

Labouring on A Clockwork Orange (1971): finding the voices of creative, technical, and administrative workers in the Stanley Kubrick Archive

FENWICK, James

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/29443/>

This document is the Published Version [VoR]

Citation:

FENWICK, James (2022). Labouring on A Clockwork Orange (1971): finding the voices of creative, technical, and administrative workers in the Stanley Kubrick Archive. Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



Labouring on *A Clockwork Orange* (1971): finding the voices of creative, technical, and administrative workers in the Stanley Kubrick Archive

James Fenwick

To cite this article: James Fenwick (2022): Labouring on *A Clockwork Orange* (1971): finding the voices of creative, technical, and administrative workers in the Stanley Kubrick Archive, Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, DOI: [10.1080/01439685.2022.2018560](https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2022.2018560)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2022.2018560>



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 03 Jan 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



LABOURING ON *A CLOCKWORK ORANGE* (1971): FINDING THE VOICES OF CREATIVE, TECHNICAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE WORKERS IN THE STANLEY KUBRICK ARCHIVE

James Fenwick

*Those films directed by Stanley Kubrick have frequently been analysed and interpreted through the perspective of the producer-director's authorial control. However, documents in the Stanley Kubrick Archive can allow for the voices of a myriad of overlooked, forgotten, and even hidden labour to be restored to the history of these films. Focusing on *A Clockwork Orange* (1971), the article considers how that film was purposely promoted by Kubrick and his publicist at Polaris Productions as having almost been single-handedly produced and created by Kubrick. The article challenges and deconstructs this self-promotion myth of Kubrick's control by critically reading against the grain of archival documents such as progress reports, unit memos, and correspondence in order to uncover the extent to which other media labourers around the world were involved in, and continue to be involved in, the film's production, distribution, exhibition, and marketing. In taking this approach, the article aims to work towards a greater understanding of production hierarchies on *A Clockwork Orange*, to question the way in which archives of canonical film directors are used by researchers, and to examine how archives contextualise or even marginalise the voices of below-the-line media labourers.*

Stanley Kubrick wrote, directed, and produced *A Clockwork Orange* (1971). But he was assisted by many creative, technical, and administrative labourers throughout

Correspondence to: James Fenwick, College of Social Sciences and Arts, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield S1 1WB, UK. Email: j.fenwick@shu.ac.uk

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

the development, production, post-production (including film processing and film dubbing, among other jobs), distribution, publicity, and exhibition process in the 1970s and, later in the 1980s, on the development and promotion of home video releases. Stanley Kubrick was but one individual (albeit, a significant individual) involved in the creation and selling of the film. But the Kubrick myth—the all-controlling auteur, the domineering director—can cloud the reality of the film’s production, distribution, and marketing.¹

Kubrick’s company, Polaris Productions, was responsible for a promotion campaign that, similar to *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968), placed him at the centre of *A Clockwork Orange*’s production. Mike Kaplan, vice president of Polaris Productions at the time, oversaw the promotion of Kubrick as a producing powerhouse. One particular publicity stunt involved the creation of an in-house newsletter, *The Orange Times*, designed to celebrate Kubrick’s authorial vision, as made clear in the editorial:

Kubrick’s reputation for control is legend. In addition to producing, directing, and adapting *A Clockwork Orange*, he operated the camera, lit the sets, was involved in every decision regarding casting, art direction, scoring and mixing.²

The promotional strategy of Polaris Productions—a company incorporated in 1962 to protect, preserve, and promote Kubrick as a producer in order to ensure the longevity of his power within the film industry³—was to create a campaign that displaced other labourers involved in the film’s production in favour of Kubrick, with all authorial, business, and administrative agency being ascribed to him. This was ‘Stanley Kubrick’s *A Clockwork Orange*’, as declared on film posters or on the cover of a tie-in graphic novelization released in 1972. He was the man holding the camera, the vision, and the authority, as visually depicted on the front cover of *Newsweek* in January 1972 and headlined ‘The Startling Vision of STANLEY KUBRICK’. The promotion strategy was about instigating, and furthering, the myth of Kubrick as the man responsible for every facet of the film’s production and distribution. In other words, self-promotion, something to which Kubrick was not averse, but had in fact made a central component of his rise to success in the film industry since at least 1950.⁴

But in reality, there was a range of other vitally important workers, each of whom contributed their own labour, and even their own ideas, to ensure the production, creative, and commercial success of *A Clockwork Orange*. This included the caterers on the film set providing refreshments for the cast and crew, or the production accountants that paid the wages of all involved, or the drivers moving equipment between filming locations. Without these workers there would be no *A Clockwork Orange*. These are obvious statements, I know, but the aim of this article is to move beyond the myth constructed by Kubrick and Polaris Productions, instead focusing on the material conditions and social relations of production of *A Clockwork Orange*, using documents located in the Stanley Kubrick Archive at the University of the Arts London (henceforth referred to as the SKA).

The SKA, far from being just about Stanley Kubrick, actually contains evidence of the material, social, and cultural realities of production that can allow researchers to empower the at times marginalised roles of below-the-line workers: camera

operators, sound recordists, assistant directors, runners, make-up artists, continuity artists, secretaries, delivery drivers and others beside. The SKA also contains evidence of the work of technical labourers (for example, those involved in the processing of the film stock) and of administrative workers (for example, staff and secretaries at the various offices of Warner Bros. involved in strategic planning for the film, as well as Kubrick's administrative team at his UK-based production company, Hawk Films). The extent of the SKA and the scope of the material it contains offers a unique opportunity to study the entire life of *A Clockwork Orange* as a media object and the labour, resources, efforts, and interactions involved in its creation and distribution. *A Clockwork Orange* has involved, over the years, a multiplicity of labourers—creative, technical, administrative—all of whom have played a part in the film's life. However, despite its size, the SKA contains archival silences. In other words, it does not contain every possible piece of documentary evidence to understand the lived experience of those involved in the film. Instead, it is necessary to 'read against the grain' to uncover the perspectives and experiences of below-the-line workers.⁵ Mary Rizzo defines reading against the archival grain as being the use of 'a piece of documentary evidence to gain information counter to the perspective of its original creators. This technique has been utilized by historians looking for the stories of marginalized people.'⁶ This approach to the archive has been adopted in a range of feminist media histories, recognising the ways in which archives privilege the hierarchies of above-the-line workers.⁷ Archival documents are not neutral sources of history, but rather material that can allow researchers to question systems of power, control, and agency. Reading against the archival grain, for the purposes of this article, means utilising documents such as progress reports, unit memos, continuity sheets, and inter-office communication, archival documents that are often framed as ephemera in histories of privileged figures.⁸ The aim is to approach these archival documents from a new perspective, looking at them to interpret the agency and contributions of below-the-line workers.⁹

By focusing on media labourers, this article serves as a case study for the wider field of production studies, a field concerned with the lived experiences and production cultures of below the line workers in the media industries.¹⁰ Production studies focuses on production hierarchies through empirical research—observations, interviews, ethnographic studies, archival research—and aims to deconstruct myths of power that typically privilege—both in terms of public attention and critical debate—above the line producers and directors. Instead, by foregrounding the lived experiences of all creative, technical, and administrative labourers, production studies can reframe notions of agency and power.¹¹ By grounding the research in production studies, the aim is to reframe Stanley Kubrick and the films with which he is associated for the wider film and media studies community. By utilising critical archival methods, the article examines how Kubrick's films and the labourers that worked on them can serve as an instrumental case study into mid-twentieth century film production cultures. It also examines how the SKA can be used to uncover the experiences of media labourers. As such, this article is not only about Kubrick, nor only contributes to the narrow field of Kubrick studies, but rather is an instrumental case study in the necessity and

importance of production studies research and archival methods in an attempt to deconstruct the myths surrounding powerful, canonical film producers like Kubrick.

For the purposes of this article, the focus will be on the film's initial production in 1970-71. Rather than discussing *A Clockwork Orange* as an artistic object that centres Stanley Kubrick, I will instead frame it as a media object that can be used as evidence of the collaborative nature of labour relations in the media industries. And I will discuss how the archival remains that *A Clockwork Orange* has left behind are the material evidence of the capitalistic conditions of production of the American film industry. I make reference to a range of archival documents, including call sheets, progress reports, budgets, correspondence, business reports, and other archival ephemera contained in the SKA. I highlight the materiality of this evidence, discussing its place, position, and status within the SKA catalogue, along the way raising wider questions as to the continuing mythologization of Kubrick as auteur at the expense of the role and agency of individual workers, the means by which archival research can contribute to the deconstruction of this myth, and the role of the SKA in wider research into film materiality, production cultures, and labour history.

***A Clockwork Orange* in the Stanley Kubrick Archive**

I want to first reflect on the material afterlife of *A Clockwork Orange* in the SKA. The archive itself is evidence of the continuing administrative labour in relation to *A Clockwork Orange*, with specialist workers—archivists, archival assistants, and archival volunteers—cataloguing, preserving, and contextualising the material remains of the film. Their work is, in many ways, an extension of the administrative functions carried out by Kubrick's staff during his lifetime, when people such as Anthony Frewin, Margaret Adams, Andros Epaminondas—secretaries, administrators, personal assistants—were involved in the creation and expansion of Kubrick's extensive filing system. The archive therefore represents the labour and resources that went into *A Clockwork Orange* and is a repository of the paperwork that was generated as a result. It also represents the ongoing labour connected to the film for those working with its archival remains.

At present, there are nineteen categories within the SKA catalogue, with categories dedicated to each of Kubrick's thirteen feature films, alongside more general categories such as 'General Business and Personal Materials', 'Look Magazine', and 'Unfinished Projects'.¹² The material remains of *A Clockwork Orange* are located in category thirteen, 'Clockwork Orange', which is broken down into ten further subcategories:

1. Development – Scripts
2. Pre-production
3. Production
4. Post-production
5. Distribution
6. Exploitation and publicity
7. Responses and awards

8. Indexed papers and letters
9. Photographs and slides
10. Financial papers

Within each subcategory are further subseries. The archival material documents the development, production, distribution, and exhibition of *A Clockwork Orange*. But it is not only within the 'Clockwork Orange' category that archival material pertaining to the film is located. For example, in category two, 'General Business and Personal Materials', there is a subseries titled 'Home Releases' within which there is extensive material about the development, production, distribution and promotion of VHS and DVD releases of the film. There are also many new boxes of material related to *A Clockwork Orange* deposited in 2019 that have yet to be catalogued and so remain 'off catalogue'. And there is also material that has been withdrawn for legal reasons (such as correspondence generated by Kubrick's lawyer, Louis C. Blau) or to protect the commercial interests of both Warner Bros. and the Kubrick estate.

Much of the archival material has very little to do with the actual 'art' of film-making, but rather is about the complex technical, administrative, and legal work that results from the process of film production. The SKA is largely comprised of receipts, invoices, business reports, stationery catalogues, payrolls, and administrative documentation. As for Kubrick, he is often absent from much of the material, despite the promise made on the front catalogue entry of, for example, the 'Clockwork Orange' category:

As well as directing the film Kubrick also: wrote the screenplay; produced the film; and it is commonly held, acted as un-credited cinematographer and main publicist.¹³

The SKA catalogue places Kubrick as the central presence in the production of *A Clockwork Orange* and, by extension, privileges him as the dominant figure within the archival material.¹⁴ But this neglects the wealth of material evidence in the archive that counters this myth. Instead, 'Clockwork Orange' is composed of evidence of the labour resources required to produce *A Clockwork Orange*. In other words, it reveals the extent to which Kubrick was reliant on a range of other individuals and forces in the production of the film. This returns us to the issue of archival silences. As Mary Rizzo has argued, archives 'are the products of power'. In the case of the SKA, Kubrick's power.¹⁵ But the problem is how the power structures inherent within the archive can then be replicated in the historical narratives of, for example, academic works that make use of the archive. Within Kubrick studies—the small but growing community of academic scholarship that utilises the SKA in the study of the life and work of Stanley Kubrick—there is the unintended consequence of replicating the myths and power of Kubrick if archival documents are not approached with new research questions and methods, questions and methods that focus on issues of agency, marginalisation, and hidden labour.¹⁶

Much of the material in the SKA often does not directly involve Kubrick, even to the extent of him not being mentioned or even copied into correspondence. Instead, the 'Clockwork Orange' category is made up of interoffice memos, correspondence, telegrams, letters, and reports between administrative workers at

various Warner Bros. offices, or between heads of department on the production itself, or between international organisations based across countries involved in distribution, shipping, or exhibition. By reading against the grain, it is possible to find the voices of these media labourers in the SKA and restore them into film history and celebrate their contribution to the films on which they worked. I want to now consider what the archival ephemera within the SKA can reveal about individual labour and how it can contribute to finding these voices of creative, technical and administrative labourers involved on *A Clockwork Orange*.

Daily progress reports

Given the extent of the material available in the SKA (over 800 linear metres of shelving, with new material being added), it is not feasible (at least, not for the purposes of this article) to conduct an exhaustive analysis of every archival document. The labour-intensive nature of such a research endeavour, and the collaborative necessity, is not something that is presently conceivable. However, it is still possible to gain a sense of the production cultures on the film through a sampling of key documents, relying on the SKA catalogue and first-hand experience and knowledge of the archive to locate relevant information. As such, this article will proceed by identifying and discussing archival documents to ascertain what they reveal about labour on *A Clockwork Orange*.

The first such key documents are the daily progress reports. A progress report is a vital administrative function on most feature film productions. The reports outline the scenes that were shot each day, scenes that were not completed, number of setups, amount of film stock used, call times, time of the first shot, lunch breaks, time the unit was dismissed, the actors and crew required, payroll obligations, numbers for catering, specialist logistics, general notes on the day's activities, and any health and safety issues. On *A Clockwork Orange*, it was production manager and associate producer Bernard Williams who wrote the daily progress reports, among his many duties.¹⁷ The documents provide an overwhelming amount of data, largely quantitative in nature. It is possible to gain an insight into working conditions on the film via this data. For example, by quantifying the details of the call times and unit dismissal times for cast and crew, it is possible to determine the hours of labour invested into the film. Between 14 September 1970 (the first day of principal photography) and 24 February 1971 (the last day of principal photography), the average daily working hours was 9.3. This average, however, is distorted by a handful of days toward the latter end of the shoot when only half days were worked. On 21 February, the crew assembled for five hours between 6pm and 11pm, and on 22 February the crew was assembled for three hours and thirty minutes, between 6.30pm and 10pm.¹⁸ More typical, especially in the opening weeks of the production, were working days of ten hours or more. The first 37 days of production, between 14 September and 4 November (with a two-week break between 29 September and 11 October due to actor Malcolm McDowell being injured on set), the cast and crew worked an average 10.1 hours

per day, with an average lunch break of 53 minutes (though, with no recorded lunch breaks on some shooting days).

This data should not be viewed as somehow evidence of irregular working patterns. Indeed, without further datasets, it is not possible to tell how regular or irregular the working hours on *A Clockwork Orange* were compared to other productions of that time. However, in the case of this one film the data does show that the cast and crew were working incredibly long hours for an intense period of time, as is the nature of film production. But the intense working conditions were exacerbated by the production's management not allowing, for example, a paid holiday on New Year's Day. Instead, below the line workers were expected to either work or lose a day's pay, as dictated in a unit memo:

There will be no shooting on 1st January. Although this day cannot be regarded as a day off the company will allow the following concession. Any member of the shooting unit not required by his Head of Department to work in preparation for forthcoming sets may, if they so wish, take the day off on the understanding that a deduction of one fifth of their flat 5-day salary will be made from their wages. Time sheets should be marked accordingly.¹⁹

The progress reports can also reveal substantial amount of detail about who was on set and what they were doing, even when specific labourers are not named. The reports list the number of set ups that were completed on any given day of the production. A set up involves a variety of film crew readying the set and positioning cameras (where necessary, moving them) and lights, blocking the actors, ensuring correct continuity and props are in use, refreshing makeup, all in preparation for the shot to be filmed. A set up is not a 'take'. A take is the number of versions of a particular shot that has been filmed, while a set up is a different shot each time. Throughout the production of *A Clockwork Orange*, on average there were 4.8 set ups per day (discounting rehearsal or camera test days, or days where, for whatever reason, filming was cut short or filming just did not take place).

Crew specifically involved in each set up would have been the following. First, the director of photography, John Alcott, who in collaboration with Kubrick would have supervised the lighting conditions of the shot, adjusted the camera lens if necessary, and managed a team of camera operators and assistants. The camera assistants included Laurie Frost, David Lenham, Ron Drinkwater (focus puller), and the production assistant Andros Epaminondas. These assistants would respond to briefs and tasks set by Alcott. For example, Epaminondas was tasked with taking instant photographs of locations in advance of the arrival of the camera and lighting team in order to establish, 'the value of existing lighting'.²⁰ In other words, there was a hierarchy of labour on set designed to ensure the speed and efficiency of the shoot, and to provide the heads of departments (i.e. people like Alcott) with the necessary information to allow them to carry out their own role.

Others involved in a set up would have been the 'gaffer', or supervising electrician (Frank Wardale), a team of assistant electricians (Louise Bogue and Derek Gatrell) and a team of 'grips' (Don Budge and Tony Cridlin). The grips had to undertake the hard labour of unpacking technical equipment such as the lights,

camera, and electricians. And the equipment could be substantial in terms of numbers of cameras, lights and cables. For example, on 7 February 1971, eight set ups were filmed for two scenes: an exterior of Alex's flat block and Alex's rape fantasy. The former was shot on location at Thamesmead, east London, and the latter at the Handley Page factory at the Radlett Aerodrome, north west London. The electrical equipment used that day included: eight Brutes, eight Molevators, fourteen mini Brutes, fourteen Hi Lifts, fifty .2 cables, three 1000-amp generators, one 240 vault alternator, along with the camera and lights.²¹ The extent of the equipment and the need to shift geographical location from east to north-west London required the hiring of four additional electricians for the day. The grips would also support the camera operation in collaboration with the camera operators (Ernie Day and Mike Molloy). This included the dolly grip, who would set up the necessary dolly tracks and facilitate the operation of the dolly camera (a raised camera on a platform with wheels that run along the dolly track). The preparation, planning, and physical intensity of this labour is documented in the Camera Equipment Planning Chart in the SKA.²² The sound recording team would also be involved in each set up, including the sound recordist, John Jordan, along with the boom operator, Peter Glossop. Testing of sound levels would be required, microphones placed on set, and the boom operator involved in the process of blocking to ensure that he did not interfere with the shot (i.e. the accidental appearance of the boom microphone in shot).

A set up also required art directors, production designers, and prop men to ensure the availability of necessary set dressing and props. For example, in the scenes where Alex was in hospital, the location used was the Princess Alexandra Hospital, Harlow. Russell Hagg (Art Director) and Tommy Ibbetson (prop man) visited the hospital in advance of the film crew to check the suitability of locations, including set dressing, and locating any hospital equipment that would be required in the scenes.²³ In addition, wardrobe supervisors would have to ensure the necessary costumes were available, and makeup artists had to be on standby for principal cast and, where necessary, extras. Following on from the above example of the day's shooting on 7 February 1971, the extras included a crowd of forty-seven a crowd of forty-seven people who needed costume, makeup, and transport. This meant that coaches had to be hired to transport the extras and extensive catering facilities put on for the day. This involved not only the food being cooked, but also required a double decker catering bus to be hired and a generator.²⁴ And while not listed on the progress report, the hiring of such facilities also represents the labour of catering staff, delivery drivers, and coach drivers, workers that are typically overlooked in studies of film production.

Just one set up required a host of different labourers, advance planning, and logistical necessities. And this process had to be repeated for every set up. Between September 1970 and February 1971, there were 555 separate set ups, each of which potentially led to several takes. The latter can be determined through an analysis of both the amount of film footage exposed on any given day (detailed on the progress report), along with the camera slate cards and the daily rushes book.²⁵ The amount of labour the 555 set ups represent is extensive, and that is without even discussing the creative labour of the actors and extras. The

extraction of this labour is based on just one set of documents within the SKA, the daily progress reports, with many other documents revealing other forms of labour that were taking place throughout *A Clockwork Orange*'s production. For example, the unit memos.

The unit memos and the unit lists

There is a box in the SKA filled with reams of paper that read as diktats to the entire cast and crew of *A Clockwork Orange*. Called the unit memos, they run from July 1970 (the pre-production phase of the film) to December 1970 (mid-shoot) and contain a variety of orders, information, and updates as to the progress of the production. Some were blanket memos to the entire cast and crew, some were more targeted at Heads of Department. In total, there are thirty-five-unit memos available in the SKA, though it is reasonable to assume that many more were issued, particularly since principal photography carried on until February 1971 and post-production shoots carried on throughout March 1971. The SKA catalogue describes the unit memos as follows:

The memos are numbered one to thirty-five [incomplete run] and concern daily operational tasks and procedures for example, purchase and rental orders, location clearing, production office business, unit personal details, publicity silence, set list and transport. The original file housing has been retained. Some have Margaret [Adams, Production secretary] written on them.²⁶

The catalogue makes it clear that the unit memos were about establishing procedures, processes, and protocol throughout the production, of coordinating the variety of workers on and off set, and a means of centralising control in Kubrick as producer, with all information, decision making, and budgetary concerns having to flow through him. What the catalogue entry does not mention is the name of Bernard Williams. It was Williams's responsibility, as associate producer and production manager, to issue the memos on behalf of the film's producer (Kubrick) and in liaison with other Heads of Departments and production staff where necessary. Margaret Adams is listed on the catalogue entry as being a production assistant, though this was not an official credit given to her on the film. Adams was a permanent staff member on the payroll of Kubrick's production company, Hawk Films. She worked for Hawk Films throughout periods of active film production and also when Kubrick was not actively involved in any particular film. She was a permanent administrative presence in the life and work of Kubrick during the 1970s. Throughout the production of *A Clockwork Orange*, Adams was based in the 'headquarters' for the main personnel: Kubrick's home at Abbots Mead.²⁷ It was likely that when Williams issued unit memos that he forwarded them to Adams to copy out and dispatch to the relevant cast and crew.

Williams was a central presence on *A Clockwork Orange*, being one of the first key operational members of the crew hired to the production in the spring of 1970. Williams was, in effect, Kubrick's chief of staff (being at the top of the

hierarchy of the below-the-line workers), overseeing the logistics of both pre-production and production, human resources administration (hiring of crew, issuing of contracts, organisation of labour permits where necessary), and the operational supervision of all those on set. When looking through the 'Clockwork Orange' category, it is Williams's name that recurs time and again, with documentation often containing his signature, or correspondence being sent to him or being issued by him to a range of other workers. Williams was vital to the overall successful production of *A Clockwork Orange*. While Kubrick was involved in the process of hiring key personnel (including the hiring of Williams) and above-the-line workers, it was Williams that hired the majority of the below-the-line workers. This latter aspect of his role is evidenced in, among other documents, the unit lists in the SKA, which detail how Williams hired drivers, transport managers, production assistants, the standby insurance doctors, boom operators, and even some of the camera operators.²⁸

As for Williams's unit memos, they provide an insight into the working conditions of *A Clockwork Orange* and the hierarchical organisation of labour. Take, for example, a memo issued on 16 October 1970, from Williams to all Heads of Department:

Unless the requests to Purchase Orders are submitted and approved by Stanley Kubrick or the Production Manager [Williams], then the individual responsible for ordering any items has done so without authority and no payments will be made. It is possible to obtain a verbal clearance in an emergency. These instructions must be strictly adhered to.²⁹

The Heads of Department to which the memo was sent included Derek Cracknell, John Alcott, Frank Wardale, Olga Angelinetta, Ron Beck, Terry Clegg, as well as being copied to the production accountant, Len Barnard, and secretarial and administrative staff at Hawk Films and at Warner Bros. It is one of several examples in the unit memos that indicate how power was organised on set, particularly when it came to the issue of finances and expenses. Williams had budgetary authorisation, but Kubrick was keeping a close eye on all purchase orders and expense claims submitted, reviewing all invoices and receipts that came through the production office (a hired office based at Chantry Lodge). In fact, the strict process for budgetary approval had been outlined by Williams in a lengthy memo on 17 July 1970, titled 'Purchase and Rental Orders': 'no purchases or orders of any kind are to be made without the approval of Stanley Kubrick and the production office therefore the following procedure must be adhered to.'³⁰ The procedure required Heads of Department to visit the production office, to fill out the appropriate requisition form, with seven copies having to be made. Copies had to be forwarded to, among others, Kubrick and Williams. The order would then be transcribed by Len Barnard onto a Hawk Films' order form and the order would be placed (any orders for props and wardrobe were handled by Frank Bruton, the Property Master). Barnard was in liaison throughout the production with John Copley and Fred Harding, the company accountant and production accountant controller respectively at Warner Bros. (Copley and Harding would counter sign all cheques).³¹ If an order had been submitted without authorisation, then it would be rejected by Barnard and Bruton. As the memo made clear:

Approval includes small items which are usually recoverable on petty cash. All orders should note that they should be delivered to The Chantry Lodge, Barnet Lane, Elstree, Herts, preferably between the hours of 8am and 7pm Monday to Friday inclusive. Please remember to advise any supplier that hawk films has a night telephone answering service. Therefore we are in operation 24 hours a day. If any delay is anticipated with an ultra-urgent order – SCREAM.³²

Once purchased items arrived, they were initially inspected by Bruton to ensure that the correct item had been delivered and that it was not damaged. Bruton also recorded all items in a purchase order book as a means of ensuring they could be resold once production had completed.³³

The production office at Chantry Lodge was a central hub of activity throughout the production of *A Clockwork Orange* and it was a site of which Williams was in clear command. He would even issue orders commanding how other staff should park their cars at the lodge:

Would all members of the unit who park their cars in this area please park in a tidy fashion as suggested by the attached parking plan in order that there is a centre aisle clear at all time and there is no obstruction caused [...] This procedure will also enable more cars to be parked in this area. Do no park cars in any of the driveways or block the chantry car port as this needs to be kept clear for deliveries and collections.³⁴

Yet, what is most striking about the unit memos is the distinction they insinuate between the mass of workers on the film and Kubrick. Kubrick kept himself separate from the production office at Chantry Lodge and the team supervised by Williams, instead basing himself at Abbots Mead along with a select few (Harlan, Alcott and his permanent Hawk Films staff, such as Adams). Kubrick even issued Williams with orders to discourage other members of the crew coming to visit him at Abbots Mead, an order Williams cascaded down to the crew: 'No vehicles, unless essential, to be taken into Abbots Mead.'³⁵ And the mass of workers and extras were not allowed to use company expenses to hire taxis. Instead, they either had to obtain permission to use one of the limited parking spaces at Chantry Lodge, or rely on one of the coaches or cars hired by Hawk Films for the production. In contrast, Kubrick travelled to and from all locations in a Mercedes Benz, with the only other person allowed to travel with him being Jan Harlan.³⁶ The fact that Kubrick kept himself separate in this way (by being based in a separate production headquarters to which only a privileged few were allowed, or by travelling in separate transport to the rest of the crew) is revealing for what it suggests about hierarchy and power. Kubrick was not one of the workers, but a manager—the manager—who was exuding a sense of authority via his exclusionary behaviour.

The unit memos are an insightful archival artefact in that they reveal the processes and procedures enacted on the production, the management style of Williams (and to some extent Kubrick), and the impact of these on hierarchical labour organisation. I now want to turn to one final set of key archival documents, the Indexed Papers and Letters, to see what they can tell us about labour beyond the actual on-set production of *A Clockwork Orange*.

Indexed papers and letters

Many of the feature films represented in the SKA have a category dedicated to correspondence, letters, or indexed files and papers. The exact title of this category varies across each collection, but all are based on the same idea of containing a variety of information that was (typically) received and dispatched from the Hawk Films office and Stanley Kubrick's personal office. The 'Indexed Papers and Letters' in the 'Clockwork Orange' category span an approximate period from 1969 through to 1985 and are stored in multiple boxes. They represent an overwhelming mass of information, much of which is not in any real order; as the catalogue makes clear, the original filing system has been retained, which also means documents can appear random, cluttered, and seemingly unorganised (this is despite the original Hawk Films administrators creating an alphabetical filing system).³⁷ But this system reflects the reality of labour on the film and how multiple tasks were often being carried out over many days, weeks, and even years. I want to focus on two subseries of the Indexed Papers: 'A-Z file sequence – general 1' (which approximately covers the period 1970 to 1972) and 'A-Z file sequence – general 2' (covering approximately the period of 1970 to 1985), respectively described on the SKA catalogue as follows:

The sub-series contains papers on covering all aspects of the finishing off of the film including publicity, budgets, censorship. All the file titles are as Kubrick's original file sequence and were in matching [orange] file covers.³⁸

The files in the sequence were colour coded pink or green, example have been retained, and the original titles have been maintained. They contains information mainly about distribution and advertising.³⁹

As the catalogue descriptions suggest, the documents within these two subseries are divergent in subject matter and the individuals involved. Much of the information is wildly esoteric in content, often being indecipherable telegrams, or draft letters that may or may not have been sent. Some of the material originates from Kubrick's own office (in particular, draft letters or carbon copies of letters), but much more originates from outside his office, received from external organisations, usually an assortment of regional Warner Bros. offices from around the world. For example, throughout late 1971 and early 1972, there was repeated correspondence in regard to the distribution and exhibition of *A Clockwork Orange*, a process of which Kubrick wanted to maintain strategic oversight. And while Kubrick was certainly a central figure in the distribution and exhibition of the film, he was but only one figure, with a cast of other workers (executives, managers, administrators) from around the world being involved too; for example, Leo Greenfield, who was the General Sales Manager at Warner Bros., a post he took up in 1969 when the company was taken over by Steve Ross's Kinney International.⁴⁰

Greenfield was one of many individuals to whom Kubrick responded in regard to matters of distribution and exhibition. The Indexed Papers contain numerous examples of correspondence from Greenfield, often only copying Kubrick into a memo or letter, or not even doing that. What the archive reveals is how Kubrick was one of many voices involved in the complex process of international film

distribution and was often been guided by more specialised voices within Warner Bros. as to how *A Clockwork Orange* should be distributed, such as Greenfield. Indeed, within 'A-Z file sequence – general 1', there are specific files dedicated to Greenfield that were part of the original filing system created by Kubrick's staff, suggesting the importance of people like Greenfield to both the administrative, but also the strategic processes of distribution and exhibition.⁴¹ Take the file 'Greenfield, Leo – incoming', which contains telexes (an electronic process for sending and receiving written communication that preceded the advent, and growth in popularity, of the fax machine in the 1980s) from Greenfield to the Hawk Films offices. Greenfield was regularly communicating recommendations for the distribution strategy of *A Clockwork Orange*, researching box office trends in each city, and suggesting which theatres and cities would best suit the film on its first run:

Pleased to advise you we are accepting 'Clockwork Orange' deal Coral Theatre, Coral Gables opening 2/10 for minimum run of 18 weeks. First six weeks 70%. Second six weeks 60%. Third six week 50-60%. Re your cable 12/20 avenue theatre, Montreal, has 717 seats. Played 'Music Lovers' 3/12-6/18 for 12 weeks. Grossed \$69,000.⁴²

Greenfield was a highly specialised worker with a long-standing background and experience in film distribution and exhibition. He was noted in the industry for his ability to sell often difficult films through his 'imaginative and unorthodox' approaches, and had previously worked in distribution for Cinerama, Columbia, Buena Vista, and Universal.⁴³

Browsing through 'A-Z file sequence – general 1' and 'A-Z file sequence – general 2' it is possible to highlight workers involved in *A Clockwork Orange*, contributing either significant or tangential labour in some way. Across this two subseries, there are 112 separate filing entries, each representing the labour of either an individual, or more typically individuals. The 'Abacus' file, for example, contains correspondence that details the labour (and hours) involved in the processing of film rushes and the checking of the final film print by the UK based company Abacus Productions. The work of film processing quality assurance and wedge testing—a process that helps determine the necessary film print exposure time—involved nearly 150 hours of labour split between two individuals and represents a highly important technical (and even creative) component of the final film product.⁴⁴ Some of the file entries are named for specific individuals: 'Buchanan, Tom', 'Boyd, Joe', 'Heinz, Richard', 'Senior, Julian'. Some people have multiple file entries, perhaps indicating their level of involvement and importance to a particular process, as in the case of Norman Katz, who in 'A-Z file sequence – general 1' has three separate entries dedicated to him: 'Katz [Norman] – file', 'Katz [Norman] – follow up', and 'Katz [Norman] – titles'. Katz was the chief executive officer of Warner Bros. International and had requested that staff across Warner Bros. submit regular reports to him on their interactions with Kubrick, presumably as a means of monitoring Kubrick's own behaviour as a producer and manager.⁴⁵

Other file entries are vaguely named, such as 'Underground', which is a file comprised of data and research of all the London Underground stations that have

potential advertising billboards that could host *A Clockwork Orange* posters. The file includes lists of dimensions of the billboards, along with the names of specific stations and any corresponding information.⁴⁶ Such files do not always make it clear who conducted the research, but one can assume that either a member of Kubrick's own staff had undertaken the task, or that the data had been obtained externally from either Warner Bros. or from Transport for London. Other vaguely titled files are more explicit in the individuals involved in the labour, such as the file 'USA ad[vertisements] budgets'. The file contains research on a range of films being distributed and promoted by Warner Bros. simultaneous to *A Clockwork Orange*, as well as information and correspondence detailing the labour involved in distributing trailers and advertising spots across the USA. Take the following memo from Ernie Grossman to Dick Lederer:

Tom Buchanan and I are making arrangements to have the 30 second 'Clockwork Orange' TV trailer tagged in quantity as a theatre cross plus trailer and we'll mail the proper allocations by the end of next week based on info received from Mike Kaplan that we will have in excess of a 100 trailers for tagging here Wed 19 Jan. Starting next week I will stay in touch daily with every town by phone, wire or conference call to ensure that these engagements are launched properly.⁴⁷

Grossman was an advertising and publicity supervisor for Warner Bros. in the USA, based in New York and responsible for both the East Coast and West Coast.⁴⁸ He was also the executive assistant to Richard Lederer, who was the vice president for advertising and publicity at Warner Bros.⁴⁹ What is evident from Grossman's memo to Lederer is the hierarchy of labour involved in the process of publicity of *A Clockwork Orange* in the major East and West Coast cities of the USA: from the development of TV advertisements, to the research of which television stations to target (with an entire file dedicated to the latter, 'USA Budgets TV trailer', work overseen by individuals at Warner Bros. such as Dave Judson, cooperative advertising director, and Andy Fogelson, director of advertising)⁵⁰, to a whole team of regional-level publicity 'field men'. Publicity field men were a feature of many of the major distributors' advertising and publicity departments. They were regionalised publicity representatives that would cultivate local networks and work closely with cinemas and local TV and newspapers in order to promote Warner Bros. product. Essentially, they worked on the frontline of promoting and selling films to local exhibitors and local audiences.⁵¹ Indeed, the importance of these publicity field men was reflected in the way that Warner Bros. would hold annual 'seminars'. These seminars would bring together the vast network of field men to discuss and share best practice, to hear talks from the likes of Lederer, and to discuss forthcoming major films for the company.⁵² The work of these publicity field men is not represented in the SKA beyond references in correspondence such as that between Grossman and Lederer, or through lists of field men and the areas they covered that were attached to such memos. Their labour is hidden, then, at least in terms of this particular archive, but the work they conducted was often the operational implementation of strategies discussed at the top of the labour hierarchy, between the directors, executives, and presidents at Warner Bros. and Kubrick and his staff at Hawk Films.

Conclusion

While Kubrick was certainly instrumental in the production, distribution, and promotion of *A Clockwork Orange*, archival research shows that he was only one of a multitude of workers involved. An array of individuals came together, investing their own labour and resources into the creation of the film and its ongoing life as a media object. Kubrick may well have at times operated a camera (usually when it was handheld), or told John Alcott what to do with the lights, or intervened in terms of research and strategy regarding distribution, publicity, and even dubbing. But that was Kubrick's prerogative and his job as a producer, artist, and a manager. But Kubrick did not do everything. Archival documentation makes it obvious that it would be physically impossible for him to undertake every task related to the production and global distribution and exhibition of *A Clockwork Orange*. It was a collaborative venture involving a multiplicity of workers around the world, in contrast to the myth propagated by his own publicists at Polaris Productions.

By reading against the archival grain in the SKA, evidence can be uncovered of the voices of the creative, administrative, and technical labourers that worked on the film, alongside evidence of the material, cultural, and social realities of production and of the material resources necessary to produce and sell it. There is much more evidence in the SKA to further investigate these issues not only in relation to *A Clockwork Orange*, but also those other films associated with Kubrick, and even with films with which he was not directly associated but evidence of which found its way into the SKA for one reason or another. Ultimately, this case study demonstrates how the SKA is a unique and significant archival collection that is not just about Stanley Kubrick, but about the people, processes, and materials necessary to produce a film in the twentieth century and is the material afterlife of those individuals, forces, and resources.

This leads to questions pertaining directly to the archive itself. First, what does the archive actually represent? What was its purpose prior to its institutionalisation at UAL? By this I mean the need to query the status of the archive itself. The size of the SKA and the variety of information it contains can lead one to query Kubrick's own intentions and motivations in collating the material in the first place. Can the archive be read or interpreted as some kind of computational resource or database compiled by Kubrick's administrative staff? Rather than the archive representing a psychological dimension (Kubrick as hoarder), arguably it represents a broader management and strategic purpose in his mission to accrue power as a producer and manager. Through his centralising of strategic decision making in his role as producer, and of his amassing of information, Kubrick was able to make critical and decisive interventions into work processes, particularly when he detected signs of failure. The archive can be viewed as a system designed to combat such failures. The archive is also a resource that allowed Kubrick and his administrative staff to interact with the vast network of labourers around the world, from scrawling notes on documents to amassing research and information that allowed them to make decisions and to understand the wider strategic landscape of the film industry.

Second, how are researchers utilising the SKA and what information are they consulting? In turn, what information is being overlooking or avoided and why? This article has shown that the SKA is typically not about Kubrick but about other people and things. I would suggest that the SKA, and the research being conducted

into it, points toward a wider research potential for the film and media studies community, particularly those working within production studies, labour history, eco-criticism, archival histories, and archive studies. For example, the article hints at wider debates on film materiality, geology of the media, and media environmentalism, as espoused by the likes of Jussi Parikka and Hunter Vaughan.⁵³ Vaughan's work is part of a growing body of work in 'green' film and media studies, focusing on concepts of the Anthropocene and the way film and film cultures are inextricably linked to the environment and the Earth's natural resources.⁵⁴ One could go to the extremes in analysing the material, cultural, and social resources that contributed to the production of *A Clockwork Orange*, enacting a media archaeology of the film that could go so far as to argue that mineworkers, excavating precious metals used in the creation of the film stock and other media technologies used, were labourers involved in the creation of *A Clockwork Orange*. The evidence available in the SKA even makes it possible to consider the carbon footprint of *A Clockwork Orange* via an investigation of the aviation and shipping companies responsible for transporting the film across the world by tracking invoices and receipts.⁵⁵ And it's even feasible to examine the production processes and materials used, and individuals involved, in the printing of, say, film posters, again via receipts and business catalogues that Kubrick retained.⁵⁶ The evidence of the geological resources and the environmental impact of *A Clockwork Orange* is contained within the SKA and other archives like it. However, to work towards such conclusions, the research focus and methods currently utilised with regards to the SKA need reframing; scholars of Kubrick need to move away from a focus on Stanley Kubrick towards questions of materiality and social relations of film production.

The material contained within the SKA can be utilised as part of interdisciplinary research and outputs that impact on scholarly understanding of a range of concepts and ideas beyond just the history of Stanley Kubrick and his films. Contained within the SKA is material evidence of film studio histories and production processes, of the histories of telecommunications and stationery catalogues, of the history of art and artwork to the photographic urban histories of British cities. The SKA can also be studied and understood both as the material remains of a filing system that once functioned as part of a business organisation, but which has now come to take on a new institutionalised existence. The opportunities for theoretical, empirical, and even creative practice-based research using the SKA are wide-ranging; to bring about its full potential as an academic and knowledge resource requires cross-collaboration between scholars, researchers, archivists, and practitioners.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Peter Krämer for reading a first draft of this article and for providing insightful feedback and advice.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. For more on the Kubrick myth, see James Fenwick, 'The Problem with Kubrick: Reframing Stanley Kubrick Through Archival Research', *New Review of Film and Television Studies* (forthcoming).
2. *The Orange Times*, 1972, uncatalogued, CWO-RKive 1, Stanley Kubrick Archive, University of the Arts London (SKA).
3. James Fenwick, *Stanley Kubrick Produces* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2020), 121.
4. *Ibid.*, 23–4.
5. Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010).
6. Mary Rizzo, 'Reading against the Grain, Finding the Voices of the Detained', *Museums & Social Issues* 12, no. 1 (2017): 28.
7. See, for example, Frances Galt, *Women's Activism Behind the Screens: Trade Unions and Gender Inequality in the British Film and Television Industries* (Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2020); Melanie Bell, *Movie Workers: The Women Who Made British Cinema* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2021); Nupur Chaudhuri, Sherry J. Katz, and Mary Elizabeth Perry (eds), *Contesting Archives: Finding Women in the Sources* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2010).
8. Frances Galt, 'Researching around Our Subjects: Working Towards a Women's Labour History of Trade Unions in the British Film and Television Industries', *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 20 (2020): 167.
9. *Ibid.*
10. See Vicki Mayer, Miranda Banks, John Caldwell (eds) *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries* (New York: Routledge, 2009); Miranda Banks, Bridget Conor, Vicki Mayer (eds) *Production Studies, The Sequel!: Cultural Studies of Global Media Industries* (New York: Routledge, 2015); John Caldwell *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); Daniel Herbert, Amanda D. Lotz, and Aswin Punathambekar, *Media Industry Studies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020); and Philip Drake, 'Critical and Cultural? Production studies as situated storytelling', in *The Routledge Companion to Media Industries*, ed. Paul McDonald (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021), 96–106.
11. Herbert, Lotz, and Punathambekar, *Media Industry Studies*, 30–3.
12. The archive catalogue can be accessed online at the following web address: <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/TreeBrowse.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&field=RefNo&key=SK>.
13. 'Clockwork Orange', SK/13, <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=SK%2f13>.
14. For more on the Stanley Kubrick Archive and its privileging of Kubrick, see James Fenwick, 'The Exploitation of Sue Lyon: *Lolita* (1962), Archival Research, and Questions for Film History', *Feminist Media Studies*, (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2021.1996422>
15. Rizzo, 'Reading against the Grain', 28.
16. Two scholars that are contributing to research on media labour on Kubrick's films are Manca Perko and Catriona McAvoy. See Manca Perko, 'Voices and

- Noises: Collaborative Authorship in Stanley Kubrick's Films' (PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, 2019); and Catriona McAvoy's current PhD project, *Below the Line: Decentering Narratives from the Stanley Kubrick Archive*, Sheffield Hallam University.
17. Daily Progress Reports, SK/13/3/4, SKA.
 18. Daily Progress Report No. 111, 21 February 1971, SK/13/3/4, SKA; Daily Progress Report No. 112, 22 February 1971, SK/13/3/4, SKA.
 19. Unit Memo, 30 December 1970, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 20. Unit memo, 30 October 1970, SK/13/3/2, SKA.
 21. Daily Progress Report No. 99, 7 February 1971, SK/13/3/4, SKA.
 22. Camera Equipment Planning Chart, 1970–71, SK/13/3/17/3, SKA.
 23. Unit memo, 30 October 1970, SK/13/3/2, SKA.
 24. Daily Progress Report No. 99, 7 February 1971, SK/13/3/4, SKA.
 25. Slate contents cards, 1970–71, SK/13/3/15, SKA; Daily rushes book, 1970, SK/13/3/8, SKA.
 26. Unit memos, SK/13/3/1, SKA, <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=SK%2f13%2f3%2f1>
 27. As one-unit memo made clear, when Kubrick was not on set he was based at his office at his home at Abbots Mead, along with Jan Harlan, John Alcott, Andros Epaminondas, and his personal secretary Kay Johnson (Unit Memo No. 7, n.d., SK/13/3/1, SKA).
 28. Unit Lists, SK/13/2/18, SKA.
 29. Unit memo, 16 October 1970, SK/13/2/3, SKA.
 30. Unit memo no. 1, 17 July 1970, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 31. Unit memo no. 8, 27 July 1970, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 32. Unit memo no. 1, 17 July 1970, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 33. Delivery and Dispatch Notes, SK/13/10/8, SKA.
 34. Unit memo no. 4, 17 July 1970, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 35. Unit memo no. 17, 26 August, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 36. Unit memo no. 13, 3 September, SK/13/3/1, SKA.
 37. Indexed Papers and Letters, SK/13/8, SKA, <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=SK%2f13%2f8>
 38. A-Z file sequence – general 1, SK/13/8/3, SKA, <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=SK%2f13%2f8%2f3>
 39. A-Z file sequence – general 2, SK/13/8/4, SKA, <https://archives.arts.ac.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=SK%2f13%2f8%2f4>
 40. 'Leo Greenfield New WB Sales V.P.; Goldstein Retires, 5-Yr. Consultant', *Variety*, 1 October 1969, 5.
 41. 'Greenfield, Leo – incoming', SK/13/8/3/40, SKA; 'Greenfield, Leo – outgoing', SK/13/8/3/41, SKA.
 42. Telex from Leo Greenfield, 24 December 1971, SK/13/8/3/40, SKA.
 43. 'Leo Greenfield New WB Sales V.P.', 5.
 44. Letter from John Mackey (Abacus Productions), 10 December 1971, SK/13/8/3/1, SKA.
 45. Telex from Stanley Kubrick to Norman Katz, 10 February 1972, SK/13/8/3/45, SKA. For more on the relationship between Kubrick and Katz, see James

- Fenwick, 'Stanley Kubrick: Producers and Production Companies' (PhD thesis, De Montfort University, 2017), 193–4.
46. 'Underground', SK/13/8/3/82, SKA.
 47. Memo from Ernie Grossman to Dick Lederer, 14 January 1972, SK/13/8/3/83, SKA.
 48. 'Ernie Grossman Promoted to Ad Post at WB', *Boxoffice*, 8 June 1970, 6.
 49. 'Grossman Aide at WB', *Variety*, 27 October 1971, 5.
 50. Memo from Dave Judson to Andy Fogelson, 8 February 1972, SK/13/8/3/84, SKA
 51. For more on the advertising and publicity departments of the major Hollywood distributors between the 1950s and 1970s, see Fenwick, *Stanley Kubrick Produces*, 138–42.
 52. 'Warner Exploiters Meet for Three-Day Seminar', *Boxoffice*, 23 July 1973, 4.
 53. Jussi Parikka, *A Geology of Media* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Hunter Vaughan, *Hollywood's Dirtiest Secret: The Hidden Environmental Costs of the Movies* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019).
 54. For more on eco-critical film and media research see, Salma Monani *The Cinematic Footprint: Lights, Camera, Natural Resources* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012); Adrian Ivakhiv, 'Green Film Criticism and Its Futures', *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 15, no. 2 (2008): 1–28; the In-Focus dossier edited by Jennifer Peterson and Graig Uhlin 'Film and Media Studies in the Anthropocene', *Journal of Cinema and Media Studies* 58, no. 2 (2019); and Mark Bould, *The Anthropocene Unconscious: Climate Catastrophe Culture* (London: Verso, 2021).
 55. Delivery and dispatch notes, SK/13/10/8, SKA; Print distribution, SK/13/5/4, SKA; Kubrick's Harrier Films was also involved in shipping film prints by the 1980s, a process overseen by company administrators such as Martin Hunter. See, for example, invoices for shipping film prints to Argentina ('Clockwork Orange – Argentina', April 1985, Box 10, SK/13/8/4/3), France ('Clockwork Orange – France', July 1984, Box 10, SK/13/8/4/7), and Brazil ('Clockwork Orange – Brazil', 1982, Box 10, SK/13/8/4/4). There is also evidence of Kubrick's companies receiving dubbed film prints via London Heathrow, with invoices and tracking receipts produced by another of his companies, Puffin Films ('Clockwork Orange – Shipments', July 1988, Box 10, SK/13/8/4/10).
 56. Advertising development, SK/13/4/14, SKA.

Notes on contributor

James Fenwick is a senior lecturer in the Department of Media Arts and Communication at Sheffield Hallam University. He is the author of *Stanley Kubrick Produces* (2020), *Unproduction Studies and the American Film Industry* (2021), editor of *Understanding Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey: Representation and Interpretation* (2018), and co-editor of *Shadow Cinema: The Historical and Production Contexts of Unmade Films* (2021).
