Popular Culture and the Intellectual
Media Trends and Social Change

Edited by

William P. Huddy and Andrea Marshall

WH
WATERHILL
PUBLISHING

ISBN 978-1-7753096-1-1

Toronto New York

Contents

Talking of Terror: British Television Intellectuals and Bridging the Gap between Celebrity and Intellectual Culture

John Tulloch and Belinda Middleweek

Abstract. This paper explores the theme of 'bridging the gap' between celebrity and intellectual culture through a parallel analysis of terrorism reportage across television genres. Drawing on the British television series *Atheism*, the documentary series *I Survived* and a selection of British and Dutch television news interviews we illustrate the varying ways in which public scholars negotiate the institutional constraints underpinning national and international approaches to terrorism reportage. The final section of this paper offers a personal and professional example of 'bridging the gap'.

Keywords: British Television Intellectuals, Celebrity, Elaborated Discourse, Terrorism Reportage, Iconic Images.

Introduction

This paper takes as its starting point the theme of 'bridging gaps' between celebrity and intellectual culture. By adopting a parallel analysis across television genres, we illustrate the varying ways in which public scholars negotiate the institutional constraints underpinning national and international approaches to terrorism reportage. One of the authors, John Tulloch, a media academic with extensive experience of television studios via his ethnography of production books, and also a survivor of the London terrorist bombings on 7 July 2005, was catapulted into the public spotlight when British newspaper outlets used his photograph as a symbol of the attack. In that instant, Tulloch became an unwilling celebrity whose status was reaffirmed via numerous international requests for interviews at each anniversary of the explosions, while his photograph stood as an iconic image repurposed in newspapers for political expediency. Through his television appearances for British and international broadcasters, Tulloch gained insight into this short-grab genre of television production and, much like British public intellectual Jonathan Miller before him, was able to use, at times, his conceptual and editorial control of the narrative to explore several presentational identities in an elaborated discourse that signaled the gradation of possibilities available to both Miller and Tulloch as contemporary television intellectuals. The other author of this paper, Belinda Middleweek, has the advantage of being an academic *and* television producer who interviewed Tulloch about his survival for the series *I*

Survived…Stories of Australians and thus provides a production perspective on the institutional constraints governing their television interview.

British Television Intellectuals

Britain does not seem to cherish public intellectuals. Timothy Garton Ash, an Oxford professor and respected journalist, has commented about this in *The Guardian.*

> Is the person sitting next to you [on the tube] an intellectual? Are you? Or would you run a mile from the label? The other night I asked a commentator I consider to be obviously a British intellectual whether he is an intellectual, and he replied, with a flicker of alarm behind his spectacles, 'Oh no!' Why not? 'Because I'm afraid of suffering from Imposter Syndrome' (Ash, 27 April 2006).

Jonathan Miller, whose series *Atheism* we will be analysing here, has said something similar. He argues that a 'life of the mind' interest is deeply suspect in England, where you tend to be seen as a 'pretentious pseud' if involved in it. Moreover, he complains that the kinds of television histories of ideas which he produced in the past are becoming increasingly hard to do unless, he says 'they are presented by what is now called a celebrity' (2010) – and at the beginning of his three-part series he explains why he does not like that.

However, Stefan Collini argues in his book *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* that we should not *over*-emphasize the recent growth of 'celebrity culture.' Nor should we link this with the so-called 'decline' of intellectuals, which has been blamed on two forces: (i) the increasing sub-division of inward-looking academic disciplines; and (ii) 'the rise of celebrity culture, with the dynamics of the popular media increasingly governing the public sphere of modern societies, leading to the displacement of the intellectual by the media personality' (Collini 2006, p.451).

Collini refutes the view "that the kind of public presence once enjoyed by intellectuals is in the process of being *replaced* by the glitzy superficiality of celebrity culture" (2006, p.473, 474). He argues that when we look historically from the early 19th century onwards, we see "a plurality of overlapping publics reached by a plurality of overlapping media," always offering 'intellectuals new opportunities' (2006, p.488).

So Collini concludes that intellectuals today "can make use of existing media to reach those publics who, being neither doped nor dumbed down as fashionable commentary suggests, *do* want to see issues of common interest considered in ways that are less instrumental or less opportunistic, more

reflexive or more analytical, better informed or better expressed" (2006, pp.495-6).

So what are these media outlets? Between them, Garton Ash's and Collini's list of British media outlets for intellectuals is both wide and embracing. It includes BBC Radio, the *Times Literary Supplement*, *The London Review of Books*, the internet and the blogosphere. But – here's our point – *neither* Ash *nor* Collini include television. In this medium, Collini argues, the visual dominates. In contrast, radio is good for 'the oral exposition of ideas'; while the sheer length of newspapers does allow for nuance and complexity. But in television, he says, a "speaker's appearance and manner" is what counts. Discussion, says Collini, "is brutally abbreviated; liveliness, conflict, and sound-bites are over-valued" (Collini 2006, p.490).

Now, this may be true of shorter television forms, like news and documentary interviews, but even there Tulloch experienced some very positive collaboration as his co-author Middleweek will later address. However, the early British television intellectuals did found a new television genre as public intellectuals. They include Professor AJP Taylor, Sir Kenneth Clark, Dr Jacob Bronowski, Dr Jonathan Miller, Professor David Starkey, Dr Simon Schama, and Professor Marcus du Sautoy. They are all men, and they are mostly middle-aged – which is why Tulloch held back the completion of his book *British Television Intellectuals* for five years, allowing for the emergence of many strong female presenters (like Mary Beard) and also younger men (like Brian Cox). Still, those early patriarchal pathfinders did reach enormous audiences through television. They created models for television emulation elsewhere in the world. They were *not* starved of length, having as many as 13 one-hour episodes to develop nuanced and complex arguments. Their discussion was *not* brutally abbreviated.

Collini says that "when a future historian is writing the history of Britain's intellectuals at the beginning of the 21st century, appearance on television will not be a significant criterion for inclusion" (2006, p.493). We disagree. Tulloch himself is an historian educated in history at Cambridge University, at the same time as Simon Schama who has done rather well for himself as a public intellectual. We are not challenging Collini's point that 'Editors and sub-editors will cut, re-write, and headline according to the prevailing wisdom of their guild' – though we would use the term 'tacit' or 'intuitive' knowledge' rather than Collini's apparently dismissive 'wisdom of their guild' (see Middleweek and Tulloch, 2018). And, yes, producers will have an eye on their time-slot and their audience ratings. But we do not agree that, in this developing television genre, they are always "quick on both counts to cut contributions they consider too long or too boring'; with presenters and

interviewers always pressed," Collini says, "to extract the memorable over the judicious, the partisan over the even-handed, the accessible over the daunting, the short over the long" (2006, p.494). This can be demonstrated by looking briefly at Miller's TV series, *Atheism: A Rough History of Disbelief.* In particular, we will look at a few sequences from his discussion of 9/11. This is near the beginning of episode 1 (which is available on YouTube). We hope to show some ways that good intellect and good television *can* work together.

A Rough History of Disbelief

Jonathan Miller's *Atheism* is, as he says at the start of episode one, a narrative of the historical disappearance of something: and that something is belief. Yet Miller's emphasis is as much about current religious *resurgence* as about the past loss of faith, linked, among other things, to terrorism.

Miller, writing and recording the series in 2003, deliberately begins his narrative in the present, in New York City. We edit to a clear blue sky. It is the same clear blue sky that those planes flew out of on September 11, 2001, just two years before. Miller is on the Staten Island ferry, and as the camera tilts, like those planes, down to the Manhattan skyline, we see Miller, with one New York icon, the Statue of Liberty in the background, noting the absence of another icon, the Twin Towers. This reminds him, he says, "of the religious implications of what one saw on television on that hideous day." We see Miller among young passengers on the ferry, as he continues: "although when it happened many people said it was a cowardly act – atrocious it certainly was – it's really hard to see it as *cowardly* exactly, since it was perpetrated by people who sacrificed themselves in the certain knowledge of their forthcoming death." Miller is at the rail of the ferry staring at the *new* Manhattan skyline without the Twin Towers, and we may be reminded of those opening words of the episode: "This series is about the disappearance of something," as Miller, in close focus ponders these difficult words about terrorism.

We then edit to shots inside Manhattan. The camera looks up to the *remaining* skyscrapers, mixed with downward shots to the ubiquitous yellow taxis below in the streets, and then to near pavement-level views of unassuming people walking in the sunlit city as they had done on that fatal day. We see Miller walking among those crowds in a long shot. His voiceover talks about how it was only in the name of absolute assurance of a permanent life after death that anyone would be willing to undertake such an act against a society whose lack of religion they deplored. "It is these people-in-the-street," Miller adds, whose supposed "support for Jewish claims in what is called the

Holy Land [the terrorists] were implacably opposed to." Miller is already elaborating his nuanced discourse, as he continues:

> Therefore the conspicuous absence of the Twin Towers, involving as it does the conspicuous *conflicts* between Christianity, Islam and Judaism, is I think one of the most powerful expressions of religious fanaticism in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

This is a strong statement; which he develops further, saying,

> But it is important to remember that you only have to travel a few miles from New York City to find yourself in the middle of a country which, far from being the *secular* world which was deplored and attacked by the Islamic fundamentalists is, in fact, *intensely Christian*, and therefore in its own way of course just as religious as the Moslem world that attacked it.

We now see Miller at home watching on his television screen the grainy TV images of Ground Zero, with firemen and George W. Bush coordinating operations as mechanical diggers destroy what remains of the hideous site. In voiceover Miller comments: "But for someone like myself, who has nothing you could possibly call religious belief…the spectacle of September 11 is a forceful reminder of the potentially destructive power of the three great monotheistic religions which have dominated the world in one way or another for nearly 2000 years." These words, emblematized by visual destruction on and after the day of 9/11 convey the central narrative theme of the series *Atheism*, as on-camera Miller walks on, in long-end of the lens close-up through the streets of New York.

However, the television visuals are telling their *own* story as Miller takes the Staten ferry and walks through the strong sun and shadow of New York streets talking of terrorism. Even as he speaks of the suicide bombers' beliefs, it is hard not to notice that Miller is surrounded in New York's streets by people who could well be Muslim, and, early in this sequence, the camera image of him is momentarily, almost subliminally, blurred and obscured by one of them getting in the way. Yet the next shot, his point-of-view, follows with positive, *non*-threatening images. It is a multicultural pavement of New Yorkers: Latinos, African-Americans, Asians, an elegant young Hispanic woman with sunglasses perched fashionably in her long hair, an older bearded man, possibly a street person, with brimmed hat squashed down on his head. They are all walking towards us. Maybe our response watching it lay in the image itself, or in what Miller goes on to describe as the viewer's intuitive memory, but it was hard not to feel strengthened by this visual moment of melting-pot democracy.

Yet this tacit belief is then threatened visually. These shots of an active democratic people walking to work or shopping are systematically obliterated by quick, harsh lateral shots of traffic and water jets obscuring this New York public. This is followed, cued by Miller's words "what is called the Holy Land," by huge words on a truck emblazoned with the Stars and Stripes: "Gone, But Not Forgotten September 11." The *ideological* drama of combat is already expressed by this conjuncture of image and words. This image is displaced by the shots looking up skyscrapers we mentioned earlier, as Miller gradually elaborates his overall *conflictual* theme; and his strong statement about the potentially destructive power of the world's three great monotheistic religions is matched instantly by a zip-pan to a Christian cross fashioned out of the wrecked girders at Ground Zero. We see shots of young Americans looking at firemen and at display boards from Ground Zero, with the words scrawled over the images, "Never Forgive Never Forget (God Bless America)." But the word 'Never' has been rubbed out by another hand; and the camera focuses on this, and on the graffiti words, "Ave Maria Holy Queen!"

What immediately follows this Ground Zero sequence is interesting visually and audibly. 'Vox-pop' interviews – the voice of the people – are standard television fare in most genres. But in the earlier histories of television intellectuals vox-pop interviews hardly occur. Yet they do occur *twice* in Miller's three-part series, and the first is in this terrorism sequence. This vox-pop begins immediately after Miller talks the elaborated clauses and sub-clauses of academic qualification as 'a thinker.' "I wouldn't want to say, and I think it would be entirely inaccurate to say, that my interest in, or my objections to these religions were actually *provoked* by the events of the last two years" – not exactly the quick sound bite Collini predicts. And appropriately to this intellectualized discourse, there is now a camera edit from an over-the-shoulder shot of Miller watching 9/11 images on his television to a zoom-in to his own study. Miller sits on his large, comfortable sofa, his full bookshelves behind him. This shot reveals the familiar Miller hand gestures, and, in close-up, his lined, expressive face, as he speaks another elaborated sentence: "All the same, these events do bring one face to face with the consequences, both social and political, of beliefs in the divine, the supernatural, the holy, the sacred and the transcendent, ideas which I like *many* others find alien, uncongenial and, to be frank, almost *unintelligible.*"

By now Miller is shaking his head in puzzlement. Jonathan Miller has, from the start of this episode, presented himself as the wise, thoughtful, ironic, but somewhat distanced intellectual; and this scene ends with Miller's face, his mouth a little disdainful, leaning into the camera as he gets up from his sofa. But, in immediate contrast to this world-weary shot, the production team

juxtaposes a cluster of four visually dynamic vox-pop television interviews in *support* of Miller's position. We see a young man of mixed ethnicity with a northern English working-class accent saying, "I don't believe in God. I don't think there's enough evidence to prove that there's a guy up there in the sky…There's people starving all over the world, there's wars…Why would he stand by and let that happen?"

Technically, this vox-pop shot is *internally* dramatic in three ways. It shifts back and forward between the grainy image and slightly muffled sound of this young man on Miller's TV, and the clearer original camera recording by the production team. It also uses rapid focus-pulls within the short ECU sequence to generate within-frame movement. Furthermore, the vox-pop head of the young man slams forward towards the viewer (and Miller watching the sequence). This is even more apparent in the third vox pop interview, where an angry grandmother who has not believed in god since the death of her three-year-old grand-daughter visually seems to slam into the face of Miller himself watching her on his television. Why is it shot and edited this way? What does it *do* in the narrative? We think this vox-pop sequence is important to Miller's series in four ways.

First, it gives cross-age, class, gender, ethnicity support to Miller's carefully intellectualized words, academic posture, and *books*-dominated mise-en-scène. It adds an everyday-ordinary drama to the otherwise very 'BBC Four' self-presentation of Miller. One thing that TV professionals particularly dislike is static intellectual talking heads pontificating in abstract words to the camera. But this vox-pop camera style establishes a talking-head *dynamic.*

Second, it acts as non-academic support for the very *similar* discussion Miller has with the arts and sciences 'experts' who are a structural, dialogical and ideational motif of this series. For example, a blond vox-pop woman replicates in her words author Henry Miller's more elaborated comments about his period of belief during childhood.

Third, it replicates, but also varies another key ideational and stylistic strand of the series. This is the insertion of actor Bernard Hill – who was famous in Britain for his iconic black-humor lead as Yosser in *Boys from the Blackstuff*, mockingly serious in its depiction of Thatcher's Britain. Here Hill, always in chiaroscuro, and looking exactly like Yosser, appears in ECU throughout the series, speaking the same disbelief as the young multi-ethnic vox-pop man, with the same "if God exists and is omnipotent, why then?" formulation. But, in the Hill/Yosser sequences it is voiced in the *elaborated* and nuanced words of philosophers from Miller's brief history of disbelief: people like Epicurus, Democritus, Aristotle, Cicero and Seneca.

Fourth, these stylistically different actants in the series narrative – the academic and literary experts talking with Miller in the relaxed comfort of their book-lined homes, lit naturalistically; the inter-textual Yosser persona of actor Bernard Hill lit expressionistically; the age-, gender-, and ethnicity-differentiated vox-pop participants, in dynamic movement and represented visually as both 'on TV' and 'live in the street' – are all augmented by the multiple *presences* of Miller himself. In this series, Miller switches seamlessly (and certainly not boringly) from the elaborated discourse spoken to camera from his study, to the silent watcher-ethnographer moving through the crowded streets of New York; to the celebrity ironist seen in several moments of the series. There are also the many Millers seen on his laptop by the bookish Miller in his study as he summarizes and speaks back to his figure on the laptop, as though in a university tutorial. And then, finally in the *other* vox-pop sequence in episode 3, we see a different Miller again. Here Miller, speaking at length about his own nearness to death, becomes the secular comforter to a dying old lady in the most moving sequence of the series.

So, through the series we see many different self-representations of Miller *himself*, as he switches across several presentational identities: as medical scientist, as young Cambridge Footlights comic, as academic tutor, and as sharer of secular termination with other old people. Miller and his production team combine all these identities within this particular mediated role of the television intellectual; and, in our argument, fuse the intellectual with the popular at many different levels.

Talking Terror

Our second approach in this paper about 'talking terrorism' will proceed along two axes: an *institutional/generic* axis, on one hand, and a *personal/subjective*, on the other. We illustrate these axes via four very different kinds of television institution and different performance subjectivities that impact on the way in which we 'bridge the gap' between academic and celebrity culture. At the centre of this discussion is co-author John Tulloch, whose photograph became one of the iconic images of the 7/7 attack, and Mohammad Sidique Khan, the terrorist who exploded the bomb in Tulloch's London Underground carriage. In a selection of interviews for English, Welsh and Dutch broadcasters Tulloch explores his and Khan's mediated constructions as 'victim' and 'terrorist', and confronts the hijacking of his image by the popular press for political purposes. By being part of the conversation, Tulloch is accorded more airtime, more creative and editorial control and further opportunities for the sharing of his intellectual expertise. Both axes are crucial because being a public intellectual will vary according to the institutional positioning of the program (prestige or

popular), the subjective positioning of the academic (their 'role') and the way the media shapes and frames that dialogic exchange.

BBC 2 'Newsnight'

The earliest of Tulloch's TV interviews took place some five months after the London terrorist attack for BBC2 Newsnight – one of Britain's most prestigious current affairs programs – as part of their end of year broadcast. The authoritative self-presentation of Britain's famous television host, Jeremy Paxman establishes a prestige institutional frame from the outset. He opens by responding directly to the misuse of Tulloch's bloodied and bandaged image on the front page of Britain's most popular tabloid *The Sun*.

The producer had initially phoned proposing Tulloch would talk as a media academic about 7/7 images of his own choosing. He responded by offering interview cues he hoped producers would adopt in editing. By repeating the word 'image' Tulloch attempts to steer the segment, in the absence of having any program control.

> TULLOCH: It's like an image. I have an image of it. It's like being pulled like a rubber photo. That bar that goes down the end of the seat…my head smashed it. It was all in images you see, just little images.

That cueing of images enabled Tulloch to establish his media academic competence in a longer, two-minute exchange with interviewer Liz McKeen. Each chosen image is analysed in turn, with prominence given to the rescue of bombing victim Davinia Turrell and a still of British Prime Minister Tony Blair reflecting on the bombing aftermath.

> TULLOCH: I was in a lot of pain and…I saw this photograph of Tony Blair…and the first feeling I had was, what a performative act…He's standing like this *(Tulloch bends over)*, head down, hands down. Given that he told us countless times, 'it's not if it's going to happen, it's when it's going to happen', if you were Tony Blair wouldn't *you* be ready for how you performed the day it happened? Of course you would!
>
> McKEEN *[V/O iconic image of Tulloch]:* Given his skepticism, it's ironic that last month John became an unwitting agent for the Prime Minister in his bid to get controversial anti-terror legislation past reluctant MPs.
>
> TULLOCH: It's interesting if you compare [my image] with the other iconic image that came out of Edgware Road of Davinia Turrell who was shown everywhere…in the first few days, with the mask. But of

> course, by the time you get terror laws the mask becomes an impediment. Now what *The Sun* wants is 'the victim'. This is me, in my view, reduced to a category. I am a victim, I have no voice. Well then, let's use his voice – without ever asking me of course – 'Tell Tony he's right' *[this headline's positioning beside Tulloch's mouth appeared as though they were his words]*.
>
> McKEEN: And of course that wasn't your voice, that doesn't reflect what you were thinking at all.
>
> TULLOCH: No…if I'd put my words on there it would've been, 'Not in my name Tony'.

The dialogue here conveys the pitch of this 'prestige' Newsnight program in which Tulloch was positioned as 'the media professor interpreting images' – a *non*-victim identity that contrasts with flashes of his vulnerable persona in the interview. These three identities – survivor, celebrity and intellectual – exist simultaneously in Tulloch's critique of a photograph of terrorist Khan. In voiceover Tulloch describes his commitment to better understand the motivations of the bomber while on screen a photograph of Khan appears sitting among colleagues at a primary school in Beeston where he worked as a teaching assistant.

> TULLOCH: Suddenly these aren't terrorists as 'Other', shady people from outside. There's the man who bombed my carriage Mohammad Sidique Khan and he's got this expression of listening and there's me in hospital thinking…How can these people do this?
>
> McKEEN: You're talking about the bombers with understanding. Do you feel any anger over what they did?
>
> TULLOCH: …We must, if we're going to make our country better and more secure and more democratic and more multicultural, understand this better.

ITN UK

Tulloch elaborated the need to 'understand this better' in his subsequent appearances on ITN News, London in July 2006 to commemorate the first anniversary of the 7/7 bombings. Instead of an interview about 'images' as in the Newsnight program, Tulloch was accorded the unusual privilege of conceptual and editorial control over a three-minute television segment, a result of the mutual professional respect developed in his earlier interviews with the network. Tulloch reverses Khan's journey to the London Underground on the morning of 7/7 by interviewing residents from Khan's

hometown of Beeston as well as students from Leeds University. After viewing the rushes at the end of a nine-hour edit, ITN doubled the initial offer of a three-minute segment, extending Tulloch's story to a two-part special running over two nights prime-time. In the first part we see the television academic steering the narrative in a more institutionally-embedded role as *interviewer*.

> TULLOCH *[V/O]*: I know all about the Khan who devastated people's lives on 7/7. But I've heard about another Khan: the teacher's aide who tracked kids' education, the guy who helped teenagers with other social problems in the community. I wanted to hear about both Khans and what life's been like in Beeston since 7/7. In a local park where Khan played football I met some Beeston residents.
>
> TULLOCH: What was your impression of him?
>
> WOMAN: That he was a very nice young man, very well spoken, very pleasant, always polite and actually quite a nice lad.
>
> TULLOCH: And was that a general view as far as you knew?
>
> WOMAN: Yes, I've never heard anybody say a bad word about him.

In the role of professional interviewer Tulloch 'gives voice' to those who knew the 'nice lad' and challenges Khan's mediated construction as 'paranoid killer', especially via the words of a school governor who emphasized that it was British foreign policy which led to this terrorist act, and a woman who spoke angrily about the exploitative behaviour of media who came to interview in Beeston.

In the second part of 'John's Journey' Tulloch's editing control was especially evident in his choice of statements from the four young Muslim students he interviewed, and in his deliberately mono-tonal voiceover, the latter intended to focus audience attention on the *interviewees'* knowledge and experience. Unlike the forthright Paxman of Newsnight, the 'chatty' ITN newsreader conveys the 'popular' institutional positioning of a national commercial broadcaster.

> NEWSREADER: John Tulloch stood three feet from Khan as he exploded his bomb at Edgware Road. Yesterday we followed John as he visited Beeston to see how 7/7 has changed the community Khan grew up in. Tonight he meets young Muslims to hear what they think of the bombing one year on. Here is part 2 of John's story.
>
> TULLOCH *[V/O]*: I've come to Leeds to speak to young Muslims in the area about Mohammad Sidique Khan and what 7/7 meant to them. Like Khan, they're university educated and their local mosque was at

> the centre of investigations the week after 7/7. They strongly feel the bombers were motivated by foreign policy.
>
> TULLOCH: These Muslim students are *living* their studies. Hamza is a master's law student.
>
> HAMZA: Tony Blair…went…into an illegal war, got it justified through an international lawyer which every international lawyer knew was illegal. We were all misled and he has no responsibility for it. Why does he not have any responsibility for it or when will he have responsibility?
>
> TULLOCH: And Barro is a medical student studying dentistry.
>
> BARRO: The reality of the matter is… Iraq has the highest rate of children death in the whole world and let me tell you about simple medical equipment in Iraq. Simple drips…lying around in a hospital…in England…yet in Iraq these simple things that save lives are not there.

These Muslim students reveal different takes on the 'foreign policy' theme of the 7/7 bombings, and in the remainder of the interview, discuss the threats to their civil liberties in the aftermath of the attack. In voiceover, Tulloch steers the narrative with reflections such as 'I was learning all the time here' and attempts to 'understand this better' in the role of interviewer. Importantly Tulloch learned about the Arabic term 'Umma', representing the supra-national Islamic 'community', which led to all four students saying that, though they didn't agree with what Mohammad Sidique Khan did, they agreed with what he *said* – a point of sufficient surprise to Tulloch to end the interview talking about it in ECU. The ITN special enabled Tulloch also to develop his multiple identities (this time his 'learner' and professional-organizational identities, not simply that of 'a survivor') within a popular institutional media frame.

VARA

In a much longer interview sequence for the Dutch television program *De Leugen Regeert* on Netherlands' VARA public broadcaster, Tulloch is provided a lengthy to-air platform to draw on his academic expertise. In one three-and-a-half minute interview excerpt, Tulloch's argument about multiple subjectivity is stated clearly and intellectually as he recounts *The Sun* newspaper's use of his photograph to represent the voice of the people, his own retort in *The Guardian* newspaper two days later with the headline 'They stole my voice', the issue of consent to the use of his bleeding and bandaged head on the front page of *The Sun,* and the one-dimensionality of victim and

perpetrator narratives. As with Jonathan Miller's elaborated discourse in the British TV series *Atheism*, in this Dutch interview Tulloch is also afforded elaborate sentences, philosophical musings and multiple subjectivities. The opportunity for elaborated discourse on Dutch television can be explained, in part, by the program's journalism-specific focus. The program title, '*The Lie Rules*' was inspired by a famous statement made by the former Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands about the country's declining journalistic standards in a post-privatization climate. The program format involved a liberal-left panel of journalists debating the issues of the day in front of a live audience. This group-institutional setting combined with a commitment to the publicizing of 'alternative voices' not only signaled the program's journalistic values but also enabled Tulloch to perform his multiple identities.

ITV Wales

Our final interview excerpt was a Welsh regional ITV news special to mark the first anniversary of the 7/7 bombings. In this interview, Tulloch's argument about the multiple subjectivities of himself and Khan are visualized in 'three-way boxes' or split screens in which Tulloch affirms, "I'm a bit more than just victim and he's a bit more than just paranoid killer" (ITV Wales, July 2006). Without the opportunity for elaborated discourse as in the Dutch Vara program, we see the importance of having the visual equivalent of one-liners such as "I'm not just a victim and he's not just a paranoid killer" when being a public intellectual on a popular visual medium.

Our argument is that 'bridging the gap' between celebrity and intellectual culture will vary according to subjective and institutional factors. Subjectively, by offering professional cues, steering the creative and editorial direction of his television appearances, engaging in productive and collaborative dialogue and showing an understanding of, and appreciation for the industry, Tulloch was able to procure more air-time and share his academic expertise. But, 'bridging the gap' will vary according to the institutional framing of the particular television program – be it prestigious or popular – and the conventions, expectations and structural imperatives of news-making.

Conclusion: Tulloch/Middleweek – Bridging Dialogues

In 2012, Middleweek's camera crew and executive producer flew to Wales to interview Tulloch for the Australian version of the U.S documentary series *I Survived…* which catalogued the twists and turns of fate of survivors of traumatic events such as natural disasters and terrorist attacks. Though Tulloch was pleased with the interview he was disappointed that the final cut did not

retain any of the elaborated discussion that Middleweek accorded as interviewer, and Tulloch himself had accorded the Muslim university students. However, Middleweek was producing a local version of an international franchise and was bound by institutional constraints, one of the axes that affects the 'bridging of gaps' between celebrity and intellectual culture. For instance, each episode was structured by three interwoven survivor narratives, interview grabs in the place of voiceovers or dramatisations, strict durations for sound grabs and templates for each graphic to set the scene and unfolding action. The remit was to celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and survival against the odds and was in keeping with Tulloch's desire to elaborate on dimensions of his survival: the physical, psychological and intellectual.

From aspects of Tulloch's survival the script moved to the media's appropriation of his image which, in Tulloch's view, was yet another emotional obstacle he had to overcome and 'survive.' The graphic, 'Pictures of John's bloodied face appeared in media around the world,' was used to introduce the topic and enable Tulloch to elaborate on the circulation of his photograph in the proceeding interview excerpts:

> …it became one of the iconic images everywhere. And they were using me as a bit of a political football – I kept appearing on front pages of different newspapers, each one with a different politics... And I felt I didn't have a human life, I was being used…So I thought positive…'I've got time off work, I'm going to start looking into iconic images'.

Though Tulloch's reference to 'iconic images' remains intact in this script, the remainder of the sentence was cut because of commercial time constraints. Thus, Tulloch was denied the opportunity to elaborate further on his research of iconic images for a book (Tulloch and Blood 2012). Nevertheless, out of this initial disagreement Tulloch and Middleweek were able to generate positive collaboration in a publication that bridged another gap, this time between ethnographic methods, textual analysis, psychoanalytical and risk sociological analysis (Tulloch and Middleweek 2017), as well as the finalizing of Tulloch's book, *British Television Intellectuals*, the Afterword for *Screen Production Research* (2018), and this current chapter.

As authors we still do not agree on some things, but do agree about reflexivity and mutual, inter-personal, inter-disciplinary and stimulating exchange. We think that is how 'bridging the gap' should always be – a galvanizing experience between academia and industry.

References

Ash, Timothy Garton. (27 April 2006). Are there British intellectuals? Yes, and they've never had it so good, *The Guardian,* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2006/apr/27/comment.mainsection

BBC News, (December 2005), *Newsnight*, London, UK, BBC2.

Collini, S. (2006). *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Denton, R. (October 2004), *Atheism: A Rough History of Disbelief,* PBS.

Graham McNeice Productions (January 2012), *I Survived…Stories of Australians*, Sydney, Australia, Foxtel.

ITN Productions, (July 2006), *John's Journey, part 1*, London, UK.

ITV Wales, (July 2006), *One Year On*, Cardiff, Wales.

Middleweek, B and Tulloch, J. (2018) Afterword: Tacit Knowledge and Affect – Soft Ethnography and Shared Domains. In C. Batty and S. Kerrigan, *Screen Production Research: Creative Practice as a Mode of Enquiry*, pp.233-248. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tulloch, J and Blood, W (2012). *Iconic Images of War and Terror: Media Images in an Age of International Risk*, New York: Routledge.

Tulloch, J. and Middleweek, B. (2017). *Real Sex Films: The New Intimacy and Risk in Cinema*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

VARA Broadcasting Association, (n.d.) *De Leugen Regeert*, The Netherlands.