

More Than “Collaborative Rubber Stamps”: Cross-Community Storytelling in Transitional Northern Ireland

Laura Aguiar
University College Cork, Ireland

Abstract

Storytelling is one of the most cited means of dealing with the legacy of the past in transitional societies. Since the mid-1990s, with the peace process, Northern Ireland has witnessed a proliferation of official and unofficial initiatives dealing with the Troubles (1968–1998). Below the radar of official initiatives, there have been a number of grassroots projects challenging official narratives and recovering silenced accounts of the past. These range across photography, oral history, exhibition, theatre and film.

In this paper, I examine some of these initiatives and show how alternative media has played a key role in cross-community development and conflict transformation in Northern Ireland, despite the political sensitivities. As the conflict had several protagonists, the boundaries between victims and perpetrators have remained blurred and, consequently, stories about the past remain debatable. Interestingly, this has also brought opportunities for projects to develop collaborative storytelling frameworks.

Based on field notes and cross-examination of published studies about the projects, the findings show that by offering shared ownership and authorship these frameworks enable all parties to invest in and benefit from the projects and offer a supportive space for people to engage in discussions about the past. However, these projects are not immune to the paradoxical potential of storytelling to heal trauma and open old wounds – there is no guarantee that people will not re-traumatise or that stories will always be well received. Nevertheless, the findings demonstrate that when people have the opportunity to tell their stories through a collaborative process, the gap between media representations and people’s plural lived experiences is more likely to be addressed.

Keywords: alternative media, Troubles, Northern Ireland, storytelling, collaboration

Introduction

From 2011 until 2014 I lived in Northern Ireland to undertake a practice-based PhD research on cross-community collaborative filmmaking. What I encountered was a place in the midst of transition from years of violence and division. At the centre of this (slow) transition I found a creative context for alternative media projects dealing with the conflict: over 30 such projects took place before 2005 and many more have emerged since then (Kelly 2005).

I begin this article with a brief overview of the current transitional scenario and the impact of the scars left by the Troubles to outline the context for this analysis. I then examine some of the alternative media initiatives and show how these have contributed to conflict transformation in Northern Ireland, despite the political sensitivities.

Drawing on my field notes taken while engaging with these initiatives through public events and on cross-examination of published studies about the projects, I finish with a discussion of the challenges the sensitive context brings to any media project. This article demonstrates how the projects have addressed these challenges through the adoption of collaborative storytelling practices and how their strength lies in the relationships formed with the participants through shared ownership or authorship.

Northern Ireland Today: Post-Conflict?

Various paradigms have been used to interpret the conflict in Northern Ireland, or the ‘war’, or the ‘Troubles’, with the ethnic paradigm being the one most commonly used by mainstream media and politicians. This paradigm sees the conflict as a violent expression of animosities and unresolved issues about nationality, religion, power and territorial rivalry between republicans/nationalists (mostly Catholics) and loyalists/unionists (mostly Protestants). However, authors such as Graham Dawson go beyond this paradigm and incorporate a broader set of protagonists. For Dawson, the Troubles can be categorised by “systematic and sustained abuses of human rights by the British State, and a systematic blurring, by all protagonists of violence, of the categories of armed combatants and unarmed civilians” (Dawson 2007: 9).

The conflict left almost 4,000 people dead and over 40,000 injured during its 30-odd years (McKittrick & McVea 2002). Although these figures may seem low if compared to other conflicts, it is a considerable number for a population of only 1.5 million: “if a similar level of violence had taken place in Britain over the same period, there would have been 100,000 dead, one million shooting incidents and some half a million bombings” (Ryder 2000: xiii).

Apart from deaths and casualties, the conflict has also left psychological scars in Northern Ireland. In 2005, a study conducted by Queens University Belfast found that “one in five people has suffered multiple experiences relating to the Troubles” and “one in ten of those surveyed reported post-traumatic symptoms that are suggestive of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)” (Muldoon et al. 2005: 87–88). A more recent study has shown that children from deprived Protestant areas were worse off than those from deprived Catholic areas, particularly because of continuing paramilitary and criminal influence (Meredith 2015).

Although Northern Ireland seems to be slowly recovering from the economic downturn, with new restaurants opening and tourist attractions such as the Titanic Experience increasing their

visitor numbers,¹ within comfortable walking distance from the centre one is still greeted by so-called ‘peace walls’, murals and flags which clearly display the division between unionist/loyalist and nationalist/republican areas. One could argue that these displays show that Northern Ireland remains, as former loyalist prisoner Alistair Little points out, a place where inhabitants define themselves “not by what they shared in common but by what set them apart” (Little & Scott 2009: 26).

Though the level of violence diminished considerably with the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998,² some of the tension was still visible during the period I conducted my research: dissident republican groups targeted security staff in gun and bomb attacks and carried out bombings meant to cause disruption. In 2012 alone, there was an average of more than one security alert per day (Kilpatrick 2013). Tensions increased at the end of the same year after Belfast City Council voted to restrict the flying of the Union flag to 20 designated days. Part of the Protestant/unionist/loyalist community saw it as a threat to their culture and took to the streets to protest, in some cases through violence, against this vote (INTERCOMM & Byrne 2013).³

Their dissatisfaction increased in the following year, after the Parades Commission ruled that Orangemen could not march past the Ardoyne shops, a nationalist area, during the Twelfth of July parade.⁴ At the end of 2013, a six-month inter-party talk chaired by Dr Richard Haass and Dr Meghan O’Sullivan attempted to reach an agreement on issues of flags, parading and dealing with the past (McDonald 2013). An agreement would only be reached a year later with the Stormont House Agreement, which sought to provide for a set of new institutions, namely The Historical Investigations Unit (HIU), an Independent Commission on Information Retrieval (ICIR), an Oral History Archive, and an Implementation and Reconciliation Group. However, its implementation remains delayed due to disagreements about welfare reform and paramilitary activity (BBC 2015).

In 2016 relationships between republicans and unionists deteriorated when the late republican Deputy First Minister Martin McGuinness resigned in protest over unionist First Minister Arlene Foster’s handling of The Renewable Heat Incentive scheme scandal and her refusal to step aside during investigations of the scheme’s flaws (Moriarty 2016). At the time of writing, new elections have taken place, but the parties have yet to form a new government.

The difficulty in addressing and reaching an agreement on issues about the past and the tensions between republicans and unionists evidence how “[d]eep division, sectarianism, segregation, suspicion, and the socio-economic deprivation that affects our wider community and economy are all legacies of the past” (Stormont Report 2011: 162). Dealing with any of these issues is highly problematic given the current ‘meta-conflict’ situation where there is no agreement on why the conflict happened and on how to deal with its legacy (McGarry & O’Leary cited in Moloney 2014: 13). As unionist politician Mike Nesbit illustrates, “We cannot agree on what happened, and we certainly cannot agree on why it happened. We cannot even agree on the

¹ The revitalisation of certain areas of Belfast, including the Titanic Quarter, has brought debates about gentrification, city branding and heritage. For more, see Murtagh (2011) and Neill et al. (2013).

² The Agreement “established the framework for transition to a new political dispensation and social order in Northern Ireland” (Dawson 2007: 261).

³ For more on the protests, see Nolan et al. (2014) and Hearty (2015).

⁴ These annual marches are a loyalist/unionist/Protestant event and celebrate the victory of Protestant King William of Orange over Catholic King James II at the Battle of the Boyne (1690). The marches have led to conflicts in interface areas between nationalist and loyalist communities, as the former sees them as intimidating while the latter regards them a celebration of their culture.

language that we use to describe it. Was it ‘the Troubles’, ‘the conflict’, or was it, as republicans like to say, a ‘war’?” (Stormont Report 2011: 167).

The question of victimhood has also been central to debates on the Troubles’ legacy. As the conflict had several protagonists, one person’s ‘victim’ may be seen as another’s ‘perpetrator’ and “even perpetrators claim to have been the victims of circumstance” (McLaughlin 2010: 144). This blurring of boundaries in the dichotomy of victim/perpetrator has led to numerous debates on the question of a “hierarchy of victims”, where “some deaths are held to be more important and so merit recognition more than others” (Dawson 2007: 286). This question is further problematised when the State and paramilitary organisations have yet to publicly take responsibility for past atrocities, such as the Ballymurphy massacre⁵ and the ‘disappeared’. Hence, the manner and place in which perceived ‘perpetrators’, for example ex-prisoners or prison officers, tell their stories can become highly controversial issues (Mairs 2013: 251–2).

Dealing with the Past through Alternative Media

Storytelling has emerged as one of the most cited means of dealing with the legacy of the past in transitional societies (Mairs 2013: 22). Whilst in some cases it has been termed “testimony-giving” and used to uncover the ‘truth’, such as in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa, in others, storytelling has been used as a medium to recover and make sense of neglected or silenced accounts of the past (Rogers et al 2004: 12–13). Indeed, storytelling has become the major conduit for “dealing with the past” in Northern Ireland as opposed to other mechanisms, such as tribunals or TRCs. As Claire Hackett and Bill Rolston note, this is because it “allows more room for the narrator’s interpretation of his/her experience” and, consequently, enables agency to the bereaved and victims of human rights abuse to be restored (Hackett & Rolston 2009: 369).

Moreover, memory has been favoured over ‘truth’ in Northern Ireland as it may provide “evidence of how people interpret their past at a personal level, which is an invaluable contribution to other documentary evidence and provides a rich texture to our understanding of historical developments” (McLaughlin 2010: 20). Through memory internal selves connect “with external environments, pasts with presents, and random experiences with unconscious routines” (Zelizer 1995: 214). Hence, storytelling based on memory may function as “a way of re-living, re-working, making sense of, coming to terms with, and integrating violent events” which may have altered people’s lives (Zur 2004: 51) and may offer an opportunity for individuals with different experiences to listen to each other’s stories.

Political transitions can sometimes “lead to an official story or memory that erases, downplays, marginalizes or formalizes and institutionalizes the stories of some or all victims” (Hackett & Rolston 2009: 357). For instance, the voices of women have often been neglected for war history that is highly male-centred (Adie 2003; Jelin 2003; Ward 2006; Alison 2009; Cohn 2013) with personalised symbols of pain and suffering often embodied in women, while institutional repressive mechanisms often connected to men (Jelin 2003: 76). As a result, there is a gap for alternative media projects to fill to give voice to absent, silenced or marginalised voices.

⁵ In August 1971, eleven civilians were killed by a British parachute regiment during Operation Demetrius which aimed at arresting and interning without charge anyone suspected of being members of the Provisional IRA (McKittrick & McVea, 2002: 67–68). At the time of writing, no independent inquiry reviewing the killings has been set up by the British government despite the victim’s families’ long campaign.

However, it is important to clarify what I mean by ‘alternative media’ as one could argue that saying that a medium is alternative to another may be rather trivial – everything, at some point, is always alternative to something else. Chris Atton and James F. Hamilton define it as alternative to the “conventions of news sources and representation, the inverted pyramid of news texts, the hierarchical and capitalised economy of commercial journalism, the professional, elite basis of journalism as a practice, the professional norm of subjectivity and the subordinate role of audience as a receiver” (Atton & Hamilton 2008:1).

Indeed, ‘alternative media’ is just one of the many ways to refer to the type of media independent from the agenda of constituted powers (such as religious and political institutions and journalistic corporations), more accessible and participatory to the citizens, and closely wedded to notions of social responsibility (Atton 2003: 267). Other terms include “citizen media”, “activist media”, “radical media”, and “participatory media” (Rodriguez 2003: 190). Notwithstanding labels, what is common to such media projects is their grassroots and participatory nature as well as their potential to transform “passive voiceless, dominated communities into active shapers of their own destiny” (180).

However, John H. Downing reminds us that we should not presume that alternative media will always be used in a positive way; it can also be used as repressive media, such as in Nazi campaigns which shut the public’s capacity of judgement and helped impose a hegemonic form of thinking. As he observes, “radical media, depending on the point of view of the observer or the activist, can represent negative forces as well as constructive forces” (Downing 2002: 27).

The ‘alternative media’ projects examined here allow for points of view and opinions to be expressed without having to attend the interests of media moguls, politicians and religious authorities. They contrast with mainstream media practices which manipulated public perceptions and marginalized the conflict in the minds of British public through vetoes, censorship of certain voices and careful choice of words (Miller 1994; Rolston & Miller 1996). These practices were so widespread that as early as 1994 David Miller noted that “...unless they [audience] have an alternative source of information, people in Britain are inclined to believe the distorted picture of life in Northern Ireland presented by television and newspaper reports” (11).

Consequently, these distortions have generated a general sense of discontent with media producers which continues to affect any storyteller coming to work with local communities until today. Journalist Susan McKay, for example, found that some people were so hurt and angry about media distortions that they decided not to be interviewed again (McKay 2008: 8). Michelle Moloney observed while researching community oral history archives that “there was a sense of researchers coming into communities, mining them and disappearing” (Moloney 2014: 280).

Therefore, as shall be argued later, alternative media projects have offered, and continue to offer, much welcomed ethical frameworks for telling stories about the legacy of the past, to promoting community dialogue, and finding ways to move forward together.

The Strengths and Limitations of Storytelling

Scholars and practitioners in Northern Ireland have pointed out that understanding ‘the other’ is a crucial tool for the current transitional period (Dawson 2007; Hackett & Rolston 2009; McLaughlin 2010; Mairs 2013; Moloney 2014). The organisation Healing Through

Remembering (HTR), for instance, suggests storytelling as a cross-community project where people can share personal stories, actively listen to each other, and document what has taken place so that they are “available for future generations to learn from the past” (cited in Borderlines Project 2006: 6).

However, when examining the potential of storytelling we must take into account the well-established debate on its paradoxical potential to both heal trauma and to open old wounds (Felman & Laub 1992; Jelin 2003; Rogers et al 2004; McLaughlin 2010; Mairs 2013). Some authors argue that storytelling can aid an externalisation of internal trauma narratives that were previously difficult to articulate and may have a healing effect and a sense of closure. Psychoanalyst Dori Laub, for instance, in his work with Holocaust survivors and their children, found that not only did survivors “need to survive so that they could tell their story; they also needed to tell their story in order to survive” (Felman & Laub 1992: 78).

As traumatic events do not happen in a social vacuum, storytelling may offer an opportunity to gain understanding of how trauma impacted people’s lives, on both personal and social levels. For example, when working with Bloody Sunday Justice campaigners, Dawson observed that the sharing of stories among them “helped each other fill out the gaps and silences in their own recollections, and endeavored to piece together a more complete and adequate narrative of the truths behind the traumatic events” (Dawson 2007: 123). Similarly, Moloney found that cross-community oral history archive projects can “facilitate relationship building and create opportunities to explore both the consequences and the causes of the conflict” (Moloney 2014: 17).

However, even with such positive results one still cannot assume that speaking out will always be positive and unproblematic. Bhaskar Sarkar and Janet Walker remind us that there is no guarantee that the complex attempts to achieve reconciliation and justice through storytelling will work according to plan, or produce the intended effects because of the volatility of populations strained by violence and agony (Sarkar & Walker 2009: 18). Likewise, Dawson poses questions drawing out the inherent ambivalence of storytelling work: “Does the attempt to represent the traumatic past help a survivor to come to terms with it, perhaps to bear the pain? Or is it risking too much, ploughing up thing too painful or disturbing to remember, things that are best buried, consigned to silence, forgotten?” (Dawson 2007: 70).

Any alternative media project dealing with sensitive stories must consider the possibilities of dissemination and the implications that it may bring to producers, participants, audiences, and institutions that host the stories. As Sarah Pink observes, “people express some things in one context that they would not say in another; and in the apparent intimacy of a video interview an informant may make comments that he or she would not make elsewhere” (2007: 56).

Moreover, bringing people’s stories to the public may put participants – and even producers – in life-threatening danger, subject them to moral criticism, criminal proceedings, or simply damage their reputations. The controversy caused by Boston College’s Belfast Oral History Project offers a good example of the risks of dissemination. Headed by Irish journalist Ed Moloney and former IRA member Anthony McIntyre, the US-based project audio-recorded dozens of interviews with former republican and loyalist paramilitaries. Initially, participants were assured that their recordings would not be made public until their deaths. However, this was later undermined by a US court ruling, after the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) sought access to some of the recordings as part of their probing the IRA 1972 killing of Jean McConville, one of the Troubles’ “disappeared” (BBC 2014). The turning over of the

interviews has had a twofold consequence so far: it has put the researchers and participants of the project in real risk of physical harm and it has probably complicated future projects dealing with the Troubles, as people may become more reticent to share their life stories with researchers. This case draws attention to the need to discuss with participants potential consequences of having their stories made publicly available and how storytelling projects can have long-term effects in their lives.

Collaborative Storytelling in Northern Ireland

Since the mid-1990s, with the beginning of the peace talks, Northern Ireland has witnessed a proliferation of official and unofficial initiatives dealing with the past. Early in the peace process, the government-appointed Victims' Commissioner Kenneth Bloomfield produced the report *We Will Remember Them* (1998) "to look at possible ways to recognise the pain and suffering felt by victims of violence arising from the troubles" (Bloomfield 1998: 8).⁶

There have also been other official developments, some consisting of legally based initiatives such as the Saville Inquiry, which looked at 1972's Bloody Sunday. Costing nearly 200 million pounds and lasting 12 years, the Saville Inquiry "was not only the lengthiest and most detailed but also the costliest in legal history and became a huge matter of controversy itself" (Murray 2012: 3). The inquiry established that the British army had shot and killed unarmed innocent civilians and led to an official apology by the British Prime Minister David Cameron.

In 2005 the Historical Enquiries Team (HET) was established by the PSNI, which aimed at re-examining all unsolved deaths attributable to the Troubles (Hackett & Rolston 2009: 365). At the time of writing, the HET held inquiries into more than 1,800 cold case killings and have yet to investigate another 900 killings. However, in September 2014 its closure was announced due to budget costs (Moriarty 2014).⁷

Below the radar of these official initiatives, there has been an increasing number of grassroots community projects dealing with the past, ranging across photography, oral history, exhibition, theatre and film. Below, I consider some of these initiatives to exemplify this proliferation.⁸

An Crann (The Tree) operated between 1994 and 2001 and was led by poet and playwright David Gorman. The project used drama, textiles, creative writing and photography to engage participants to talk about the past. *An Crann's* outputs include various publications, such as *Bear in Mind: Stories of the Troubles* (2000), and also the 60-minute documentary film *Night Rider* (1990), about a Belfast taxi driver and his daughter.

The Ardoyne Commemoration Project (ACP) collected testimonies from Ardoyne residents, a nationalist/republican working-class district, in Belfast, and gathered them in the book *Ardoyne: The Untold Truth* (2002). Established in 2000, the Duchas Oral History Archive is based in another nationalist/republican area, Falls Road, and contains 100 audio interviews and photography of republican and loyalist individuals who were affected by the Troubles.

⁶ To access the report, see <http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/issues/violence/victims.htm>

⁷ For an analysis of the HET's purpose, its effectiveness as a 'truth' recovery mechanism and the heated debates it has generated, see Lundy (2009, 2011).

⁸ As will be seen later, this selected sample is based on projects in which I had direct engagement with producers and/or with participants through public events, as well as from cross-examination of the published studies generated by the projects themselves.

In Derry/Londonderry, Epilogues⁹ holds 27 video-recorded personal testimonies which explore six key themes – Violence, Loss, Revenge, Forgiveness, Justice, and Human Rights. The project launched in 2005 a DVD and website-based educational workshop. In the same city, the Playhouse Theatre's Theatre of Witness Programme has been producing plays where people perform their own personal stories of trauma, which are filmed and turned into documentary films.¹⁰

Operating across Northern Ireland, WAVE Trauma Centre¹¹ has collaborated with its members to produce poignant accounts of the past, such as the 30-minute documentary film *Unheard Voices* (2009) and the series *Stories from Silence* (2013). *Unheard Voices* contains six five-minute stories of people who lost a loved one or were themselves injured as a result of the Troubles and was produced by Cahal McLaughlin and Jolene Mairs. *Stories from Silence* is a series of 25 audio recorded interviews produced by journalists Laura Haydon and Susan McKay. Both films are available online.¹² The travelling exhibition *Everyday Objects Transformed by the Conflict* used personal artefacts to tell different stories of the Troubles and after touring across Northern Ireland from 2012 to 2014 is now available online.¹³

The Prisons Memory Archive (PMA) was created in 2006 by scholar and filmmaker Cahal McLaughlin and holds 175 interviews with people that were connected to the Maze and Long Kesh Prison and Armagh Gaol during the Troubles in Northern Ireland. The PMA holds a wide range of experiences, from prisoners to prison staff and relatives, both men and women. Participants were recorded inside the empty prison sites by a single camera operator who followed them while they walked and talked around the buildings. The project is currently creating an interactive exhibition platform of all of the recorded material in partnership with the Public Records Office Northern Ireland (PRONI).

However, part of the material has already been brought to the public via three PhD projects: *Unseen Women* (2011) by Jolene Mairs, who took six five-minute self-contained narratives out of the Armagh Gaol recordings. These were shown as a 26-minute linear documentary as well as a multi-screen installation. I worked with the material from the Maze and Long Kesh Prison and made the 60-minute linear documentary film *We Were There* (2014) about the women's diverse experiences of this male prison. Jamie McRoberts created the multi-narrative interactive documentary *Maze3* (2016). In the same year McLaughlin released the linear documentary *Armagh Stories: Voices from the Gaol*.

What is common to all of the above projects is that they have employed collaborative storytelling methods that favour shared ownership and authorship when working with contested stories. Interestingly, despite these projects' methodological commonalities, there is to date no generic model of collaborative storytelling within Northern Ireland (Mairs 2013: 32). The evidence base for their use "has been drawn primarily from public consultation as opposed to studies that evidence its effectiveness" (82). Surprisingly, despite this wealth of

⁹ For more, see <http://www.epilogues.net>

¹⁰ For more, see <http://www.theatreofwitness.org>

¹¹ Formed in 1991, WAVE Trauma Centre offers support and addresses the needs of people (children and adults) traumatised by the conflict. See <http://www.wavetraumacentre.org.uk/>

¹² Available at <http://storiesfromsilence.com> and <http://www.wavetraumacentre.org.uk/about-us/wave-projects/unheard-voices>

¹³ For more, see <http://healingthroughremembering.org/eoe-about/>

models, there are only a few Northern Irish-based studies that critically examine protocols employed by collaborative storytelling projects and their effect on participants and audiences.¹⁴

Lessons from Northern Ireland

The analysis of the selected sample for this paper is based on field notes taken while attending public events, such as talks, launches, performances and screenings as well as on cross-examination of published articles and reports about such projects. The findings below offer valuable lessons to alternative media projects dealing with sensitive stories, such as the legacy of a contested past. As shall be argued, at the same time the projects offer a way of telling stories that is ethical, representative and inclusive, they are not immune to the sensitivities of the context and to the potential of opening old wounds.

Co-ownership

Co-ownership is an important element of building trust and helps tip the power balance of a storytelling process back towards the participants (McLaughlin 2010; Mairs 2013; Aguiar 2015). This is in line with oral historians' notion of *shared authority*, a term coined by Michael Frisch in the 1990s and their concern with making oral history a more democratic cultural practice. Sharing authority requires interviewers to relinquish control over the product of historical inquiry and share power with their interviewees over the research, interpretation, and dissemination of the stories. It implies a “fundamental shift in perspective from ‘knowing about’ to ‘knowing with’, as psychologist Henry Greenspan has argued in relation to his own work with Holocaust survivors” (High 2009: 16). Sharing authority, thus, “is the sharing of a journey, it is the sharing of time, information, materials, claims, trust, and finally, public statements, among other things” (Parr et al. 2009: 56).

A starting point to sharing authority is giving participants co-ownership of the project – that is, they have the right to veto or withdrawal. And the benefits of co-ownership can be seen in many projects in Northern Ireland. For example, in Mairs' *Unseen Women*, she notes that “[w]here participants had the right to withdraw, the veto promoted involvement and therefore increased, as opposed to decreased, the likelihood that audiences would have access to contrasting narratives of Armagh Gaol” (Mairs 2013: 224). Likewise, in my work in *We Were There* co-ownership helped enhance the participants' sense of safety and control. Additionally, participants expressed a certain security that my “motivations and aspirations as a filmmaker aligned with theirs and, as a result, there was more a sense of trust rather than a desire to control the editing process” (Aguiar 2015: 109).

However, there is an inevitable drawback of giving co-ownership to participants: the risk of losing an important voice if a participant decides to withdraw from the project (McLaughlin 2010; Mairs 2013; Aguiar 2015). This is a risk that archives such as the Dúchas Oral History Archive or the PMA have to face on a yearly basis given the political uncertainties in Northern Ireland. For example, the loyalist flag protests in 2013 coincided with the period when the PMA got funding to make 25 interviews available interactively online.¹⁵ As a result, McLaughlin and the team had difficulty negotiating consent with some of its loyalist participants and one of them even requested to have his recording withdrawn from the project. (Aguiar et al. 2014).

¹⁴ See studies by McLaughlin (2010), Mairs (2013), Moloney (2014) and Aguiar (2015).

¹⁵ See: <http://prisonmemoryarchive.com/archive-maze/>

Moreover, one has to be careful to think that giving the right to veto or withdrawal will always be beneficial as there is the risk of pushing participants towards accepting compromises which they may not be prepared to make: “[w]here participants value representation over no representation at all, or face losing the opportunity to present a contrasting narrative to the public, the option to veto may feel like a false choice: “if you don’t like it, you always have the option to leave”” (Mairs 2013: 227-228).

Sharing Authorship

Co-ownership can be extended to co-authorship which means that participants have not only ethical but also creative control of the project (Aguiar 2015: 33). The sharing of authorship can happen at two different levels: participants can work very closely with storytellers during the production of the stories, but in the end the latter holds technical control of this process; or storytellers can train participants to ‘do it themselves’ and act mostly as facilitators throughout the project. For example, with HTR’s exhibition *Everyday Objects Transformed by the Conflict* participants were actively involved in the choice of objects, interpretation and exhibition design. Likewise, co-authorship was at the core of the Theatre of Witness plays and films as participants not only told their stories, but they also performed them. These experiences reinforce Barbash and Taylor’s view that if a storytelling project “is about someone’s subjective or emotional life, it will probably only be enriched by their active participation” (Barbash & Taylor 1997: 86).

Interestingly, in the case of the projects coming out of the PMA material, participants’ rolez ranged from co-directors to co-editors, which enabled them to regain a significant sense of power and control over their own representation. If during the filming the walk/talk approach adopted by the PMA enabled participants to decide what stories would be told, in *We Were There* the conversations between rough cuts gave them control over how their stories would be re-contextualised and re-told in a linear film. As a result, participants became more aware of how new meanings are created in the editing phase of filmmaking and had the “opportunity to reproduce and understand their world as opposed to the dominant representation depicted in the mass media” (Pink 2007: 111).

Co-authorship, thus, is a powerful bottom-up approach for building trust as participants feel ‘safe’ and know that their stories will be adequately represented. However, to maximize its potential it is important from the beginning to discuss with participants the inevitable unevenness of co-authorship and to make transparent each other’s individual and professional constraints, aspirations and roles (Aguiar 2015: 124). We all belong to specific socio-economic classes, have certain predispositions and views, “breathe a particular ‘cultural air’, and choose that some things can be said and others had best not be said” (Carruthers 2000: 17).

For the Dúchas Oral History Archive, participants were given a contributor form before the interviews were carried out. This form enabled them to know from the very start what control they had, in this case to approve the recording and request amendments or impose restrictions. As Hackett recalls:

[w]e want to make people aware that the interview is a matter of historical record that could potentially be accessed by anyone in the future (...) The key issue in all of this is that we are as clear as possible about the control they have. They are then in a position to make an informed judgement about whether to take part in the interview” (2000: 91).

This highlights the importance of setting up parameters from the start to ensure feasible shared ownership and authorship.

Furthermore, if parameters of collaboration remain under-discussed and unclear, there may be the risk of one of the collaborators, most likely the one who holds a position of power, to adopt exploitative methods under the guise of ‘collaboration’ to obtain undue credit for the work. Thus, it is paramount at the outset of any collaborative project to discuss the terms of the collaboration and to clearly demarcate the boundaries of each role. This may help avoid misunderstandings or may make the process more transparent and, thus, less likely to be exploitative or unethical for any of the parties involved.

It is crucial to highlight that collaborative storytelling is about dialogue and not about implementing whatever participants wish. This can help minimise possible misunderstandings about the collaborative process and lead participants to trust the storyteller to make decisions on their behalf when necessary. This may also help mitigate feelings of disappointment when participants’ creative suggestions are not taken on board. This transparent approach avoids the sense of being brought as a “collaborative rubber stamp” (Barbash & Taylor 1997: 88) – the collaboration is genuine, not for pretend.

Co-authorship, thus, requires a considerable degree of patience, transparency and willingness to listen as well as dialogue throughout the whole storytelling process. These elements are particularly key in places like Northern Ireland, where people remain segregated from one another and are slowly getting accustomed to working alongside who was for so long perceived as the ‘Other’.

Time and Relationships

Time and resource availability is an important issue to consider when working more collaboratively. Sharing ownership and authorship can be more time-consuming than initially thought and must be grounded in realistic and flexible goals (Aguilar 2015: 141) Whilst storytellers are under pressure from deadlines imposed by funders and institutions, participants have family, work and community commitments. As much as one can be as inclusive as possible, some participants will be more willing, or perhaps have more time, to collaborate than others.

For instance, Patricia Lundy and Mark McGovern note that for the Ardoyne Commemorative Project the handing-back phase – interviews were recorded and then handed back for approval and amendments – added years to the workload of the project. However, they point out that this was a key element in the whole working process: “the community in effect took “ownership” and control of the design, research process, editing, return phase, and production of the book” (Lundy & McGovern 2009: 115).

When determining realistic parameters of participation – whether as individuals or as a working group – one should thoroughly consider group dynamics, individual limitations, access to resources and socio-political context, since they all impact on how the project will unfold. The projects in Northern Ireland vary in their methodologies. Group dynamics have been used by projects such as the Theatre of Witness to trigger unique exchanges of experiences and ideas, produce inspiring plays and films and, subsequently, promote much needed cross-community understanding, cooperation and dialogue.

However, group dynamics may also “bring out the best and the worst in people” and “[t]he voices of the less confident, the poorer and the powerless, are less likely to be heard” (Slim et al. 2006: 147). This was experienced, for instance, by Peter Shirlow and Lorraine Dowler in their research on female partners of political prisoners in Northern Ireland. They eschewed focus groups when they found that some women felt uncomfortable speaking in front of others or that older women and more confident members tended to dominate the sessions. They also found that some of the women preferred not to share with the group “information on their relationships that would indicate that they were, as one respondent noted, “a bad wife”. Also, some of the younger women disagreed with the older women but did not wish to offend them publicly by saying so” (Shirlow & Dowler 2010: 388). Shirlow and Dowler’s experience reveals the difficulty of working with participants who are not part of a group with a shared identity and it also draws attention to the challenges that the context of Northern Ireland poses to any interview process.

Recognising this difficulty, for *We Were There* I opted to work with people individually and slowly build a sense of group. Participants first became familiar with each other’s journey through the viewing of rough cuts. By the time of the screenings, they already felt more comfortable to share panel discussions with each other and could even see themselves as part of a group. Moreover, meeting participants individually to discuss rough cuts of *We Were There* enabled us to get to know each other on a personal level and slowly build an ethical and transparent relationship (Aguar 2015: 122).

Thinking carefully about working with people individually or as part of a group is paramount in places such as Northern Ireland where, as seen earlier, people have had negative experiences when working with media producers and researchers (McKay 2008; Moloney 2014).

Inclusivity

As mentioned above, one of the key features of alternative media is that it creates the opportunity for access to voices that would otherwise remain hidden from or be misrepresented in mainstream media. Inclusivity, thus, is at the core of all projects under analysis in this paper and is a key tool for building trust.

Some projects have focused on intra-community inclusivity to generate local agency and empower residents to take ownership of their own stories. The Dúchas Oral History Archive covers a wide range of experience from many different perspectives: campaigners, combatants and activists, mostly from the republican Falls Road, though there are some loyalists interviewees. Likewise, the Ardoyne Commemorative Project contains testimonies of relatives, friends and eyewitnesses of this republican area’s victims. For Lundy and McGovern, a significant benefit of collaborative storytelling is “its capacity to get to the nitty-gritty of intra-community conflict, understand the local dynamics, create dialogue and be context specific” (Lundy & McGovern 2009: 119).

However, Hackett and Rolston point out to the limitations of intra-community projects, not only in terms of the size of the potential audience but also its nature:

...it is difficult for the story to break free from the community that produced it. There is a ghettoization of memory, such that even the most poignant stories lose their power when presented to those outside of or antagonistic to the community (2009: 369–370).

Other projects have sought to offer the widest range of experiences as possible in terms of genre, age, geographic background, religious and paramilitary affiliation. *An Crann* was one of the first to include a wide range of stories about ‘ordinary’ people’s experiences of the Troubles, from members of the police, emergency services to children. Epilogues worked with people from nationalist and unionist backgrounds to gain insight into the underlying causes of conflict and to use their multimedia stories as a tool for equipping communities to play an active role in peace building. WAVE has focused on the daily struggles of victims and survivors while Theatre of Witness has worked with groups of men and women in developing their plays and films such as *Release* (2013) and *I Once Knew a Girl* (2010).

The PMA projects sought to go beyond the nationalist vs unionist dichotomy by not only offering a myriad of experiences of imprisonment during the Troubles, but by also finding film editing strategies that would enrich the effect of inclusivity. As can be seen in *Unseen Women* and *We Were There*, the filmmakers adopted strategies that privileged human stories over historical contexts and factual information. Both films offer very little historical context, eschew archival footage and images of the conflict, and only uses material from the PMA. Moreover, they identify their interviewees by their names, and not by their paramilitary or religious affiliations. As a result, both films promote what unites their participants – being women – rather than by what separates them – being Catholic or Protestant women, republican or loyalist women – and highlight the diversity of people’s experiences.

As cultural memorial practices in Northern Ireland have often fostered division (Rogers et al. 2004: 22), these ‘minor’ editing choices, and the films resulting from them, can potentially “create shared commemorative practices that allow for reparative remembering” (Mairs 2013: 142) which may help reduce, rather than reinforce, the sense of othering.

As positive as these experiences indicate, the included projects are not without their complications, particularly in divided societies such as Northern Ireland. As Cathie McKimm, from *An Crann*, reminds us: “[t]he stories will at times be offensive, painful and difficult to hear and for that there is no inoculation, only openness and integrity to begin judging ourselves before we begin judging others” (McKimm 2000: 102). However, this also offers the opportunity for “more than learning to accept our differences – it means learning to recognise our similarities – even when we find them in the faces and the stories of our enemies” (102).

Dissemination

Collaborative practices of recording and exhibiting offer safe spaces for unheard and underrepresented stories to be remembered and shared with other people. If dissemination strategies are developed together with participants and managed thoughtfully, they can “provide truly unique openings for individuals to have a voice and claim space in venues that may have been previously off-limits” (Miller & Smith 2012: 345). Moreover, a collaborative process that continues right up to exhibition can also be regarded by participants as constructive and therapeutic. As McLaughlin recalls in regards to *Unheard Voices*, the ongoing consultation “provided some control and reassurance to those who placed themselves in the vulnerable position of being in front of the camera and microphone, telling their painful stories to an unknown public” (McLaughlin 2010: 132).

However, when working with sensitive stories the risk of re-traumatisation and non-validation of one’s story cannot be ignored, particularly in transitional societies like Northern Ireland. Shaun Henry, who funded a variety of storytelling projects, observes that:

[t]here is a danger we could become involved in an intergenerational transfer of all our hang-ups about the Troubles to a younger generation, who are, in fact, much more open-minded to things’ and he urges us ‘to ensure that somehow our storytelling, and our remembrance of the past, are firmly embedded in a notion of moving forward’ (cited in Mairs 2013: 221).

One way of doing this is to thoroughly consider dissemination strategies so that these can create safe dialogues that will potentially promote mutual understanding and ideas for moving forward. Epilogues received funding to both collect the testimonies and to conduct a multimedia workshop education programme with seven target groups: victims of political violence; ex-prisoners; former members State Security Forces; youth; teachers and adult education providers; community groups; and students of Peace & Conflict Studies. The project also offered a ‘Training the Trainer’ programme. In the evaluation of the project, Michael Arlow notes that while there were significant achievements in terms of delivery and in building relationships with the target groups, the project was not immune to the difficulties of dealing with the past (Arlow 2008: 37).

Whilst first-hand storytelling can be a key tool to promote dialogue and broaden advocacy initiatives, a dissemination strategy must consider the individual versus collective needs and the public/private boundaries of sensitive stories. Some experiences may be too personal to be shared and can lead to further trauma, embarrassment, harassment and even life-threatening situations for participants. While collecting the stories for *Ann Crann’s* Bear in Mind project, McKimm recalls that her support staff often found it difficult to hear certain stories that participants would have described as “‘political’ rather than ‘personal’”:

[t]here was even a questioning on some occasions as to whether stories with a strong political bias should be included in the book. We did publish them however, because the paradox is, stories that are perceived as ‘political’ by a listener, may be experienced as personal by the teller (McKimm 2000: 97).

Therefore, before each interview question and each selection, storytellers should consider the purpose of sharing this information and the potential risks for participants when this is made publicly available. Participants may not be aware of all risks, so it is the storyteller’s responsibility to make sure that these are clearly understood.

It is also important to think about the speed in which stories are shared. Slowly moving participants’ stories from the private to the public sphere can minimise the risks of traumatisation and offer “opportunities for reflection, negotiation, and a relationship building so that participants are fully prepared to step into the public realm” (Miller & Smith 2012: 346). For *We Were There*, we decided to screen it first at Queen’s Film Theatre to a private audience of family and friends; this offered participants a less threatening environment and helped them build strength and group cohesion for the next screenings with a diverse audience, at the Belfast Film Festival (Aguar 2015: 101).

As *Challenge for Change* former director George Stoney observes, “it is necessary to ensure that participants get used to seeing themselves on film” and that “they experience the film in the company of others to witness its impacts and address initial defensiveness or embarrassment” (cited in Miller & Smith 2012: 337). Slowly moving people’s stories from the private to the public realm is more likely to enable them to slowly feel comfortable and empowered to face larger and more diverse audiences.

Conclusion

What is unique about the frameworks developed in Northern Ireland are the relationships formed with the participants and the shared sense of ownership and authorship. As argued above, these frameworks have both strengths and limitations, but based on my observations and the observations of the storytellers it is clear that there is more to gain when working closely with the people whose stories we tell. Northern Ireland offers many models of storytelling practice that are inclusive, ethical, transparent, and acutely aware of contextual circumstances and of people's life experiences, and sensitive to minority issues.

However, as Hackett and Rolston note, "there is no easily available blueprint that can indicate the best way in which to realize the potential benefits of story-telling in transitional societies" (Hackett & Rolston 2009: 372). In this paper I outlined the lessons that could be drawn from these projects' methods and techniques. These lessons should be taken as a continuous process of reflection instead of a "one-size-fits all" ethical framework (Clark 2012: 25).

Where the boundaries between victims/perpetrators are blurred, where there is a debatable meta-conflict scenario, and the risk of re-stimulation of pain cannot be ignored, "then each political and psychic circumstance of community, group and individual will need to be addressed in the future film-making of this genre" (Mairs & McLaughlin 2012: 41).

I demonstrated how collaborative practices can be deployed to minimise these risks and to maximise participants' positive experiences of alternative media. In societies coming out of conflict, such as Northern Ireland, frameworks such as these are much needed as they encourage processes where people who tell the stories can do so in safety. And those who listen to these stories can potentially be motivated and mobilised into dealing with the complexity of the past, into understanding and acknowledging the diversity of people's experiences and into working together to create a future away from violence.

References

- Adie, K. (2003). *Corsets to Camouflage: Women and War*. London: Cornet Books.
- Aguiar, L. (2015). *'We Were There': The Women of the Maze and Long Kesh Prison: Collaborative Filmmaking in Transitional Northern Ireland*. PhD Thesis. Queen's University Belfast.
- Aguiar, L., McLaughlin, C., & McRoberts, J. (2014). *The Prisons Memory Archive: Questioning and Engaging with Interactivity*. I-Docs Symposium.
- Alison, M. H. (2009). *Women and political violence: female combatants in ethno-national conflict*. London: Routledge.
- Arlow, M. (12 September 2008). "Evaluation of 'Epilogues': Exploring the Underlying Causes of Conflict. Gaslight Productions", [Online], Available from: <http://www.epilogues.net/Evaluation/EpiloguesFinalReport.pdf> [Accessed 25 November 2012].
- Atton, C., & Hamilton, J. F. (2008). *Alternative Journalism*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849030043001>
- Atton, C. (2003). "What is 'Alternative Journalism'?", *Journalism* 4 (3), 267–272.
- Barbash, I., & Taylor, L. (1997). *Cross-Cultural Filmmaking: A Handbook for documentary and ethnographic films and videos*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- BBC (1 May 2014). "What are the Boston tapes?", *BBC News Northern Ireland*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-27238797> [Accessed 20 May 2014].
- BBC (11 September 2015). "Stormont crisis: David Cameron calls on parties to attend NI talks", *BBC News Northern Ireland*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-34217875> [Accessed 8 January 2016].
- Bloomfield, K. (1998). "We Will Remember Them", [Online], Available from: <http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/issues/violence/victims.htm> [Accessed 11 November 2012].
- Borderlines Project. (2006). *Personal Stories and Experiences from the Border Counties of the Island of Ireland*. Northern Ireland: Cross-Border Consortium.
- Carruthers, S. L. (2000). *The Media at War: Communication and Conflict in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clark, A. (2012). Visual Ethics in a Contemporary Landscape. In: Pink, S. (Ed.) *Advances in Visual Methodologies*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250921.n2>
- Cohn, C. (ed.) (2013). *Women and Wars*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Downing, J. D. H (2002). *Radical Media: Rebellious Communication and Social Movements*. São Paulo: Senac.
- Dawson, G. (2007). *Making Peace with the Past? Memory Trauma and the Irish Troubles*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Felman, S. and Laub, D. (1992). *Testimony: Crisis of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge.
- Frisch, M. (1990). *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hackett, C. (2000). "Recording Oral History: Practical and Ethical Issues" *Speakeasy: A report from the discussion forum for researchers*, [Online], Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265121441_Issues_arising_and_challenges_for_researchers [Accessed 21 November 2012].
- Hackett, C. and Rolston, B. (2009). "The Burden of Memory: Victims, Storytelling and Resistance in Northern Ireland", *Memory Studies* 2(3), 355–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698008337560>

- Hearty, K. (2015). “The Great Awakening? The Belfast Flag Protests and Protestant/Unionist/Loyalist Counter-memory in Northern Ireland”, *Irish Political Studies*, 30 (2), 157-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07907184.2014.942290>
- High, S. (2009). “Sharing Authority: An Introduction”, *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes*, 43 (1), 12–34. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.43.1.12>
- INTERCOMM, and, Byrne, J. (2013). “Flags and Protests: Exploring the views, perceptions and experiences of people directly and indirectly affected by the flag protests”, INTERCOMM, [Online], Available from: <http://www.thedetail.tv/system/uploads/353/original/Report.pdf?1386858265> [Accessed 20 January 2014].
- Jelin, E. (2003). *State, Repression and the Labours of Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kelly, G. (2005). “Storytelling Audit: An Audit of Personal Story, Narrative and Testimony Initiatives Related to the Conflict in and about Northern Ireland”, *Healing Through Remembering*, [Online], Available from: <http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/issues/victims/docs/kelly0905storytelling.pdf> [Accessed 8 November 2011].
- Kilpatrick, C. (28 December 2013). “One Security Alert in Northern Ireland for Every day of the Year”, *Belfast Telegraph*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/local-national/northern-ireland/one-security-alert-in-northern-ireland-for-every-day-of-the-year-29871264.html> [Accessed 20 May 2014].
- Little, A.; Scott, R. (2009). *Give a Boy a Gun*. London: Darton Longman Todd.
- Lundy, P. (2009). “Can the Past Be Policed? Lessons from the Historical Enquiries Team Northern Ireland”, *Law and Social Challenges*, 11(Spring/Summer), 1-55.
- Lundy, P. (2011). “Paradoxes and Challenges of Transitional Justice at the ‘Local’ Level: Historical Enquiries in Northern Ireland”, *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, 6 (1), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450144.2010.534495>
- Lundy, P. & McGovern, M. (2009). The Role of Community in Participatory Transitional Justice. In McEvoy, K. and McGregor, L. (Eds) *Transitional Justice from Below: Grassroots Activism and the Struggle for Change*. Oxford, Hart Publishing.
- Mairs, J., & McLaughlin, C. (2012). Unheard Voices: Recording Stories from the Troubles. In: MacKeogh, C.; O’Connell, D. (Eds.) *Documentary in a Changing State: Ireland Since the 1990s*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Mairs, J. (2013). *Audiovisual Storytelling in Post-Conflict Northern Ireland - participant and audience responses to filming, editing and exhibiting memories of the Troubles via two practice-led collaborative documentary film productions*. PhD Thesis. University of Ulster
- McDonald, H. (31 December 2013). “Northern Ireland Talks Collapse as Main Unionist Parties Reject Haass Proposals”, *The Guardian*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/dec/31/northern-ireland-talks-collapse-as-main-unionist-parties-reject-haass-proposals>. [Accessed 20 January 2014].
- McKay, S. (2008). *Bear in Mind These Dead*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- McKittrick, D., & McVea, D. (2001) *Making Sense of the Troubles: A History of the Northern Ireland Conflict*. London: Penguin.
- McKimm, C. (2000). “Narrative, Imagination and a Pluralist Vision”, *Speakeasy: A report from the discussion forum for researchers*, [Online], Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265121441_Issues_arising_and_challenges_for_researchers [Accessed 21 November 2012].
- McLaughlin, C. (2010). *Recording Memories from Political Conflict: A Film-Maker’s Journey*. Intellect: Bristol.

- Meredith, R. (8 December 2015). “Academic selection ‘reinforces privilege and disadvantage’ says report”, *BBC*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-35034595> [Accessed 5 January 2016].
- Miller, L., & Michele S. (2012). Dissemination and Ownership of Knowledge. In: Milne, E. J.; Mitchell, C.; de Lange, N. *Handbook of Participatory Video*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Miller, D. (1994). *Don't Mention the War: Northern Ireland, Propaganda and the Media*. London: Pluto Press.
- Moloney, M. (2014). *Reaching Out from the Archive: the Role of Community Oral History Archives in Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland*. PhD Thesis. University of Ulster.
- Moriarty, G. (30 September 2014). “Cutbacks lead to ‘effective closure’ of Historical Enquiries Team”, *Irish Times*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/cutbacks-lead-to-effective-closure-of-historical-enquiries-team-1.1946736> [Accessed 2 October 2014].
- Moriarty, G. (19 December 2016). “Q&A: What is the Northern Ireland ‘cash for ash’ scheme?”, *Irish Times*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.irishtimes.com/news/environment/q-a-what-is-the-northern-ireland-cash-for-ash-scheme-1.2907866> [Accessed 2 February 2017].
- Mulgrew, J. (30 May 2014). “Derry hotel bomb: Everglades Hotel left badly damaged in explosion 'had hosted PSNI recruitment event'”, *Belfast Telegraph*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/local-national/northern-ireland/hotel-bomb-staff-saved-lives-30316418.html> [Accessed 30 May 2014].
- Muldoon, O., Schmid, K., Downes, C., Kremer, J., & Trew, K. (2005). The Legacy of the Troubles: Experience of the Troubles, Mental Health and Social Attitudes. *Queen's University Belfast*, [Online], Available from: <http://www.legacyofthetroubles.qub.ac.uk/> [Accessed 5 November 2011].
- Murray, D. (2012). *Bloody Sunday: Truth, Lies and the Saville Inquiry*. London: Biteback Publishing.
- Murtagh, B. (2011). “Desegregation and place restructuring in the new Belfast”, *Urban Studies* 48 (6), 1119–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010371392>
- Neil, W.; Murray, M. and Grist, B. (2013). *Relaunching Titanic: Memory and marketing in the New Belfast*. London: Routledge.
- Nolan, P., Bryan, D., Dwyer, C., Hayward, K., Radford, K., & Shirlow, P. (2014). The Flag Dispute: Anatomy of a Protest. Belfast: *Queen's University Belfast*, [Online], http://pure.qub.ac.uk/portal/files/13748797/The_Flag_Dispute_report_PRINTED.pdf [Accessed 27 May 2017].
- Parr, J., Horssen, J. V., & Van der Veen, J. (2009). “The Practice if History Shared Across Differences: Needs, Technologies, and Ways of Knowing in the Megaprojects New Media Project”, *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'estudes canadiennes*, 43 (1), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.43.1.35>
- Park, D. (2008) *The Truth Commissioner*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pink, S. (2007). *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857025029>
- Rodriguez, C. (2003). The Bishop and His Star: Citizen's Communication in Southern Chile. In: Couldry, N., & Curran, J. (Eds.) *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in A Networked World*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Rogers, K. L., Leydesdorff, S., & Dawson, G. (2004). *Trauma: Life Stories of Survivors*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Rolston, B., & Miller, D. (1996). *War and Words: The Northern Ireland Media Reader*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications.

- Ryder, C. (2000). *Inside The Maze: The Untold Story of the Northern Ireland Prison Service*. London: Methuen.
- Sarkar, B., & Walker, J. (2010). *Documentary Testimonies: Global Archives of Suffering*. New York & Routledge.
- Shirlow, P., & K. McEvoy (2008). *Beyond the Wire: Former Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland*. London: Pluto Press.
- Slim, H., Thompson, P., Bennett, O., & Cross, N. (2006). Ways of Listening. In: Perks, R., & Thomson, A. (Eds.) *The Oral History Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Stormont Official Report (10 October 2011). “Dealing with the Past”, *Northern Ireland Assembly*, (63), 161–177, [Online], Available from: <http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/Documents/Official-Reports/Plenary/2011/111010.pdf>. [Accessed 16 October 2011].
- Ward, R. (2006). *Women Unionism and Loyalism in Northern Ireland: From ‘Tea-Makers’ to Political Actors*. Dublin: Irish Academy Press.
- Zelizer, B. (1995). “Reading the Past Against the Grain. The Shape of Memory Studies”, *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12 (2), 214–219.
- Zur, J. (2004). Remembering and Forgetting: Guatemalan War Widows’ Forbidden Memories. In: Rogers, K. L., Leydesdorff, S., & Dawson, G. (eds.) *Trauma: Life Stories of Survivors*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Author Contact Email: laura.aguiar@ucc.ie