

Fandom's Paratextual Memory: Remembering, Reconstructing and Repatriating "Lost"

Doctor Who

Matt Hills, University of Huddersfield

Joanne Garde-Hansen, University of Warwick

Having defined paratexts' spatial co-ordinates as possessing a "*location* that can be situated in relation to the location of the text itself," Gerard Genette also reflects on the "*temporal* situation of the paratext" (1997: 4-5). Crucially, it is the spatiotemporality of paratexts that needs interrogation if we are to understand the role they play in cultural memory. At stake is the act of remembering textual encounters through paratexts that are shared inside and increasingly across national boundaries. This ensures that television heritage *travels* not simply as a fannish scouring for textual completeness but, we contend, within recuperating acts of nation and Empire. It is imperative, then, to re-consider the spatiotemporal situation of paratexts from a cultural memory perspective, linking *Doctor Who* fandom's seemingly apolitical memories to cultural-political national communities, as we'll go on to do.

Rather than considering paratexts as activators of textual meaning we suggest that paratextual memory (i.e. memories of "being there" inserted around texts, and texts' transient contexts of "now-ness" and "then-ness" inserted into memory) inscribes specific texts with senses of longing and loss, identity and experience, that such texts could not originally convey. "Cultural memory," state Reading and Katriel, "emerges out of a blend of individual choices framed by institutional decisions and media constraints" (2015: 8). The first part of this article addresses how unofficial/official media texts constrain fans' paratextual memory, while the

second focuses on institutional decisions to recruit paratextual memory. Taken together, these frameworks contextualize the ongoing memory-work engaged in by fans, media museums, and fan-archivists.

If remembering is a creative act, as Keightley and Pickering argue in *The Mnemonic Imagination*, then paratextual memory does not “involve the preservation of the past for its own sake,” but rather signals

a collective desire to reconnect with what has apparently been lost [the text] or reassess what has apparently been gained [the remembering fan]. Both reconnection and reassessment bring the past [and the paratext] into a dynamic relationship with the present, opening up the possibility of critique in the movement made between them. (2012: 114)

How, then, might paratexts function, not just in relation to activating textual meanings but by underpinning “classic TV” commodification and discourses of television heritage? There have been some useful starting points; the final chapter of *Show Sold Separately* discusses how *Star Wars* action figures can function as paratextual memory triggers: “If *Star Wars* can act as a doorway back in time, for many fans toys serve as a key to this door” (Gray 2010: 184). How do such keys to the past provide the scaffolding for fan memory as both personal and popular? As Iain Logie Baird, television curator and grandson of John Logie Baird, suggested in an interview with one of us that the fan is “an amateur curator [...] collecting or reproducing something that’s a three dimensional object in a lot of cases to extend their sense of memory [...O]nce you watch the show you want to feel a greater sense of your identity being linked to” it (20th October 2014).

Moreover, in her analysis of “rogue” archives – those established unofficially by fans – Abigail De Kosnik refers in passing to paratexts, yet develops no further connection between fan archiving and paratextuality. We ourselves have previously analysed how “fan collectivity [...] suggests that there is room for notions of collective and personal memory in [...] research of fan behaviour” (Garde-Hansen 2011:123), as well as beginning to theorize fans as “textual commemorators” (Hills 2014) and “paratextual completists” (Hills 2015: 53). Fandom, then, exposes the issue of how paratexts and memory-work become inter-related, and we focus on this intersection to develop the concept of *paratextual memory*. This concept chimes with the “mnemonic imagination” wherein we can observe the “transactional movement necessary” for the “coexistence” of personal and popular memory through “interanimation of these two dimensions of identity and experience” (Keightley and Pickering 2012: 9). When one inherits a television collection (as a museum), one inherits a potentially dormant audience and it is the audience’s re-activation that paratextual memory can enable, although in the case of media fandom paratextual memory is used insistently by participants to maintain their fan identities.

We take *Doctor Who* fandom as our case study because there are 97 classic *Doctor Who* episodes currently missing from BBC archives, having been wiped by the BBC themselves (Molesworth 2013). The loss has created longing, and this longing has promoted creativity and entrepreneurship, underscoring the relationships between personal and popular memory that we explore below. As a vehicle of personal/popular memory, *Doctor Who*’s longevity (1963—) has “led scholars to respond to the series as a ‘receptacle’ for multiple forms of history, memory and identity” (Holdsworth 2011: 127). While it remains possible that copies of missing *Who* episodes may have been retained in countries that the program was distributed to across its history (particularly in Africa), to recover these would not simply be to reclaim “original” texts, but

rather to create new paratextual memories of contemporary restoration, (re)commodification, and repatriation.

In the case of “lost” *Doctor Who*, paratexts become significant as a replacement for, or record/reconstruction of, the program text. Of course, paratexts themselves can often display a marked ephemerality (Gray 2016: 39), and this transience renders them very much of their time. For fan archivists, collectors, and curators who collate the paratexts that surrounded a pop-cultural text at a given point, this can offer a way to “resist ephemerality” (Re 2016: 70). Paratextual memory, as we are deploying the term, involves the use of paratexts within affective memory-work in the present and for a projected future: paratextual memory commemorates a favored TV program, potentially maintains an “authentic” fan self-narrative in terms of “having been there” at times of broadcast, and performs a “good” fan identity premised on taking paratexts seriously. Paratextual memory is testified to throughout fandom, as it distinguishes fans from other audiences who, even though they may affectionately and nostalgically recall “old” TV, are far less likely to be invested in recalling, curating, and archiving its paratexts (merchandise; TV listings; press and broadcast interviews; etc.). Fans’ paratextual memory also leads to (re-)commodification in new fan-targeted merchandise such as *The Vault* book series which reproduces memorabilia (Hills 2015: 75), as well as in niche products such as Big Finish’s *Doctor Who* audio adventures. The latter accurately reproduce theme tune arrangements and logos from the era of *Who* they are seeking to evoke, as well as emulating old *Radio Times*’ listings in CD liner notes, thus inter-paratextually referencing fans’ memories of reading teasers ahead of 1960s-1980s TV broadcasts. Inter-paratextual citation is a frequent mode of productivity for fans’ paratextual memory, whether it involves reworking souvenir *Radio Times*’ covers or creating new (and counterfactual) Target book covers as digital art (Hills 2015: 34-35).

The merchandise of previous decades is persistently re-mixed, re-versioned, and re-imagined.

In what follows, we examine paratextual memory as a way in which fans have reconstructed *Doctor Who*'s missing episodes, so as to consider issues of TV repatriation. Here the cultural value of paratextual memory takes on transnational significance as the archive entrepreneur pieces together lost television from broadcasters in different parts of the world through "Missing Believed Wiped" campaigns (Fiddy 2001), acting as an intermediary between official/rogue archives, collectors, and national broadcasters. Lost *Doctor Who* stories have been returned to the BBC from the likes of Hong Kong and Nigeria, most recently via the operations of Television International Enterprises and Archives Limited (TIEA), a company led by Philip Morris. Morris has been discussed by Steve Bryant, Senior Curator of Television at the British Film Institute (BFI), as "a mega fan" (interview with Garde-Hansen, 19th March 2014). The case of classic *Doctor Who* episodes returning "home" to the BBC therefore raises questions of fan/national identity that are condensed onto these 16mm film reels. First, how have fans reconstructed missing *Doctor Who* via paratextual memory?

Remembering and Reconstructing *Doctor Who*

Sometimes a single paratext can take on an almost mythic status within fandom: Richard Molesworth refers to *Doctor Who Magazine*'s 1981 Winter Special that "contained [...] a list of which *Doctor Who* episodes still survived at the BBC It's hard to describe the shock that this list generated amongst *Doctor Who* fans" (2013: 10). Such was the fan-cultural impact of the list that Philip Morris cites it when being interviewed about TIEA's discovery of missing episodes from "Enemy of the World" and "The Web of Fear": "The 1981 Winter Special? ... I bought

that one” (Spilsbury 2013: 14). The Beeb had instigated a policy of wiping and reusing expensive videotapes, with administrative records usually existing for the destruction of “old” *Doctor Who*: “‘The Power of the Daleks’ isn’t logged on any BBC Wipe/Junk forms at all, so details of when this story’s tapes were wiped are not known [...] ‘The Highlanders’ was one of the first – if not *the* first – *Doctor Who* story to have its videotapes junked by the BBC, in 1967” (Molesworth 2013: 59).

However, *Who* fandom found ways of paratextually restoring lost episodes. Fans had made audio recordings of the program; this was the only way that *Doctor Who* could be re-experienced by the “average television viewer” prior to the emergence of video as a consumer technology (Wallace 2013: 30). Anecdotally, one of us (Matt) made cassette recordings of *Doctor Who* as a child, albeit without any awareness that this was a common fan practice. And while fans had recorded *Doctor Who* audio, the BBC had acquired selective photographic records of its output. These became known as “tele-snaps,” taken with a specially modified camera directed at a TV screen. Television engineer John Cura provided tele-snaps to the BBC, and his work covered many of the subsequently missing *Doctor Who* episodes (Wallace 2013: 31). Fans thus set about marrying up officially-recorded still photographs with unofficial, fan-generated soundtracks: “The first instance of a Tele-snap reconstruction is widely accepted to be a version of Episode 2 of The Power of the Daleks [...] made sometime around 1985” (ibid).

De Kosnik argues persuasively that fan-created digital archives, or unofficial and non-state run/endorsed “rogue archives,” demonstrate how “[m]emory has gone rogue in another sense: where it used to mean the *record* of cultural production, memory is now the *basis* of a great deal of cultural production. Digital technologies facilitate [...] remix culture” (2016: 3). Rather than coming after the consumption of media texts, cultural memory “now often precedes

[...textual] making, or occurs at every step throughout the process of making. So many digital works begin as acts of memory, with a user remembering a loved [...] mass culture text and isolating, then manipulating, revising and reworking, specific elements of that text” (De Kosnik 2016: 4). *Doctor Who* fan reconstructions or “recons” demonstrate that digital cultural memory has had analogue predecessors, using reel-to-reel tapes or audio cassettes, and that paratextual memory temporally disrupts and extends the originally transient broadcast text. Such is the fannish desire for missing *Who* that the British Film Institute’s Dick Fiddy has recounted “grown men [being] in tears” at a screening of newly-recovered *Doctor Who* material (interview with Garde-Hansen 10th July 2014).

Fans’ reconstructions amount to a kind of “remix” (Gunkel 2016: 15—16) where separate “tracks” (audio recordings and tele-snaps) are recombined. Moreover, like remixes, *Who*’s fan reconstructions exist in multiple versions carried out by different fan groups (Wallace 2013: 31). Rather than simply “reconstructing” an absent text, as the fannish language of fidelity implies, recons transformatively rework “lost” *Doctor Who* on the basis of officially archived and fan-generated paratextual traces (Booth 2017: 38—39). Official tele-snaps are incomplete visual records since they do not record all camera shots, whilst unofficial audio recordings lack information during action sequences. Fan recons have thus incorporated script information as subtitles, as well as sometimes adding specially shot footage or CGI.

These fan reconstructions perform paratextual memory: they are an approximation of the text, built out of reference sources, but they are also newly remixed paratexts saturated “at every step throughout the process” of fan productivity by fan-cultural memory, as De Kosnik argues. Such fan activities have arguably helped to provide the protocol for how to officially remember television (from pre-production through to production and promotion), a protocol that is at the

heart of the BBC's Information and Archives policy and governance today

(<http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/dq/contents/archives.shtml>). Through their refusal to be restricted by the BBC's policy of videotape wiping, fans can "defend their ability to determine the temporality of their engagements with media texts." Additionally, recons also work to preserve "fan time" as opposed to the official "media time" of BBC Worldwide's commodified *Doctor Who* (De Kosnik 2016: 158). Where "media time" involves the rhythms of broadcast/commercial release, "fan time" is open and ongoing; in this mode, fans determine the temporality of their engagement with favored (para)texts.

Fan recons have largely remained culturally "underground," diverging from the TV/consumer "mainstream" (Booy 2012: 115). After all, only dedicated fans would be motivated to view photographic images edited together with occasionally undecipherable audio tracks: such paratextual memory is highly specific to fandom. Not-for-profit recons have usually been tolerated by the BBC, while BBC Worldwide have commodified fans' knowledge and memory-work, with missing stories being commercially released on audio (accompanying fan-like reconstructions). This niche commodification of fans' paratextual memory (Wallace 2013: 33—34) later led to particular missing episodes being animated for official DVD release (Booth 2017: 39).

The intersection of unofficial and official production has been intensified via 2016's BBC release of "The Power of the Daleks" as an entirely animated adventure. This is the first time that a fully missing *Doctor Who* story has been officially (re-)commodified in such a manner (Lizardi 2015: 27), with BBC Worldwide's Paul Hembury noting that "there's a financial measure of success here, of course" at the same time as invoking the discourse of TV heritage: "it's a key part of television history, isn't it?" (Guerrier 2016b: 24). In order to reach outside the small fan

market for recons, “Power” had to be reanimated and neo-textualized, its visuals converted from still photographs to moving images designed for the contemporary 16:9 viewing ratio (rather than the 4:3 original). Fans’ paratextual memory underpins neo-textualization in this instance, with fan-generated remixes establishing a market for new BBC Worldwide texts (the re-animated “Power” has received commercial, fan-targeted cinema screenings outside the UK in a bid to maximize revenues from international fandom).

2016’s “Power of the Daleks” was premiered on the 50th anniversary of its original 1966 broadcast, to the minute, whilst simultaneously promoting the BBC Store. “Heritage” is used to legitimate BBC Worldwide’s commodification of TV history, despite such heritage hinging significantly on fans’ reconstructive paratextual memory rather than the BBC’s destructive (videotape-wiping) history:

While [...] fan formations are by no means indicative of television viewers in general [...] it is at least plausible to suggest that these groups and their practices have added to the overall historical construction of [...] television heritage [...], helping legitimate television (and particularly past television) in myriad ways as [...] culturally significant. (Kompore 2005: 124—125)

As fan-journalist J.R. Southall has pointed out, fans conceptualize missing *Who* as “cultural heritage,” noting that for “the general public [...missing episodes are] of considerably less importance” (2014). For BBC Worldwide to circulate “heritage” discourses around “lost” *Doctor Who* thus aligns with fan priorities, as well as fusing the legitimation of “key [...] television history” with BBC Worldwide’s commercial aims. It is testament to the BBC’s “mnemonic

imagination” wherein one can observe the “transactional movement” we noted earlier as a realignment of personal and popular memory (Keightley and Pickering 2012: 9) – in this case, downloading/viewing “new” animations of “old” *Doctor Who*.

The neo-text of “Power of the Daleks” remains marked by budgetary limits in terms of its animation style (its funding having been dependent on projected financial returns). Producer-director Charles Norton has discussed how compromises in the original TV production, such as photographic and toy Daleks compensating for a lack of props, have been remedied (Guerrier 2016a: 15, 2016b: 21). Yet “Power” insistently displays its own compromises, reducing the amount of character movement and the texture of animated materials. Clive Young argues that fan films are inevitably “flawed” as a result of creative compromises (2008: 241), but this seems equally true of the animated “Power of the Daleks” as an official product. Unofficial fandom and official production may be blurred together here in a series of ways (Wallace 2013: 33; Booth 2017: 38—39), but fans’ paratextual memory and “fan time” nonetheless remain differentiated from the BBC’s (“media time”) of proprietary neo-textualization.

So far, we have considered paratextual memory as an unusual form of textual “remix” which has, despite media constraints, led to the (re-) commodification of “lost” *Doctor Who* and the circulation of legitimating “TV heritage” discourses. These discourses have been predicated on a commodification of repatriated *Doctor Who*, a process associated with the return of indigenous heritage. The search for missing *Who* has taken TIEA’s Philip Morris to locations ranging from “Aden to Zambia” (Spilsbury 2013: 15), and hence we will address how paratextual memory has driven the repatriation business of (re)-commodifying classic “British” television in the context of individuals’ entrepreneurial choices and institutional decisions.

Remembering and Repatriating *Doctor Who*

Our focus on cultural memory and paratexts should not be confined to the temporality of the (para)text, and we have additionally set the scene above for considering paratextual memory as spatial transaction, circulating in and through people, their conversations, connections, relationships and travels. As Keightley and Pickering (2012: 10) note, in “exploring the creativity of memory” there is a tendency to personify memory and imagination, speaking of them “as if they are autonomous agents,” but it is “always people who remember and imagine” and “in whom and for whom the mnemonic imagination gains operational force” (2012: 10). *Doctor Who* fans’ desire to be proximate to paratextual memory-work (and to generate new paratextual memory and fan authenticity based on “being there”) has been noted by Dick Fiddy of the British Film Institute. Fiddy remarked of BFI-associated screenings of recovered *Doctor Who* in 2014 (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/mediacentre/worldwide/130214doctorwho.html>), and a 50th anniversary season of *Who* screenings in 2013, that fans “want to talk to you, want to share things [...] in fact, in the gathering in the bar afterwards were 200 to 300 fans and some of those fans hadn't been able to get in to the screenings but just came because they wanted to engage in the conversation that was happening afterwards” (interview with Garde-Hansen, 10th July 2014).

This kind of after-talk also drives transnational archive entrepreneurship that seeks to retrace media-colonial routes of transaction in a postcolonial context, as a white British man, Philip Morris representing TIEA, pursues access to television broadcasters’ archives in Africa. The “mega fan” Morris aims to “repatriate foreign materials,” and “exploit [...] television heritage” in the pursuit of “preserving the past for a better future” (TIEA ‘homepage’ at

www.tiea.co.uk). Defining TIEA as a “repatriation company,” Morris is said to have gone “to the same archives time and time again and probably on the fifth or sixth visit they’ve [African broadcasters] admitted having stuff. I think also they didn't trust him first of all because he was white” (Fiddy, in interview with Garde-Hansen, 10th July 2014). More importantly, TIEA is regarded as a go-between, free from professional association with the BBC or BFI, and thus Morris is able to retrieve BBC material that has been held in error without any penalization of African broadcasters. The process of transcoding, digitizing and restoring these “original” *Doctor Who* texts (in reality, film copies made by BBC Enterprises for overseas distribution) thus generates a newfound “archive TV” commodity, allowing lost and found *Who* (*Doctor Who* that had a kind of refugee status, or was being held in the “wrong” place) to travel home.

While participatory remembering and heritage have become key drivers for curating, exhibiting and (commercially) distributing *Doctor Who*, creating new value chains for reactivating dormant nostalgic audiences and serving fan audiences alike within a *regenerative milieu* (Gorton and Garde-Hansen, forthcoming), Philip Morris has exploited the relative ease of getting one’s hands on “old” TV. Where previous searches for overseas “missing” British television had sometimes relied on remotely enquiring about the TV holdings of broadcasters, Morris acted like “boots on the ground” (as he remarks in Spilsbury 2013: 15), visiting all sorts of African stations and building working relationships with them (and see [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Morris_\(archivist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Morris_(archivist)) for more on Morris’s activities). The militaristic discourse echoed in “boots on the ground” also positions Philip Morris as a kind of adventurer, a “missing episodes hunter,” even, firmly cast in the cultural paradigm of heroic masculinity.

Ordinarily, institutions such as museums will build up official collections of artefacts, but when the National Media Museum curated a *Doctor Who and Me* exhibition in 2013 it eschewed the need to collect the text, or even the paratexts, instead basing its superfan-sourced exhibits (which were all on loan) around fannish paratextual memory, and displaying fans' "memorabilia, treasures, things that they had collected, things that they had made" rather than "collecting any of these objects; none of them were to enter into the museum collections" (Michael Terwey, NMeM, interview with Garde-Hansen, 22nd June 2016). An obscured (or perhaps romanticized) understanding of the ownership of television hence allows repatriation to be undertaken discursively on behalf of a nation that has *lost* its cultural heritage: "The BBC really don't own *Doctor Who*. It is owned by *these people* [fans] and now *the people* [the wider audience]" (ibid).

But if the BBC retain copyright in *Doctor Who* – contra such populist discourses of "fan ownership" – then recovered *Who* is also potentially, if temporarily, owned by a "mega fan" turned entrepreneur and adventurer, Morris, given that it forms part of TIEA's business: "He says he has no desire to become an archive and a library. [...] I think he could operate as an archive much like we [the BFI] do. We keep hundreds of thousands [of titles], we're the biggest [film and TV] archive in the world but we have very, very, very little copyright" (Dick Fiddy, interview with Garde-Hansen, 10th July 2014).

Defining the classic *Who* fan as an appropriator of a "cultural product for their own forms of expression" (Michael Terwey, 22nd June 2016), as the National Media Museum has done, also museologically frames television fandom as a bearer of intangible cultural heritage. This manoeuvre chimes with UNESCO's Memory of the World Programme (1992 to the present) and the right to memory articulated as cultural memory, documentation, archives, library collections, and artefacts linked to increasingly intangible forms of documentary heritage, from sound

recordings to film, television and digital media. More than this, by representing and mediating “a community of people sharing what's important to them and having lots in common with each other,” such museum practices become not about “telling you this is an important television programme, [... but rather] about a whole bunch of people saying ‘why this is important to me and my life,’ and ‘this is why *Doctor Who* has helped me to become the person I am’” (Michael Terwey, NMeM, in interview 22nd June 2016). Heritage discourses are drawn on here, just as they are by BBC Worldwide in a commercial context and by fans as part of their fan-cultural identity, yet in a relativized fashion whereby popular TV is insecurely legitimated (Connolly 2014: 65).

Paratextual memory yearns for a “thing” to attach itself to: an object, an archive, or a material form of media ranging from TV listings to all manner of merchandise. Crucially, this is typically something that enables fans to demonstrate they “were there,” objectifying fan cultural capital or authenticity (a form of status that collectors can accrue at one remove through “second-hand fandom”; Geraghty 2014: 181). This “thing” also calls for cataloguing metadata (increasingly digital): data that tells us the when and where of paratextual memory, making it retrievable. When *Doctor Who* is remembered publicly for the benefit of its fan community – and for an imagined national community – then it needs to be restored, displayed, and supported by artefacts (costumes, props, equipment, documents) as well as anchored to personal histories (through interviews and other fan ephemera such as fanzines). This amounts to paratextual memory as the right to have access to one’s cultural past, but it is a performance privileging communities that can demonstrate intangible heritage as an extant resource rich in meaning. It resonates with UNESCO’s overall understanding of memory as a human right to cultural

heritage (patrimony) extending into deeper time and updated within its “Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003.”

Patrimony, property that is inherited patri-linearly (through the male line) and “patrimoine” (“heritage” in French) may assume a white, male privilege to the cultural inheritance of memory texts, objects, and artefacts passed down the generations from fathers to sons. Arguably, this privilege has not disappeared from the cultural and social scene of the (re)-commodification of recovered *Who*. Repatriation of *Who* texts, as and through paratextual memory routes and locations, does not simply enact the return of cultural objects to their country of origin in a simple transaction between a “collecting institution” – whether the BFI or the BBC – and an “Indigenous population” – nation/audience/fan (Cohen 2015: 93). If “successful repatriation is connecting ... cultural objects [...] to the correct Indigenous claimants,” as Hart Cohen (2015: 93) says of the repatriation of film, then who exactly are *Who*’s claimants? Furthermore, if a digitized “original” text such as the DVD release of “The Enemy of the World” returns to the scene via fandom’s paratextual memory (as a key driver) then what form of restitution is this repatriation enacting? “Enemy of the World,” for example, should technically have been returned at the time or destroyed. It can only ever return as a form of digital paratextual memory within a reformatted media ecology of *participatory heritage* where institutions such as the National Media Museum and the BBC have shown a tendency to stop collecting popular TV, just as fans have become vital archive entrepreneurs in their place. Fans’ “rogue archives” (De Kosnik 2016) may not be entirely roguish, instead having formerly official functions devolved to them (by way of reducing costs for state-endorsed memory institutions).

Media fans have been described as “networkers, collectors, curators, producers and more” (Duffett 2013: 21), and today they have begun taking decisions about the preservation of

beloved media, as well as forming a target-market for the commercial exploitation of recovered TV, and circulating television's heritage discourses. Such fan-archivists perform paratextual memory as they conserve fan objects, using paratexts as memory markers of authentically "being there," or being distinctively knowledgeable about texts' moments of production, broadcast, and consumption. Fannish paratextual memory calls on us to think about a wider spatiotemporal array of paratextual operations beyond corralling textual meaning, also requiring a far greater dialogue between fan studies and memory studies. We have made one start with this piece.

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of the British Academy for funding the "Inheriting British Television" Project (2013-2014) which generated all the original interview material, and Warwick Institute of Advanced Study for funding the Paratextual Memory Symposium (2016).

References:

- Booth, Paul (2017) *Digital Fandom 2.0* Peter Lang, New York.
- Booy, Miles (2012) *Love and Monsters: The Doctor Who Experience from 1979 to the Present* I.B. Tauris, London.
- Cohen, Hart (2015) 'Film as Cultural Memory: The Struggle for Repatriation and Restitution of Cultural Property in Central Australia' in Anna Reading and Tamar Katriel (eds) *Cultural Memories of Non-Violent Struggles* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: pp.91—110.
- Connolly, Maeve (2014) *TV Museum* Intellect, Bristol.
- De Kosnik, Abigail (2016) *Rogue Archives: Digital Cultural Memory and Media Fandom* MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Duffett, Mark (2013) *Understanding Fandom* Bloomsbury Academic, London.
- Fiddy, Dick (2001) *Missing Believed Wiped: Searching for the Lost Treasures of British Television* BFI, London.
- Genette, Gerard (1997) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Geraghty, Lincoln (2014) *Cult Collectors* Routledge, London and New York.
- Garde-Hansen, Joanne (2011) *Media and Memory* Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Gorton, Kristyn and Joanne Garde-Hansen (forthcoming) *Inheriting British Television: Memories, Archives and Industries* BFI, London.
- Gray, Jonathan (2010) *Show Sold Separately* New York University Press, New York.
- (2016) 'The Politics of Paratextual Ephemeralia' in Sara Pesce and Paolo Noto (eds) *The Politics of Ephemeral Digital Media* Routledge, New York and London: pp. 32—44.

- Guerrier, Simon (2016a) ‘Story Preview: *The Power of the Daleks*’ in *Doctor Who Magazine* 505: pp. 14—15.
- (2016b) ‘A First for *Power*’ in *Doctor Who Magazine* 506: pp. 20—24.
- Gunkel, David J. (2016) *Of Remixology* MIT Press, Cambridge and London.
- Hills, Matt (2014) ‘*Doctor Who*’s textual commemorators’ in *Journal of Fandom Studies* 2.1: pp. 31—51.
- (2015) *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Event* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Holdsworth, Amy (2011) *Television, Memory and Nostalgia* Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke.
- Kompare, Derek (2005) *Rerun Nation* Routledge, New York and London.
- Keightley, Emily and Michael Pickering (2012) *The Mnemonic Imagination* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Lizardi, Ryan (2015) *Mediated Nostalgia: Individual Memory and Contemporary Mass Media* Lexington Books, Lanham.
- Molesworth, Richard (2013) *Wiped! Doctor Who’s Missing Episodes (Revised Edition)* Telos Publishing, Prestatyn.
- Reading, Anna and Tamar Katriel (eds) (2015) *Cultural Memories of Non-Violent Struggles* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Re, Valentina (2016) ‘Beyond the Threshold: Paratext, Transcendence, and Time in the Contemporary Media Landscape’ in Sara Pesce and Paolo Noto (eds) *The Politics of Ephemeral Digital Media* Routledge, London: pp. 60—74.
- Southall, J.R. (2014) ‘Feature: DOCTOR WHO - UPDATE ON THE MISSING EPISODES’, Starburstmagazine.com, posted 28/2/14, available online at

<http://www.starburstmagazine.com/features/feature-articles/8067-feature-doctor-who-the-missing-episodes>, accessed 18/11/16.

Spilsbury, Tom (2013) 'The Hero of the World!' in *Doctor Who Magazine* 466: pp. 14—17.

UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage* Paris,

Unesco <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf>

Wallace, Richard (2013) 'Joint Ventures and Loose Cannons: Reconstructing *Doctor Who*'s

Missing Past' in Paul Booth (ed) *Fan Phenomena: Doctor Who* Intellect, Bristol: pp. 28—37.

Young, Clive (2008) *Homemade Hollywood: Fans Behind the Camera* Continuum, New York.