists remind us, this has real material consequences: jobs performed by women tend to pay less than those performed by men.[10] The film industry is no exception, with a production secretary earning roughly two-thirds the salary of a first assistant director, in what are effectively equivalent roles in terms of responsibility and skill. We commonly make the mistake in thinking low pay is a reflection of low skill, thus eliding the process by which "value" has been attached. Pay is not set in accordance to the value of the work done in a straightforward manner, and as labor historians have shown, setting low wages for women helped to *create* the idea that women's work was less valuable than men's.[11]

Closely linked to the idea of women's innate capacity for detail work is the notion that they have natural skills in communication and empathy, making them ideally suited to care for others. Here the research of Arlie Hoschchild on emotional labor has been invaluable in understanding the work performed by those in public-facing roles and is directly relevant to the film industry. Hoschchild defines emotional labor as that which "requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others."[12] Using the example of the flight attendant, Hoschchild shows how those in that position are required to perform "service with a smile" in order to deliver on the airline's promise of a positive travel experience for its customers. This must be performed effortlessly, as "part of the job is to disguise fatigue and irritation; . . . otherwise the labor would show in an unseemly way."[13] Such emotional labor has an exchange value—it can be "sold for a wage"—but

it also places an emotional responsibility on the worker when they carry out their everyday duties. Emotional labor relies on the performance of caring skills (empathy) and the ability to manage emotions, both within the self and others, and is central to the service and welfare industries (nursing, social work), which are dominated by women employees.

Many of the jobs undertaken by women in the film industry are service roles connected to the welfare and care of others, and, as such, the industry has relied heavily on the emotional labor of women in order to succeed. The continuity girl, production assistant, personal secretary, and wardrobe mistress have to display tact and diplomacy, to remain calm in a crisis, and to manage on-set egos if they are to perform successfully in their roles. As this study will show, continuity girls were often at the sharp end of production, as it was their job to tell other crew members—tactfully yet firmly—when something was wrong. Personal secretaries were often given tasks that bridged the public-private divide, such as buying gifts for the director's wife or, more dramatically, being asked to procure an abortionist, a request that compromised them both legally and morally.[14] Wardrobe staff, who worked closely with actors, were responsible not only for dressing stars but also for ensuring the performer arrived on set in the right frame of mind to face the camera. And even those in postproduction roles, such as editors, had to be able to work indirectly through persuasion and suggestion. As editor Anne V. Coates described it, women were well equipped to handle the director in the editing suite because they were good at "disagreeing in a certain way"—that is, avoiding direct confrontation, a skill they had learned, she claimed, through managing "cantankerous personalities" such as husbands and sulky children.[15] Emotional labor and the caring skills, resourcefulness, and discretion that foster good interpersonal relations are an essential part of moviemaking—"the grease which oiled the studio machine"—yet they are rarely recorded in official archives or studio records.

Film Historiography

The myths surrounding women's work as unskilled or biologically determined have been compounded by established film historiographies that work against bringing women's labor into view. This is because they privilege the director as the organizing principle for film scholarship, building as it does on the cherished notion in Western culture of the romantic artist as individual genius. This model is predicated on the concept—or conceit—of a single creative vision and clear authorial signature that can be traced across a body of work. Indeed, the production of a substantial

oeuvre comprised of multiple works across several years, and preferably decades, is the motherlode of auteur studies. This model of author/auteurship—which also drives publishing and film festivals—favors men and male-defined notions of long, uninterrupted careers, where success can be measured through screen credits and industry awards. As such, it is poorly equipped to deal with women's participation in film industries or indeed most forms of production, cultural or otherwise. The expectation of what feminists define as "continuous work histories" is the cornerstone of industrialized societies, a model that positions "full-time life-long commitment to employment with minimal responsibilities beyond the economic" as the norm.[16]

This is not women's norm, where the working lives of many were shaped by child care and domestic responsibilities, with employment patterns that varied over the life course. More typical are what social historian Penny Summerfield describes as "episodic" waves of working, where career and family alternatively take center stage in a woman's life.[17] Priority within this model could shift within a relatively short time span. Editor Monica Mead (discussed in chapter 5) used the term "episodic work" to describe contract working in the 1950s, where she typically worked for four or five weeks and then had a few weeks off, a pattern that characterized her working life during the years when her children were growing up. Other women chose professions like editing because, unlike directing, it did not demand extended periods of concentrated effort. Women did not lack stamina, but rather, as Virginia Woolf observes, women's lives are "always interrupted. . . . [They] never have a half hour . . . that they can call their own."[18] Interruptions have real, material consequences. Catherine Martin's research on executive secretaries shows how their working week was a mix of high-level and mundane tasks where "the constant interruptions caused by . . . secretarial duties, ma[de] it difficult . . . to gain more specialized skills or earn promotions."[19] Women's workdays are interrupted and interruptible because their work is deemed secondary to the needs of others. Subtle forms of discrimination are built into the very structure of the roles women perform, their time never their own but always at the service of someone else.

We can see this laid bare in the context of the film industry, where there are innumerable examples of women working intensely in film production for relatively short periods of time (five to six years) before leaving the industry, or shifting from one role (director, producer) to another (editing, writing) on the grounds that it fit more easily around children. Joy Batchelor moved from animation into scriptwriting, art director Peggy Gick from features into shorts and commercials, while editor Lusia Krakowska

left the film industry for teaching, where she specialized in the care of children with autism. These women, and many others, several of whom are discussed in this book, did not disappear from professional life, but they do have track records that look different from a male-defined norm, with shorter filmographies, often across different media. This makes it difficult to fit them into the gendered frameworks of established film historiography.

How, then, might we address women's absence in film history? This study offers three mechanisms to tackle the problem. First, it mobilizes the concept of the episodic or interrupted career as a lens through which to recover women's occupational labor. Second, it draws on a criterion of success that contextualizes women's achievements within discrimination. Women at all times worked in a male-dominated industry where their labor was valued differently from that of men, and their seemingly "modest" achievements should be understood in this context. Finally, it adopts a more flexible, inclusive model of creativity to accommodate the many and varied tasks women undertook in the performance of their professional duties in below-the-line roles. To do this, I draw on Hoschchild's concept of emotional labor and on two other, less commonly used definitions of "creativity" and "art." One is Elizabeth Nielson's study of costumers, where she found in their accounts of their work an expression of creativity that was "synonymous with resourcefulness . . . a kind of spontaneous adaptability . . . to make do in a hurry with very few resources."[20] I have found this description of resourcefulness-as-creativity a useful way to understand the many ingenious approaches women brought to their working lives, and I use it to recover their work as a form of creative labor. The other is the work of cultural theorist Raymond Williams, who shows how "the original general meaning of art . . . refer[ed] to any kind of skill."[21] This study adopts that definition of skill-as-art and uses it to reposition aspects of women's labor as forms of creative endeavor. My aim here is to show how, by retuning our critical bandwidth into different measures of "a career," "success," and "creativity," we can undo the rigid distinction between creative and noncreative that has excluded women from notice and begin to tackle the related problems facing film history.

Methodology and Materials

There are many innovative approaches to the study of women's film history, not least in cinema of the early period, where scholars have drawn across an impressively diverse range of traditional and often less orthodox sources, including gossip, shipping records, cookbooks, and marginalia.

This process has not only helped to bring women filmmakers into view; it has also opened up questions of evidence and the gaps and silences in the archive.[22] But much scholarship of women in early cinema focuses on senior creative roles (directors, screenwriters, producers), and other materials and methods are needed for a study of women as movie workers. Here studies of contemporary media practitioners provide a guide: research by John Caldwell, Vicki Mayer, Miranda Banks, and others who focus on production workers and production practices in clearly defined media industry contexts. These scholars of production studies typically draw on the traditions, protocols, and research questions of the social sciences, using questionnaires, surveys, interviews, ethnographic observation, and statistical data in their bid to apprehend the social life of present-day media practitioners. These methods focus on how media workers "form communities of shared practices, languages and cultural understandings of the world," the goal being to understand not individuals per se but how media practitioners as communities of workers function.[23] But production studies scholarship focuses on practitioners currently working in media production, and it lacks any historical dimension.

To investigate women in the historical movie workforce, we need a multidisciplinary approach that mobilizes the tools of traditional social sciences with those drawn from a humanities-based film history. To this end, this study brings three main data sources into dialogue: quantitative data (trade union membership records), qualitative data (oral history interviews), and the materials of traditional film history, principally trade and popular film press publications, memoirs, and other sources. Trade union records of the film industry provide empirical data about its workforce, oral histories open up people's experiences of work, while trade and press publications offer a sense of the conversation within the film industry of the day. These sources are discussed in more detail below. This study brings together the sensitivity to unorthodox forms of evidence that characterizes women's film history with a production studies approach to using interviews and statistical data to understand communities of media practitioners. By combining these different methods and triangulating across three main data sources, my ambition has been to draw a more empirically robust yet detailed and nuanced picture of women's contribution to film production than any single source or method could illuminate. This methodology is not about identifying an individual's agency through on-screen textual traces—indeed this type of film analysis is poorly equipped to understand the labor of movie workers—but instead functions to understand the roles performed by women in the film production workforce and the processes through which their collective

efforts as workers supported the film industry's outputs. The study lays down a new history of women in a particular national film context, and while British in focus, the research process itself and the implications of its outcome—particularly relating to questions of method—have far wider international applications.

Describing Work: Trade and Press Publications

One of the more valuable sources of primary materials for this study has been press publications, both trade and fan—notably, *The Cine-Technician*, *Picturegoer*, *Documentary News Letter*, and other publications produced for those working or with an interest in the film industry. These publications feature personality profiles, photographs, advertisements, studio roundups, production plans, correspondence, and industry reports, all enlivened with rumor, anecdote, and gossip. *The Cine-Technician*, for example, was published by Britain's leading film trade union and reported not only on key developments in the sector (legislation, government directives, technological changes) but also on the marriages, births, and deaths of notable members of the workforce, as well as social events hosted for industry workers and their children. Sources such as these are not unmediated reflections but should be approached as windows onto the workplace cultures we wish to study. Their lack of impartiality and investedness has significant value for film historians, as, when read from a feminist perspective, they reveal how workplace cultures and their gendered norms, habits, and practices were constructed and contested for their contemporary readership. As Robert Allen and Douglas Gomery argue, trade publications, "being contemporaneous with the events they report . . . provide a sort of baseline chronology for institutional history," and when used in conjunction with other sources, they provide valuable contextualization for understanding women's work in film.[24]

Quantifying Work: Trade Union Records

Along with press and trade publications are the membership records of Britain's leading film trade union, the Association of Cine-Technicians (ACT). This collection of records provides key information about sixty-six thousand technicians accepted for membership between 1933 and 1989, the period of the union's heyday, of which twenty thousand can be classified as film technicians. The records cover a wide range of roles, from directors to negative cutters, men as well as women, and capture data about an individual's name, age, and marital status; the role they held, who employed them, in which department; and how much they were paid. The collection as a whole provides the first comprehensive and empirically based insight into the numbers of women (and men) working in the industry, the kinds of roles they filled, and the gendering of work sectors.

Labor records and employment statistics are a well-recognized source of data for social scientists and labor/economic historians. Feminist researchers have also used statistics effectively to demonstrate women's low levels of representation in the present-day media workforce and to leverage institutional/policy change, but they have been less readily used in film history. This might be explained in part by issues of availability and preservation but also by the types of film history that have dominated scholarship. An aesthetic study written through directors, genres, and film movements (for example, the French New Wave) would have little need for quantitative data of this type. These two factors are, of course, interlinked; the type of film history we write is shaped by the availability of sources, while the preservation of sources is shaped by the types of film history deemed worthy of writing about. But union records have considerable value for tracing the types of forgotten people that make up the bulk of the film industry's workforce.[25] At an immediate level, such records are a form of textual documentation of work, making women's presence in the historical film industry visible and their labor manifest. They can be used to examine structural differences in the workforce—for example, no men got their union ticket through the continuity role, and few women were recruited as sound technicians. In some respects, this confirms what is already known or suspected, but quantitative lists are a persuasive source of evidence, especially when advocating for institutional change. Natalie Wreyford and Shelley Cobb have shown in their research on women in the contemporary British film industry how "numbers gave some sort of credibility to the inequality" experienced by women, making it "speakable, and for some, more real."[26] Chapter 2 lays out in more detail the history of the union, its eligibility criteria, the job levels it accepted, and the impact of this for writing women's film history.

Organizational records offer more than just bare numbers, however. They have what archivist Caroline Williams describes as "rich contextual layers" through which we can glimpse not only an institution's internal dialogue but also how that was shaped by wider social mores.[27] The initial inclusion, and later exclusion, of fields such as marital status on the union's records reflects changing sensibilities and legal prohibitions and constitutes quite a sensitive index of the changes in workers' rights. Moreover, because the forms were completed by workers themselves, they allow us to see the occupational vocabulary they used. Some women used

a feminine variant for a job title with a masculine suffix—"draftswoman" replaced "draftsman," for example—or constructed alternative feminine terms such as "editress." These are tantalizing traces of how women used the form to define or claim an occupational identity for themselves as women in a male-dominated business environment. Labor records work at both the macro and the micro level, allowing us to measure who did what and making visible tiny moments of individual decision.[28] Using labor records in this way and on this scale has not previously been attempted in histories of film industries, British or otherwise, and the data and synthesis presented here have the power to transform the field of study.

Qualifying the Work Experience: Oral Histories

Oral history brings a third dimension to our understanding of women's film work. Because women's experiences are often missing from, or misrepresented by, more traditional historical sources, feminist scholars have a long tradition of turning to oral history in their commitment to "uncovering and documenting women's overlooked activities in history . . . [and giving] voice to women who have not been heard."[29] As Polly Russell succinctly describes it, "Oral history methods disrupt traditional academic disciplines[,] and because disruption is central to the feminist project, the two often go hand in hand."[30] Women's individual work histories give new insights into women's experiences of work that, in turn, have the capacity to "reassert women's position as social actors and historical agents," challenging established historiographies that have too often marginalized their labor.[31] This study draws on oral history interviews—both newly recorded and legacy—with women film practitioners from a variety of roles, including continuity, editing, costume and wardrobe, animation, makeup, and sound recording. The interviews provide invaluable insight into the everyday practices, values, and cultures that shaped women's experience of the workplace. Oral testimony is particularly powerful for the ways it brings into view the different forms of emotional labor specific to the film industry. This includes not only descriptions of unpleasant tasks that women found delegated to them—production secretaries made responsible for relaying "bad" news between crew members—but also how those tasks were described. A continuity girl's recollection of being "in a state" over a misplaced prop and the possibility of a scene reshoot suggests how one of the principal functions of her job was to "worry" so that others did not have to.[32]

Archiving Women's Work: A Feminist Intervention

The decision to work with oral history was motivated by two feminist goals: (1) to put women's voices on the historical record, attending to descriptions of their work in their own words, and (2) to archive the recordings for future research and public dissemination, thereby creating a lasting record of their labor. To this end, the oral history interviews and the trade union membership records have been archived at a digital repository titled "Women's Work in British Film and Television" (available through learningonscreen.ac.uk).[33] Support for the repository came from public funds provided by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, one of the UK's leading research organizations, which also provided funds to support the research on which this book is based. Resources held in the digital repository will enable researchers to continue to map production histories in radically new and imaginative ways and to provide a body of evidence for women currently working in the media industries who continue to face gender discrimination and structural inequalities at work. Many women interviewees participated in the study because they were motivated by the idea of building connections between generations of women. For one interviewee, "If they [women] aren't going to talk about it, how is anyone going to know about it?" Another one said, "History is important," as we learn through "the mistakes and successes" of the past.[34] The goal of restoring women to history is also the goal of "restoring history to women" and has been a powerful drive in feminist methodology.[35] As Caroline Ramazanoğlu argues, "Feminist research is politically *for* women; feminist knowledge has some grounding in women's *experiences*, and in how it *feels* to live in unjust gendered relationships."[36] These principles have been at the heart of the study and its commitment to record and disseminate women's oral histories. The oral recordings have enabled present-day practitioners to explore their occupational heritage and understand the historical roots of current working practices in their industries, where vertical and horizontal sex segregation remain rife. As historian Joan Sangster has persuasively argued, such forms of labor history, which emphasize wage work and unions, are "far from passé, they seem all the more urgent as we witness the global degradation of human labor amidst neo-liberalism."[37] In an era when the institutional sexism and discriminatory practices of the media industries have been sharply exposed, we need histories of women's work—their skills and contributions, battles and successes—more than ever.

Scope and Structure

This study covers the period between 1930 and 1989, as it was during these years that the film trade union had the greatest influence over women's work in the industry. It ranges across features, shorts, and documentaries (both live action and animation), which reflects the union's own reach across multiple sectors of production. This approach was chosen in order to make best use of the available trade union records and to explore the extent to which different production sectors offered women different opportunities for, and experiences of, work. It also allows a more comprehensive picture to emerge than has previously been possible and brings into view points of connection between women engaged in seemingly diverse tasks—for example, placing women's paint and trace work in animated shorts alongside continuity on feature films. Given the book's broad remit and the wealth of new primary materials on which it draws, some clear organizing principles have been necessary. Different jobs and work sectors are put in the spotlight at different historical moments rather than tracking a handful of roles longitudinally. The work of the continuity girl in features is highlighted in the 1930s, for example, while the animation industry's paint and trace girls are at the forefront of the 1950s chapter. These principal foci are set in the wider context of women's film work in the respective decades. The decision to adopt a spotlight approach was shaped by a number of factors, including existing scholarship, the availability of additional evidence beyond trade union data, and a commitment to extend knowledge and understanding of women's work across the fullest possible range of roles. This method allows patterns to emerge that are sensitive to both stable and new areas of employment for women. It also provides a greater number of potential connections for present-day media practitioners whose working lives continue to be shaped by the gendered legacies of historical working practices.

Chapter 1 opens by laying out the historical emergence of the film trade union and how its organization worked to favor men's labor at the expense of women's. The characteristics of the union's membership records are then described in some detail, together with an account of the data management principles that guided the study. The chapter then analyzes the number of women granted union membership and their commonly recurring roles, tracing their patterns of employment and placing that information within the wider context of shifts in the film industry. This analysis is organized by the six main categories that comprised the film industry: Floor; Research, Development, and Publicity; Art and Effects; Camera, Sound, and Stills; Cartoon and Diagram; and Postproduction.

Chapter 2 sets women's work in the context of a production boom in the British film industry in the 1930s, a time when the sector was modernizing after the introduction of sound and film studios were keen to create a new image of themselves. I show how they achieved this by linking the modernization narrative to masculinity in fan and trade publications and sidelining women and their labor in the process. It then moves on to examine women's labor in costume, continuity, and editing/negative cutting—jobs that have come to define popular understanding of women's contribution to sound-era cinema. It recounts some of the skills required to succeed in these roles and the processes through which they were assigned secondary status in film production hierarchies.

Chapter 3 continues the theme of secondary status by examining how this played out in the 1940s, a decade dominated by the Second World War and an official address to women to join the workforce as reserve labor. In the service film units, I show how women "free[d] a man for the fleet" by taking over roles in editing, projection, photography, and animation, while their work as assistants in art departments kept the "back room" of Britain's film studios functioning. This chapter also draws on the experience of women in documentary directing to introduce the concept of the episodic-interrupted career as a defining characteristic of women's employment. I use the concept to illuminate the multifaceted nature of women's occupational profiles and, in doing so, disrupt the dominant, male-defined narrative of the continuous work history as the key indicator of career success.

In Chapter 4 the focus shifts to the 1950s and women's experiences in publicity, animation, secretarial, and editing positions (specifically for the nonfiction market). In a decade dominated by debate about women's place in the workforce, relative to the home, this chapter uses women's accounts to trace multiple instances of occupational autonomy and the performance of skilled labor, revealing not only how women sought out and secured avenues for professionally satisfying work but also how their careers bring into view forms of creativity that have been neglected in existing film histories.

Chapter 5 examines the experiences of some of the first women who broke into the male-dominated domains of makeup and special effects in the 1960s, the "pioneers" of their day. Case studies reveal how women managed to establish an initial footing in these professions in the face of entrenched sexism in the feature film industry and the hostile tactics of the trade union. This chapter also puts women's work in costume and wardrobe departments in the spotlight, opening up the idea of resourcefulness-as-creativity, and explores how the world of commercials, supporting the

rapidly expanding television sector, offered new opportunities to different groups of women, affording some of them considerable professional autonomy.

Chapter 6 focuses on the 1970s and 1980s and continues the theme of women in male-dominated positions, extending it by contrasting the experiences of women in the feature film sector with those who actively built film communities outside mainstream production. Focusing first on women in camera and sound jobs, it explores how—in the words of one woman—they faced the choice of either "fitting in or fighting" and the strategies they adopted to survive in a macho working environment. It then moves on to examine women's experiences in the workshop sector, a unique feature of the decade's film culture, which supported cross-job working, media education, and training. Through a focus on the themes of child care, women-only spaces, class, and ethnicity, this chapter explores the possibilities, and limitations, of work outside the mainstream film industry. It also opens up the intersection of gender, ethnicity, and sexuality and argues for a wider recognition of Black women's pedagogy in film history.

A recurring theme in this study—and feminist history more broadly—is tracing connections across different generations of women and examining where experiences coalesce and diverge with the goal of bringing about change. Historian Joan Wallach Scott's argument about mobilizing the past to imagine a different future has been a guiding principle for my research.[38] The book closes with an account of working with oral history in a dialogue with young women at the beginning of their careers in the media industries. It shows not only how the present continues to be shaped by legacies of the "past" but also how women are using the past to shape their futures as producers of media.

1

Organizing Work

Gender and the Film Trade Union

This chapter opens with an outline of the general contours of the British film industry, providing orientation for the nonspecialist reader. I then sketch out the historical emergence of the industry's leading trade union, the Association of Cine-Technicians, before analyzing its evolution and how it favored men and their work at the expense of women in the workforce. The next section describes the chief characteristics of the ACT's membership records, which comprise one of the key data sets for this study, and outlines the methodology used to work with this material. The remainder of the chapter lays out an analysis of the women granted membership of the ACT for the six decades between 1930 and 1989. This discussion is structured into six main categories: Floor; Research, Development, and Publicity; Art and Effects; Camera, Sound and Stills; Cartoon and Diagram; and Postproduction. The analysis highlights the patterns of discrimination and opportunity for women in the context of technological and market shifts and trade union changes across the era.

The British Film Industry

In over a century of filmmaking, British film production evolved from the artisan, family-run business model of the early twentieth century to a large-scale established industry with studios, production companies, laboratories, distributors, and movie theater chains. Most commentators characterize the industry's history as turbulent, its screens dominated by Hollywood films against which domestic production would always

director in much film scholarship. Editing work also enabled women, where necessary, to combine paid work with family responsibilities. Topics such as mine-shaft sinking may have been less obviously glamorous than feature filmmaking, but the sector had its compensations. This may explain why women's recollections of the mining industry were so enthusiastic: Marshall described it as "marvellous . . . I adored it"; for Wood, it was "extraordinarily interesting"; and for Mead, "Why did I keep going? . . . Because I enjoyed it." Editors like Wood, Marshall, Mead, and the forty or so others granted ACT union membership in the 1950s as full editors would not have the high-profile career of the Oscar-winning Anne V. Coates but, like their contemporaries in paint and trace or the production secretaries in features, did succeed in carving out a space in the film industry to do professionally satisfying work.[92]

Conclusion

The defining characteristic of the 1950s shows women taking what opportunities they could to do interesting and meaningful work that they made creatively rewarding. This was often in roles that men did not want (production secretary, paint and trace) or sectors like nonfiction film, which had lower status relative to features. Some women called for the union to regrade jobs held by women, arguing that this was skilled labor on par with male-dominated roles and should be compensated for accordingly. Wider recognition and acknowledgment of women's skill sets in these roles would have helped them earn promotions—from production secretary to production manager or publicity assistant to publicist—but these calls fell on deaf ears. The union patriarchy saw no reason to reassess its remunerative structures or revise its prejudicial assessment of women's technical and managerial capacities. This clash between expectations and experience, opportunities for women and union authority, would reach a head in the next decade, when a small number of "pioneer" women began to elbow their way into male-dominated positions.

5
The 1960s
The New Pioneers

The 1960s are commonly perceived as a decade of change in British society. For social historian Arthur Marwick, the decade ushered in a "cultural revolution," and, while other historians have been more circumspect, there were many new developments that impacted people's personal and public lives in these ten years. The country enjoyed full employment and high wages, and there was an increase in disposable income being spent on new consumer goods. Contraception became more widely available, enabling couples to control family size and untie sex from marriage, while greater numbers of women entered the workplace than in previous decades. The expansion of education for girls led to a corresponding rise in expectations that interesting work would follow, with many anticipating that they would enjoy greater life opportunities than their mothers. Many women had been through the new art schools that proliferated in Britain in the 1960s, and, equipped with training in commercial art, graduates of the system looked to the new creative industries of film, television, popular music, and advertising for employment.[1] As this chapter shows, it was this new generation of art school–trained women who began to test the film industry's traditional working practices in fundamental ways. Changes to censorship rules meant that new themes could be explored more fully in film, television, and other media forms, including a corresponding increase in the sexualized imagery of women's bodies, especially in advertising. The film industry and the trade union were slow to respond to the ambitions of a new generation of women, although they were quick to publish sexualized imagery in their journal, now published as *Film and Television Technician*,

where a raft of "pinup girls" appeared in print in the mid-1960s. Of course, much remained the same—the 1960s did not necessarily "swing" in small towns and rural areas—and a more realistic approach to the decade is to see it as one of "transformation and tradition," where new ideas and ways of thinking butted up against established habits.[2] Taking this idea as a touchstone, this chapter examines key developments in the film industry before describing some of the film-related jobs in which women worked. Four case studies follow in areas that characterize women's work during this decade: costume, makeup, special effects, and women's experiences of working in the commercials sector, one of the decade's growth markets.

The "New" Film Industry

The film industry was experiencing its own transformation. The trend of declining cinema audiences, which had started in the 1950s, accelerated in the 1960s, and by the end of the decade, annual cinema admissions were down to around 500 million individual visits in the UK, from a postwar peak of 1.6 billion.[3] Under these precarious conditions, producers had to look beyond domestic audiences for sales, with export and television being the most obvious markets.[4] Many film companies increasingly created products for television (short films, serials, and children's entertainment), while the export market for features was supported by the influx of American capital that poured into the film industry in Britain. As Margaret Dickinson and Sarah Street have shown, a favorable exchange rate provided affordable labor costs and studio facilities and made Britain an attractive investment opportunity, and by the late 1960s between 80 and 90 percent of films made in Britain had American backing.[5] American investment reached a peak in 1968 with companies such as MGM, Disney, United Artists, Twentieth Century Fox, and others pumping over 31 million pounds into their British subsidiaries. The industry enjoyed some high-profile successes, including the James Bond films and big-budget productions like *Lawrence of Arabia*. In addition, the decade saw an emerging independent sector with small companies such as Woodfall and Vic Films producing innovative "New Wave" fare, feature films such as *A Taste of Honey* (1961) that brought the stories of young working-class people to the screen for the first time. But under these market conditions, the film industry became increasingly volatile, and established production companies such as Rank and the Associated British Picture Corporation struggled to survive, with stalwarts including Ealing Studios and British Lion closing in 1959. These were replaced by numerous one-picture companies that rented studio space and hired crew on short-term

contracts. Over the course of the decade, American financing dropped sharply—down to just under 3 million pounds by 1974—and production levels noticeably dwindled.[6]

Against this backdrop of boom and then slump during the 1960s, film technicians had to adapt to survive. On the one hand, there was work: British crews were needed to produce the feature films financed by American capital, and studios like Pinewood kept their construction and camera staff on contracts, providing a labor force that outside production companies using the studio's own stages were then obliged to employ.[7] But on the other hand, the conditions of employment changed, with increasing numbers now working freelance on a film-by-film basis. Looking beyond the feature film sector, production of short films continued to flourish, albeit under increasingly difficult distribution arrangements, and the commercials sector offered film technicians opportunities for work, especially in camera and editing roles. Applications for union membership reflect this drift to freelance status, showing greater numbers of technicians now describing themselves as "freelance" or "self-employed" on their membership forms relative to previous decades. While total applications (combined figures for men and women) remained high—over two and a half thousand were processed between 1960 and 1969—as the decade progressed, the union became increasingly concerned about the levels of unemployment and eventually put an embargo on new entrants to the film production branch in 1969.[8] This shook the confidence of the workforce and, as we will see, left men even more determined to protect jobs in the industry from outsiders, especially women.

Women and Union Records: An Overview

What did these developments in the film production landscape mean for women in the film industry? Just under five hundred women applied for membership in the 1960s, a figure that represents around 18 percent of all applications. This is the lowest percentage since the 1930s and can be explained by the expansion in the workforce that was taking place in jobs traditionally occupied by men (see appendix C). Women's applications continued to follow the usual pattern, with the majority joining through traditional feminine roles, such as production secretary, assistant editor, and in paint and trace, although with the exception of production secretary, these were no longer in the large numbers that had characterized previous decades. Women continued to have a presence in the art department as draftswomen, in publicity as assistants, and in film libraries as assistants and librarians. Small numbers joined as scriptwriters, casting

directors, and set dressers, with a handful gaining their union ticket as assistant directors, all for small companies specializing in nonfiction shorts. These women were paid on average between fourteen and sixteen pounds per week, comparable to a production secretary role and reflecting the junior/supportive function of the grade. And despite the gradual shaking loose of the old studio system, with its hierarchical job levels and tightly structured ways of working, this had no impact on the long-established male dominance of the camera department, which remained resolutely closed to women, perhaps unsurprisingly given the mounting concerns about unemployment.

At first glance, the profile of women's employment in the film industry suggests, at best, stasis and, at worst, regression, certainly when set in the wider context of the departure of established women film technicians, who, as Sue Harper writes, "left the film industry in droves."[9] This was especially true of directors and screenwriters, who, finding themselves out of step with a volatile industry, either retired or opted for television or children's filmmaking. The careers of established directors such as Muriel Box and Wendy Toye, producer Betty Box, and screenwriter Anne Burnaby all faltered during the 1960s.

But a more detailed examination brings a different picture into view, one that suggests women's employment was more robust and diverse than has been widely recognized. Alongside the production managers and assistant directors were a handful of women joining the union as directors, notably Mai Zetterling, Estelle Richmond, and Midge Mackenzie. These women brought with them several years' experience gained either abroad or in acting. The numbers of women costume designers in art departments went up this decade: nineteen in total (as well as three men), notably greater numbers compared to the handful who joined the union in the 1950s. Many of the costume designers in the 1960s were freelancers, gaining their union ticket through small, independent production companies such as Romulus, Grand Films, Apjac Productions, and Woodfall. So the burgeoning independent sector provided women with employment in traditional femininized roles. Costume and wardrobe form the first of this chapter's case studies, with particular emphasis on the creativity of the wardrobe department.

Trade union records also show that new areas of employment were opening up for women in the 1960s. In the Art and Effects category were approximately two dozen women who joined the film union as either puppeteers or matte artists and model makers. Most puppeteers worked at either Grosvenor or AP Films (later Century 21), companies that specialized in producing serials like *Thunderbirds* for children, which were

broadcast through independent television companies. Matte artists and model makers were recruited into departments of special effects through companies such as AP Films, MGM, and others. Such jobs had previously been closed to women, but as demand for skilled workers grew during the decade, some companies were willing to employ them, a decision that was not without its critics. The matte artist in special effects forms another of this chapter's case studies.

Departments of special effects were not the only new employers of women in the 1960s. As the film industry navigated a volatile landscape, makeup departments—long-established bastions of male power—began to open their doors to women, albeit slowly and reluctantly. Oral testimony shows how a small number of women began to get a toehold in makeup departments in the 1960s, crossing into the film industry after training in television. As the case study here shows, they were usually greeted with displays of overt discrimination and prejudice from the majority-male workforce. And while much of the film industry was leaden-footed in the face of women's increasing aspirations, the burgeoning commercials sector was more welcoming. Oral histories shed light on women's experiences of working on commercials—as editors, continuity girls, and art directors—a sector one woman described as "brilliant" and "exciting," and this forms the final case study of the chapter.[10]

Taking the narrative of tradition and transformation as a touchstone, this chapter examines both customary areas of employment for women (costume and wardrobe) and newer opportunities in makeup, special effects, and commercials. Case studies of wardrobe and commercials are important to reclaiming women's work in areas commonly thought of as noncreative. Conversely, makeup and special effects as male-dominated departments have not suffered the same level of critical marginalization. Here my interest is in recounting women's experiences on the studio floor, a history told primarily through men's opposition to women. Because these positions were associated with masculinity, with men's identity as workers heavily invested in them, men had much to lose by women's incursions, especially as the job pool was beginning to shrink. As the case studies show, the union as a regulator of labor did much to limit women's progression in these fields.

Costume Design and Wardrobe

In chapter 2 I explored how in the 1930s British studios paid greater attention to costume design as part of a wider move to increase the quality of British films. The case study of costume designer Gordon Conway

and her call for "better dressed pictures" opened up some of the work-flow processes around costume and its mix of costume hire, adaptation, and original design, alongside the challenges designers faced in terms of resources and status. It also highlighted how roles within costume teams were often gendered, with construction and maintenance functions (cutting, sewing, repairing, ironing) falling disproportionately to women while design and supervision roles were more readily available to men. These distinctions were often aligned with creative/noncreative values that, as we have seen throughout this study, were less rigid than has commonly been understood.

This case study builds on that analysis and has two main goals: (1) to outline some of the core elements of the costume designer's role as described by women in the 1960s, focusing on their emotional and physical labor, and (2) to examine the costume department from the perspective of the wardrobe mistress, attending to questions of creativity. The 1960s present a new development in the history of women's work in costume as an upturn in the number of women designers coincided with an international appetite for British culture, especially popular music, films, and fashion. In this decade British films were the subject of widespread popular debate, and because they often showcased fashion, costume was a central part of that discussion, which, as we will see, placed women's work center stage.

The nineteen costume designers who joined the union in the 1960s were working in a professional context that was very different from that of their 1930s peers. By now, costume was well established in British studios, its status having been boosted during the Second World War, when costume dramas enjoyed immense popularity, especially those produced by Gainsborough Pictures and its leading designer, Elizabeth Haffenden. Costume designers had been formally recognized as members of the art department, with membership of the ACT granted in 1947, and facilities at studios had been built up and developed over the years since Conway's tenure. By 1956 the wardrobe department of MGM British Studios at Elstree was sufficiently noteworthy to be profiled in the cine-magazine *Film Fanfare*. This boasted of the department's resources, including its costume holdings and staff (both designers and wardrobe supervisors), and showcased the work of wardrobe mistresses as they fitted actors—and even chimpanzees, with costumes for the studio's current *Tarzan* film, *Tarzan and the Lost Safari*.[11] The wardrobe department at Rank's Pinewood Studios was seemingly as impressive. An article published in a leading fan magazine, *Films and Filming*, trumpeted the studio's "vast selection of off-the-peg uniforms, with accessories to match," while its ladies department used "lace by the mile" to produce glamorous gowns for the studio's female stars, all under

the creative supervision of its leading designer, Julie Harris.[12] As chapter 2 illustrated, similar profiles in the fan magazines of the 1930s had turned to Hollywood studios and their designers to showcase advances in costume departments. By the mid-1950s, studios like Pinewood were showcasing their own facilities.

It was into this professional context that costume designers entered in the 1960s. The union records show three distinct groups of women being accepted for membership in this decade. The first group were in their mid-twenties and at relatively junior levels, with between nine months' and two to three years' experience under their belts, a status reflected in their salaries, which were between twenty and thirty pounds per week. This included Yvonne Blake, whose career as a costume assistant started in 1961 on the low-budget horror film *The Terror of the Tongs* (1961). Over the next decade she would graduate to *Nicholas and Alexander* (1971), for which she won an Oscar. The second group of women were at the other end of the pay and experience scales and included older women between the ages of forty-five and sixty who had expertise gained outside film, notably stage designer Jocelyn Herbert and renowned costume historian Doris Langley Moore, who in 1963 established the Museum of Costume (since 2007 known as the Fashion Museum) at Bath.[13] With their expertise they could command high salaries for film work, between £100 and £150 per week, although costume design for film was only a small part of their professional portfolio. The third group were in their thirties and, with experience across theater, film, and television, commanded salaries of between £50 and £75 per week, a respectable wage and similar to that earned by men as lighting camera operators or producers. This group included women such as Jocelyn Rickards and Emma Porteous, who would go on to establish long and fruitful careers as costume designers, specifically working in the feature film industry. Rickards designed for some of the most eye-catching films of the decade, including *From Russia with Love* (1963), *Blow Up* (1996), and *Morgan: A Suitable Case for Treatment* (1966), for which she was Oscar nominated.

Rickards and her contemporaries Shirley Russell, Julie Harris, and Phyllis Dalton enjoyed high-profile careers in the 1960s. Dalton's and Harris's careers were well established by this point, and they won Oscars this decade for, respectively, *Doctor Zhivago* (1965) and *Darling* (1965). Russell had started her career working as an assistant to Doris Langley Moore and joined the film industry in the early 1960s, earning a BAFTA nomination for *Women in Love* (1969). She ran her own costume company, The Last Picture Frock, which she later sold to the costume house Angels, and was such a widely acknowledged expert on period costuming that art

dealers called on her to help date paintings.[14] Married to a more famous husband, director Ken Russell, she was positioned in the popular press as "Mrs. Ken Russell" and "Ken's wife," and described herself at work as costume designer, "continuity girl, sandwich-maker, the lot" in her early collaborations with Russell.[15] Notwithstanding this adjunct status, women's opinions were frequently sought in the popular press of the day as the latest British films interested their readership. Statements about design principles were a common feature of their remarks, with Jocelyn Rickards describing costume as "a means of conveying by a visual signpost the background of each character," while Russell cautioned against designs that left the audience "more aware of the costume than of the actor."[16] What is also laid bare in their accounts of their work is the emotional and physical labor the costume designer's role involved, especially when working with actors. Jocelyn Rickards described her job as that of the actor's "whipping boy," responsible for "coax[ing] nervous performers into skin-tight leather trousers, dusting their privates with talcum powder to ease the fitting, without speaking a cross word."[17] The consequences of doing so had been made apparent to her early in her career when she lost her temper with a performer about to go on stage, who then gave "an awful performance—I felt dreadful, personally responsible."[18] In order to succeed in her job, Rickards had to learn the lesson that one of the functions of the costume designer's role was, to quote Arlie Hoschchild, "produce the proper state of mind in others"—in other words, undertake the type of emotional labor that is one of the defining characteristics of much of women's professional work.[19] Rickards's experiences were echoed by Shirley Russell, who had to persuade the infamously short-tempered actor Oliver Reed into collar studs for the period film *Women in Love*, leading to what she later described as "some very nasty sessions with him first thing in the morning."[20] Far from being just amusing anecdotes, Russell's comments remind us that, BAFTA nomination or not, her work came at a price, where skills of tact and diplomacy had to be married with a capacity to absorb emotional blows if, like Rickards, she was to perform successfully in her role.

A costume designer's work also involved significant physical labor, something that is rarely acknowledged in accounts of women's work in filmmaking. Rickards recalled a particularly long day that ended with her "kneeling on a dusty floor hammering away on Coca-Cola bottle tops" to create military medals for a modestly budgeted production.[21] Of her work on *Doctor Zhivago*, a period drama with a large cast and heavy costume demands, Phyllis Dalton recalled how she and her team had to "walk and hump clothes" around on a location shoot when the wardrobe bus had

been "left too far away" to transport them.[22] Shirley Russell summarized her work on the 1920s-set musical *The Boy Friend* (1971) as "physically hard. It wore me out."[23] Comments like these by leading designers touch on the emotional and practical aspects of design, often sidelined in film studies that are more concerned with questions of artistry and aesthetics.

But what of the much larger workforce who worked under designers like Rickards, Russell, and others who were themselves only the most visible face of the costume department? While recent research has opened up costume design and the core elements of the designer's role, much less is known about the labor of wardrobe staff and their collective contributions to film production. It is difficult to be certain of total numbers, as wardrobe staff in British studios were members of the union NATKE, and no union records survive of their membership.[24] But there are clues about the size of the workforce and its perceived value to be gleaned from ACT documentation. When the ACT accepted costume into its ranks in 1947, it took only three jobs—supervising dress designer, dress designer, and assistant—while categorizing ten jobs for membership of NATKE: wardrobe supervisor, wardrobe master/mistress, and their staff members, as well as costumers, dressers, dressmakers, cutters, needlewomen, and assistants.[25] The distinctions being drawn between these positions seems to mirror the design-versus-construction/maintenance functions introduced at the beginning of this case study, and implicit in the ACT's decision are certain assumptions and hierarchies about what types of work have value in the production economy.

These assumptions seem to have been reflected in the popular press, where, despite costume designers being highly visible in the 1960s, there was no equivalent correspondence detailing the work of, for example, a dressmaker or needlewoman. We have to go back to 1950 to find a brief profile of a wardrobe mistress, Vi (Violet) Murray, published in the pages of *Picturegoer*. Emphasizing Murray's skills in sewing, dressmaking, ironing, and improvisation, the article's author, John Farleigh, praises the wardrobe mistress as "the housewife of the studios," effectively suggesting that her professional skills are little more than an extension of women's presumed natural talent for domesticity.[26] Later descriptions would be equally vague, with a 1981 delegation of British costume designers describing wardrobe staff as "responsible for the servicing, upkeep and continuity of the clothes, once the film is under way," although they were less forthcoming about what this involved in practice.[27] What were the challenges of servicing clothes when faced with, for example, location work, multiple takes, or a cast of extras to dress? How did the wardrobe department ensure continuity when costumes went missing or were misplaced? To begin to address

these questions, I have drawn on interviews with costume designers and wardrobe mistresses to piece together a picture of women's work in this underreported area of production. I focus on the careers of two women: Betty Adamson (career span 1949–87) and Rosemary Burrows (career span 1958–2005). Both had extensive careers in the wardrobe departments of Britain's film studios, but I want to focus on Adamson's work on large-scale international coproductions and Burrows's work for the smaller-scale Hammer Film Productions, as these open up how wardrobe departments functioned on productions of varying size and budget.[28]

In accounts of work given by the costume designers Julie Harris, Phyllis Dalton, and Jane Hamilton, wardrobe supervisor Betty Adamson emerges as a key figure, remembered with enthusiasm and praised for her organizational skills and problem-solving abilities. In 1969 Julie Harris was working as costume designer on *Goodbye Mr. Chips* (1969), a musical drama set in a boy's boarding school. With several hundred schoolboys to dress, Harris ordered identical stock costumes for the opening scenes but was horrified to discover that "when the clothes were unpacked none of the ties and hatbands had any stripes on them."[29] She credits Adamson with getting the production out of a tight spot: "We had a wonderful wardrobe supervisor called Betty Adamson, who found art students in Sherbourne and lots of pots of white paint and brushes. And they all sat down and painted the stripes . . . on all the ties and boaters. It went on almost all night."[30] Adamson's skills appear to have been the stuff of industry legend.

Some years later, costume assistant Jane Hamilton was taken on as a junior to Julie Harris, who was designing for *The Great Muppet Caper* (1981). Shot in Pinewood Studios, the film presented a number of wardrobe challenges, as it mixed together humans and puppets in a live-action musical setting. In Jane Hamilton's account, one of Adamson's many talents was her ability to successfully coordinate the wardrobe needs of large casts on big productions. Shooting on the Muppet film involved an ambitious underwater musical number where Miss Piggy was accompanied by two dozen professional swimmers dressed in silk capes, bathing suits, and flowered bathing caps to perform a synchronized routine that moved from poolside to underwater. Multiple takes were made possible by Adamson rigging up huge heaters on the set to dry off the outfits and coordinating a team of dressers to get the swimmers quickly out of the costumes and back into them again ready for shooting. Hamilton recalls that the director "kept taking takes," leaving the wardrobe department to get the swimmers "in and out and in and out. . . . It was unbelievable. I couldn't have supervised that in a million years."[31] For Hamilton, Adamson was "a brilliant supervisor . . . really efficient . . . really practical and knowing,"

Figure 10. Wardrobe supervisor Betty Adamson's work on *The Great Muppet Caper* (1981).

whose professional skills were clearly invaluable. Her labor enabled the director's "vision" and saved the production shoot considerable money by keeping cameras rolling (see fig. 10).

Nowhere was this more than evident than during location shooting, where the "servicing, upkeep and continuity of the clothes, once the film is under way," brought particular challenges. Adamson is remembered by Jane Hamilton as a frequent coworker of costume designer Phyllis Dalton, who designed for large-scale international coproductions, including *Lawrence of Arabia* and *Doctor Zhivago*, although, as was often the case for wardrobe staff, Adamson was not granted a screen credit for these films. On these types of productions, specialist facilities had to be carefully preplanned and, unlike cameras, lighting, and other technical equipment, were rarely at the forefront of the director's mind. Getting up to five hundred extras into period dress for a day's shooting on *Doctor Zhivago* meant a significant amount of forward planning by the costume team, from setting up wardrobe tents where extras could be dressed to laying out uniforms in the sun to break them down and give them the appearance of age. Costume was, as we have seen, hard work, with Dalton

recalling heavy clothes to "walk and hump" around the shoot, often with little more than an "old hanging rail" to assist you.[32] Dalton found that practical problems soon arose when "you've got a crowd of extras in period costume . . . lying about on the grass . . . [because] no-one has thought of even a bench to sit on."[33] It was for reasons such as this that Dalton rated "a good wardrobe supervisor" as someone who would always ask "what's happening to the crowd," ensuring appropriate wardrobe facilities were part of the planning conversation from the outset. Here we see how wardrobe, as one part of the "complicated jig-saw puzzle" of film production, links to the work of the production secretary, discussed in chapter 4. In Dalton's assessment, Betty Adamson was not merely good but "a wonderful . . . wardrobe supervisor" who could manage, during location work, to rig up "a washing machine and everything going in the middle of the desert. How she managed it, I still don't know."[34] So wardrobe supervisors like Adamson had to work accurately at speed, have physical strength, good people skills, and excel at organization and logistics.

Adamson's ability to make the seemingly impossible possible comes through clearly in the recollections of those who worked with her. Indeed, her occupational talents resonate strongly with those described by Elizabeth Nielson in her assessment of costumers in the Hollywood studio system. For Nielson, what costumers often referred to as "creativity" was "synonymous with resourcefulness . . . [a] *spontaneous* productive sense of creativity . . . [that could] find cheap and fast solutions to production problems."[35] Although this type of imaginative, nimble thinking was rarely acknowledged by either award ceremonies or in an individual's paycheck, it nevertheless played a central role in achieving the finished look of a film. But Adamson herself was ably supported by a team of unhistoricized dressers, needlewomen, and many others, of whom little is known. Dalton recalls that "as many as fifteen or twenty" worked on costumes for *Doctor Zhivago*, which, as a prestigious production for MGM British, represented the high end of the market, but even this account excludes the Spanish costumers who embroidered the ball gown for the film's star Geraldine Chaplin, sent out from London to Madrid, where, Dalton recalls, it was "so much cheaper to have it embroidered."[36] Spanish labor may have been cheap, but the skills were second to none, as Dalton discovered when the dress went missing in transit between the two cities. It was the Spanish costumers who stepped into the breach: "They just did me another one, very, very quickly . . . an all-night job."[37] This meant creating a new ball gown from scratch—cutting, sewing, embroidering, and finishing entirely by hand—a feat that could be achieved only by highly skilled, experienced dressmakers (fig. 11).

Figure 11. Geraldine Chaplin in *Doctor Zhivago* (1965) wearing costumes designed, made, and maintained by Phyllis Dalton, Betty Adamson, and other unknown wardrobe staff.

While Dalton presents the anecdote as "one of the worst things that's ever happened" to her professionally, it also reveals the significant amount of outsourced labor that props up film production generally and costume specifically. We have no way of knowing how much the Spanish costumers were paid or the working conditions in which they labored. Nielson's research on the Hollywood studio system has shown how many of the "exquisite hand embroideries and decorations" that characterized MGM's productions were produced by "fine seamstresses from Mexico and Japan and Puerto Rico," often immigrant laborers who worked long hours in cramped conditions for very modest wages.[38] British studios may not have operated on the same scale as Hollywood, yet Dalton's story reveals how similar working practices were in play. Her designs for *Doctor Zhivago* won her an Oscar for Best Costume Design, but, like most industry awards, they fail to acknowledge the below-the-line labor—from Adamson's logistical skills to the unnamed dressmakers and embroiders—who made the glamorous production possible.

While Betty Adamson represents the experience of one type of wardrobe supervisor—working as part of large team handling crowd scenes and extras alongside principal players—Rosemary Burrows's experience in the 1960s was at the other end of the spectrum. Interviewed in 2010 for BBC Radio 4's *The Film Programme*, Burrows gives a fascinating insight

into the production culture of a small studio producing films with modest budgets.[39] Burrows was a student at the Berkshire College of Art in 1958 when she was asked to help costume crowd extras on a film being shot at Hammer's Bray Studios, for which she was paid £11 per week ("I thought I'd died and gone to heaven"). Hammer specialized in horror films made in the studio rather than on location, budgets were modest (Burrows recalls £230,000 being relatively generous for the studio), and with a six-week shooting schedule, she had to work quickly and efficiently.[40] Hammer's productions used a small roster of actors, notably Christopher Lee and Peter Cushing in lead roles, and the crew members were salaried, earning modest pay in exchange for regular employment. The wardrobe team was small, headed by the experienced Molly Arbuthnot (who had worked in the film industry since the 1940s), and the cast members were dressed in outfits from the studio's wardrobe stores, which Burrows would adapt and embellish according to the demands of the script. The only original design work Burrows recalls was for bespoke nightgowns for female stars, designed to reveal or obscure cleavage, buttocks, and legs according to the demands of the different national markets across which the films were distributed.

With no prior experience in costume (Burrows had been studying pottery before she joined Hammer), she had to learn quickly and described her apprenticeship as "a pretty incredible initiation."[41] Instrumental to her learning was the actor Peter Cushing, whom Burrows described as "quite fanatical about period. . . . He taught me a lot." Cushing's most iconic roles for Hammer were Baron Frankenstein and Doctor Van Helsing in the studio's iterations of *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, respectively. This meant the character had to appear in the debonair style of a nineteenth-century gentleman, but satisfying Cushing's period demands was challenging not least because, as Burrows recalls, "there was no budget" for wardrobe. Unfazed, Burrows, under Cushing's tuition, used a series of eye-catching frock coats, polka-dot cravats, velvet jackets, and satin-trimmed waistcoats, complete with tiepins, cufflinks, and other accessories to visually signpost the character's professional background and social standing. Burrows's recollections suggest how the costume "look" of Hammer's films—renowned for their visual style—was a combination of the actor's input with the wardrobe team's creativity—that is, resourcefulness (see fig. 12). Her account gives a brief glimpse into how a wardrobe department functioned on small-scale productions where small teams with minimal resources built up close working relationships with actors. Burrows's experience is far removed from the large-scale washing, drying, and dressing facilities that Adamson orchestrated on location, but the

Figure 12. Rosemary Burrows with Peter Cushing on the set of *Arabian Adventure* (1979).

underlying skills are the same: resourcefulness and great skills in interpersonal communication.[42]

Burrows passed her "initiation" at Hammer, if her subsequent career is any indication. By 1967 she was acting as "Mother Confessor" (her description) to Marlon Brando during the making of *A Countess from Hong Kong* (1967)—presumably performing the same kind of emotional labor as Shirley Russell and Jocelyn Rickards—and would later advise Christopher Columbus on special effects when he was directing *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (2001). But despite the wealth of experience and knowledge Burrows and many others held, costume and wardrobe continued to suffer from a lack of proper recognition in the industry. Costume assistant Jane Hamilton, who started in films in the 1970s, found that "the male sex . . . [were] always a bit patronising, about women doing 'frocks,'" an attitude that dogged her career in the 1980s. And Shirley Russell, who costumed amazing fantasy sequences in *Lisztomania* (1975) and *Tommy* (1975), still struggled to convince her director husband, Ken Russell, quite "how much work is involved" in delivering her designs.[43] This was more than merely status; it had real material consequences for

women who continued to be underpaid relative to the value they added to the production team. The "housewife of the studios" still had an uphill struggle for equal wages.

Makeup

If costuming represents one strand of women's work in an area with an established tradition of employing women, how did they fare in areas of feature filmmaking such as makeup that had long functioned as bastions of male power? There was little tradition of women working in this area, which had been dominated by men for decades, possibly because of a tradition stemming from early cinema of male barbers doing studio hair and makeup for film. In Hollywood the Westmore brothers (Perc, Ern, Monte, Wally, Bud, and Frank) ruled the studio system, along with Cecil Holland and Jack Dawn at MGM's studios, a state of affairs that reflected the masculinization of the wider beauty industry. Women's labor, where it was permitted, was confined to supportive tasks such as body-painting extras rather than chief makeup artist or heads of department.[44] Conversely, women's hairdressing—categorized as a subdivision of the makeup department—was staffed by women, with the department functioning as a social space in the studio, where actresses congregated and gossip was shared.[45] Britain followed a similar pattern; hairdressing was staffed by women while men held senior makeup positions, headed departments, and took the lead in defining the craft. Harry Davo, chief makeup artist at British International Pictures, wrote "The Art of Makeup," published in *The Cine-Technician* in 1935, while fan magazines regularly profiled men in their pages: "Gerald Fairbank, the make-up expert at Beaconsfield Studios," in *Picturegoer* (1936), and Billy Partleton, the "master of make-up," in *Films and Filming* (1957), among others.[46] Other leading figures included Robert (Bob) Clark, chief makeup artist at Elstree Studios (from the 1930s to the 1970s) and Walter Schneiderman, whose career started in the 1940s and who worked at many of Britain's leading film studios.[47]

Men did not have it entirely their own way, however, and this case study has two aims: to sketch a brief history of women's makeup work in British films before turning to the work of Linda de Vetta, whose career illustrates how a small group of women broke through into feature film makeup in the 1960s. There are no ACTT records to support this case study, as makeup artists and wardrobe staff were members of NATKE, meaning crucial evidence about wages and workforce demographics is missing. Oral histories, however, provide a valuable insight into this under-researched area, revealing how makeup represented a new area of work opportunity

for women in the 1960s, albeit one fraught, once again, with male prejudice and discrimination. I examine women's entry into the profession; their workday, skills, and expertise; and how they were treated by their male peers and the unions. Makeup is now one of the most popular jobs for women in film, with recent statistics showing that 85 percent of makeup artists working in Britain are female. What this case history reveals is how women like Linda de Vetta had to surmount considerable male prejudice to build successful careers in the British film industry, paving the way for subsequent generations of women.[48]

The size of the makeup workforce in Britain was relatively small compared to camera departments or editing. In the estimation of Walter Schneiderman, there were between fifty and sixty makeup artists working in the British film industry as a whole during his career, with no more than six to ten of them being women, mainly at the larger studios of Shepperton and Pinewood.[49] In such a small-scale and niche profession, it was particularly difficult for women to make any inroads once men had established their dominance. Women's function in British makeup departments rarely extended beyond support roles, with the wives of makeup artists drafted in to do body makeup on actresses on some of the bigger productions.[50] Only occasionally were they tolerated as assistants. Peggy Rignold was taken on as an assistant to Elstree's makeup chief, Harry Davo, in the mid-1930s and became sufficiently competent in the role to be "hired out" as an assistant to other men.[51] But any ambitions she may have had for career progression were interrupted by the outbreak of the Second World War, and by 1942 she had joined the Film Production Group of the Army Kinematographic Service as an assistant editor. Jill Carpenter enjoyed a long career as a makeup artist in the 1950s, '60s and '70s, although her screen credits show she was predominantly working on second features, a profile suggesting that for a woman to progress beyond assistant was a more realistic option in low-budget filmmaking.

One of the few women to work on prestige productions for any length of time was Connie Reeve (figs. 13 and 14). Born in 1924, she had attended art school and worked as a commercial artist before World War II. Family connections helped Reeve gain entry into the film industry, as her sister was married to Harold Fletcher, head of makeup at Shepperton Studios, who invited her to train as a makeup artist after the war.[52] Earning a wage of around six pounds per week in the late 1940s (comparable to an editor or senior secretary), Reeve worked on some of the most iconic British films of the postwar period, including several Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger films—among them *The Red Shoes* (1948), *Gone to Earth* (1950), and *The Tales of Hoffmann* (1951)—as well as *Moulin Rouge*

Figure 13. Connie Reeve applying makeup for *The Tales of Hoffman* (1951).

Figure 14. Connie Reeve applying makeup to Barbara Bain on the set of *Space 1999* (1975–77).

(1952) and *The Prince and the Showgirl* (1957). The quality of her work was such that, by the early 1950s, she was entrusted with making up leading star Gina Lollobrigida in John Houston's *Beat the Devil* (1953), but despite (or because of) her talent, she struggled to progress to chief makeup artist and later claimed that women were neither "welcomed nor supported" in

the industry.[53] Career progression became more difficult after her marriage in 1956 and the subsequent birth of two children, but she found a way around the child-care conundrum by having her infant daughter cast in the television series *Swallows and Amazon* (1963), allowing her to work on the production. Imaginative solutions to child care were one thing, but early mornings and long days were not conducive to family life, and she took a step back from her career when the children were small, although she would later return to work in television and occasionally features.

Although Reeve had family connections, even she experienced prejudice, which suggests how feature films were less than hospitable to women in anything other than assistant roles. Conversely, one of the peculiarities of the British system was that makeup in television was dominated by women, who benefited in the 1960s from selective and comprehensive training schemes run by the BBC and independent television companies such as ATV (Associated Television). One BBC employee claimed that television companies at this time had a policy of employing women only in their makeup departments precisely because "the film industry refused to employ women" in the role and "all the other areas of television were male-dominated."[54] While television might have served as a relative oasis for women with professional ambitions to work in makeup, any attempt by them to move across into films was met with a hostile reception. As one woman recalled, "We were considered very inferior" by the film industry, a classic example of women's skills being downgraded by men to exclude them from entry into a profession.[55] Despite this prejudice, it was the "television girls" who were to bring pressure to bear on the male dominance of the feature film industry.

As British cinema enjoyed a production boom in 1967, its film studios were scrambling around for additional freelance labor. The industry's small roster of makeup artists were fully engaged, and with another big film with a large cast about to go into production at Shepperton (on the period comedy *Great Catherine*, 1968), the studio was desperate for additional skilled workers. It was under these conditions that they turned to a small group of television-trained women who were freelancing at the time: Linda de Vetta, Ann Brodie, Heather Nurse, Jane Royle, and Sandra Sylvester. In this case study, de Vetta serves as an illustrative example, as she is one of the few women working in the field whose life story has been recorded, and it is through these recollections that we can map the labor practices of this unique moment in film history. De Vetta started her career in television, training at ATV Studios between 1962 and 1963, and subsequently worked on live television shows for the company before leaving in 1966 with the ambition to work freelance and learn more about

prosthetics. She quickly found work as a makeup artist on commercials and fashion shoots but was approached in the spring of 1967 with an offer of freelance work on *Great Catherine*. Along with four other women (all of whom had trained in television) she was signed up for eight weeks' work on the film. The conditions of employment were strict: the women were to work only on "specials"—that is, actresses in supporting roles—and at a salary that was half of what the makeup men received, justified on the grounds that the women were merely "assistants." At the end of the shoot, they were to be granted membership of NATKE, although even then strict conditions would be placed on their employment. As de Vetta recalls, the women were not to be "allowed to chief a film, we weren't allowed to do commercials, because it meant we would be working on our own and unsupervised. . . . In essence . . . we could only be a makeup assistant under a union membered makeup artist."[56] This is despite the fact that the women had all completed formal training programs in television and had built up several years' experience by the time they signed the contracts. Once again, the industry handled the need for labor by creating junior positions, at lower wages, into which women could be recruited (see chapters 1 and 2 for further examples).

De Vetta quickly proved herself invaluable, however, and in the next few years she worked on a number of feature films, including *Charge of the Light Brigade* (1967), where she and her coworkers set up temporary tents on location in Turkey to process the hundreds of Cossacks and officers requiring makeup for battle scenes. She was sufficiently skilled to be appointed chief makeup artist on *Performance* (1970) by the film's director, Nicholas Roeg, but this contravened the conditions of her union ticket, and the makeup branch of NATKE responded by taking her to a union tribunal to revoke her membership. De Vetta eventually won the case—thanks to some nifty legal footwork by her father's lawyer—but at this point she found herself ostracized by some in the makeup community.

Over the next few years, she continued to find work, but it was difficult, and she was often forced to take productions that had been rejected by makeup artists who were more established in the business. She joined the makeup team on *Ryan's Daughter* (1970) because few other people wanted the job; she recalls, "They'd asked other makeup artists [but] they wouldn't go to Dingle in Ireland for six months!" She worked again with Nicholas Roeg on *Walkabout* (1971), this time uncredited and operating under the radar as "Linda Richmond" (her married name) on what was a shoestring-budget shoot where, in addition to doing makeup, she cooked meals for the second unit when the catering truck got stuck in a sand dune. And she often found herself tested by the male establishment, many of whom had a thinly veiled dislike of women, especially television-trained "girls." She recalled one incident where Charlie Parker, chief makeup artist on *Ryan's Daughter*, refused to speak to her until she had created three rubber prosthetic ears for John Mills's character in the film, a test to prove she was capable of the job; she passed it with flying colors. Parker would later apologize to her, but, as de Vetta recalled, such treatment "wasn't uncommon."[57] She later proved useful to Parker on the film when he fell out with leading actress Sarah Miles on the shoot and gratefully delegated her to de Vetta. Young pretenders like de Vetta clearly had their uses, absorbing the emotional fallout of on-set debacles and pacifying the crew with a home-cooked meal.

De Vetta was not alone in experiencing attempts by the union to block the careers of women. Christine Allsopp, daughter of makeup artist Connie Reeve, was similarly treated with hostility when she applied to be a trainee member of the makeup branch in 1977, forced to endure several meetings with "mostly men complaining about the 'television girls' and trying to defend their turf from these 'interlopers.'"[58] Makeup artist Mary Hillman had a comparable experience when she tried to work in films after serving an apprenticeship with the BBC and working extensively in television and the commercials sector in the 1960s. Director Alan Parker asked her to be makeup chief on *Bugsy Malone* (1976), but she found herself ostracized on set: "I was a member of the union [but] no-one in film would work with me because I was a television girl."[59] With the support of Parker and NATKE's president, she stayed on the film, but it was an uncomfortable experience, where "no-one . . . spoke to us because we were television."[60] While it is a function of unions to regulate the supply of labor, these examples suggest that the terms used to achieve that were highly feminized, indicating it was the sex of the applicants—as much as their labor—that represented a threat to the department.

Despite the many obstacles that the union placed in the way of women, de Vetta and others put up with male prejudice because they found working on feature films particularly engaging. For de Vetta, it satisfied her desire to learn new skills and experiment with techniques, opportunities that she felt were less readily available in television at the time. Not content with refashioning John Mills's prosthetic ears, she created the look of a badly decomposed cadaver on *Walkabout*, scarred actor James Fox's body for his drug-fueled character Chas in *Performance*, and, most famously, created a modified lens for David Bowie's iconic yellow cat's eyes on *The Man Who Fell To Earth* (1977).[61] Because she was employed freelance and frequently worked on location, it was up to her to supply her own equipment, and her pride and joy was a Max Factor box, brought from

America in 1967 by her then husband, which she stocked with makeup, brushes, specialist chemicals, and dental tools for modeling (see fig. 15).[62] Her workday was arduous, with long hours and heavy responsibilities. For de Vetta, this meant getting out of bed at 5:30 a.m. and doing her own makeup before driving herself across London to Shepperton Studios for a 7:00 a.m. start. This was no mean feat, as the trend for women in the 1960s was for full makeup with two sets of false eyelashes, and de Vetta drove at such speed that the crew nicknamed her "Leadfoot Linda" for her ability to get to the studio in under an hour.[63] The rewards were plentiful, however. The pay was good—forty-five pounds per week in 1967 ("a fortune"), one hundred pounds in 1970 ("more than my old male friends")—so, unlike the underpaid production secretaries discussed in chapter 4 doing more traditional forms of women's work, long hours in

Figure 15. Linda de Vetta on the steps of Pinewood Studios, circa 1969. Source: Photograph in author's possession.

a "man's job" were generously remunerated with a "breadwinner's" wage. And she relished the technical aspects of the job. This included not only working with prosthetics, latex, and other materials but also liaising with camera and lighting crew, checking, for example, that her makeup work harmonized with director Tony Richardson's choice of film stock to produce the required sepia tones on *Charge of the Light Brigade*.[64] Once she had children, she found the long hours and location work unsustainable and, like countless women before and after her, switched to working on commercials when the children were small, returning to features in the early 1980s with the support of live-in help. She enjoyed a long and successful career and later worked on high-profile films with leading directors including James Cameron, Roman Polanski, and David Lean, and as a personal makeup artist to A-list stars including Sigourney Weaver, Jeremy Irons, and Judi Dench.

What of the other "television girls" who were recruited alongside de Vetta in early 1967? Their profiles suggest mixed fortunes. Jane Royle, like de Vetta, enjoyed a high-profile career in features, winning a BAFTA for her work on *The Company of Wolves* (1985), and Ann Brodie continued in feature films through the 1970s before moving to Canada and the United States to develop her career. The career of Heather Nurse was more modest, with half a dozen screen credits to her name, including working with Bette Davis on *Madame Sin* (1972) before her credits petered out, a similar profile to that of Sandra Sylvester. But the 1960s represent a turning point when women finally began to get established in feature film makeup. A brief expansion in film production, coupled with the women's experience in television (which made them a ready-made and well-trained workforce), created the conditions of entry that, once under way, were difficult to reverse and would lead, over time, to women's current dominance of the field. In the 1960s, however, to be a makeup artist was to be a woman in a man's world, and that was no easy ride. To paraphrase editor Monica Mead (see chapter 4), you had to be better than most men and tenacious to survive as an "interloper," something that is mirrored in the experience of women in special effects, the next case study.

Special Effects

Trade union records show other new areas of employment opening up for women in the 1960s, with around two dozen joining the union in the roles of puppeteer, trainee matte artist, and model maker. Most of the women were employed by either Grosvenor Films or AP Films, the latter being best known for popular series such as *Supercar* (1962), *Fireball XL5* (1962–63),