

**Patricia Edgar**

Ray Argall interviewed Patricia Edgar for australianscreen on 9 June 2009. This transcript was sourced from [http://aso.gov.au/people/Patricia\\_Edgar/extras/](http://aso.gov.au/people/Patricia_Edgar/extras/).

00:00:55

Patricia And I'd sort of read this in the paper and I thought, here's an opportunity for La Trobe, for the media centre. So I sort of got Ronald Goldman, who was the Dean, we approached Myer, Ken Myer and we got enough money out of him to invite him as a visiting professor. So we virtually warehoused him until the film school was ready. And so of course – I used to talk with Dessie every morning, he'd come and sit first thing in the morning, we'd go through the politics of the day. And he would give me his counsel.

Q He would give his lecture, screen the film, then do Q & A. Quite remarkable.

00:02:22

Patricia He actually had a terrific sense of humour too ...

Q We found that out ...

Patricia He did look so kind of dour at first. But no, he was very um, helpful in teaching me a good deal. And so I got involved with the film school of course. But I would have anyway.

Q The clips that you've looked at, do any bring back memories of when you made them?

00:03:06

Patricia     They all bring back memories and when I saw that question, it's just so difficult, they are all my children. And ah, every single one of those series was really important for particular reasons. So I could – I could argue the case for any of them as being really important in its time and purpose. So then I said, alright, I've got to choose something. And the most important program that I believed that I was responsible for was *Lift Off*. *Lift Off* was the early childhood program that looked at the eight to – three to eight age range. And we looked at what it was that kids in that age needed to learn and understand, and created characters and themes and ideas around that. And then developed an outreach program that extended over every single stage. And the partnership with the ABC meant that it was to go to air, we were aiming to do it as a weekly program because we were up against both *Playschool* and *Sesame Street*. And all of that went wonderfully well until there was um, a scandal at the ABC with the whole fuss about sponsorship of programs. And in that fallout, David Hill went, Patty Conroy, head of television went, and Nick Collis-George as head of children's programming went. Now they had been the three really important people in backing the idea of an Australian series of the dimension of *Lift Off*. In the end we'd made 78 episodes and I still believe that the material with *Lift Off* is truly remarkable with what was accomplished. And the new head of ABC television took it off air which to this day distresses me, which I think was a criminal act, a culturally criminal act. Because it was done in order to preserve funding to make in house programming of *Playschool* and *Bananas in Pyjamas*. The *Playschool* people had always argued against the idea of *Lift Off* on the grounds that they didn't want to see the resources dispersed. Plus a really misguided notion that they'd found the perfect solution to preschool programming. And there was *Playschool*, so you

didn't really need another program. But *Lift Off* was not about that, and *Playschool* is really a program for a younger audience, we were looking at the audience that extended into school, a really enriching, engaging program that would develop the sort of interpersonal emotional skills of children. And ironically now, in 2009 which is nearly 20 years later, this program would be a perfect program to support the national curriculum framework which is looking at children's learning from naught to eight.

00:07:05

*Lift Off* was the answer but of course it was way, way, way ahead of its time. But that program is an exceptional program.

Q Talk about the concept of philosophy that you brought in?

00:07:27

Patricia Well we actually looked at all areas of the curriculum and one of the areas that Peter Clarke, who was working on the program, was particularly interested in, because he was very far-sighted and an intellectual who read widely about the age group and understood it and knew the best work being done. And we came up with the idea that each episode would have an abstract theme. So the title of episode one was *Rubbish*, so everything around that episode related to that. And Peter interviewed six, seven, eight, nine year olds about that theme and what rubbish meant. And so ideas were very free flowing. And it became very philosophical which was the intent. And then Peter would edit the voice track to a three minute track and we chose separate animations for every episode to visually represent the ideas that were in that discussion. And these became the Munch Kids, they were introduced with the notion that kids sat around having their sandwiches and just chatting about things in life. And

there are some truly remarkable discussions and remarkable images, remarkable concepts and ideas that these young kids come up with. So one of the thing with people who really don't work with kids or aren't familiar with kids, or only know their own kids, is just how clever kids are, how absolutely skilled and insightful they are. And how much they are learning at that age. And these pieces certainly exemplified that. And there is at least one that's in the clips.

Q I was interested in the use of animation. Is there a particular way that animation communicates?

00:10:08

Patricia It certainly communicates very quickly and it can be very effective with that age group. You show any children in that naught to eight group images and if they're animated they are immediately attracted. Now the extent to which it will hold them and certainly hold them for repeat screenings depends very much on the quality. But with animation, and there are all sorts of styles of animation within this series, you can convey just a whole range of ideas in a way you can't do with live material, with live action. So with collage, with just ah, sort of almost like popular animation, with clay animation, with all sorts of different styles that were put together, the ideas can be captured in seconds.

Q What was your experience with – the feedback you got from your target audience?

00:11:39

Patricia The feedback with that age group and with most kids I've always found is direct, honest, spontaneous, sort of right off the top, and they bounce ideas,

they're very forthright, they're very giving, they uninhibited about the process of, am I saying the right thing or am I not saying the right thing. It's like, here's an idea, let's throw it on the table. And so you would get things going in all sorts of unexpected directions. Certainly you couldn't script these things, no way. Like you can't imitate kids drawings. They are a spontaneous representation that only kids are capable of doing. And every time you do it, and you see it in a lot of films where people want to use a child's drawing or so on, they're just totally constructed and artificial. So all the time... and that was certainly one of the things with the Foundation that I was very strongly on about was to draw on the kids. I mean I came from a teaching background and a research background. So I've worked with kids most of my career. And I knew what was there, and I also knew that it wasn't being drawn on in most of the programs that were being made. Most of the programs made for kids were jolly little adventures that people thought, well, kids will like this. But it was not about drawing kids out and getting the experience from them.

Q And educators, teachers, were you getting a response from them that was helping to inform where you were taking those ideas?

00:13:45

Patricia Teachers have always been a problem with media. There's the hurdle that is very, very difficult to overcome. With a lot of teachers. And particularly with an ageing workforce. In their attitude television was often, well that's something they do at home, it's just entertainment, it sort of gets in the way, it's not the important stuff, it's not really about education. And it's really my job to compete with that and to really teach them something that's going to stop them

looking at that dreadful stuff that's out there. That's an incredibly prevalent attitude. And it hadn't gone far away. I spoke to a workshop earlier this year with early childhood teachers, and two of them told me that the first thing they did at the beginning of the year was put the computer in the cupboard. So that their view was, while I have the kids they must, they must be out playing, they must play with them. But they really do not understand both how important these media are in kids' lives and what can be learnt from it, what can be drawn from it, which is really a very positive value. So it's always been an uphill battle, but it's an important reason now why the classroom is so far behind what really is going on with kids in the home and in the community and if they're not careful the classroom is going to be like an anachronism.

Q What parts of your work would help in the classroom situation?

00:15:57

Patricia Well, I would be as immodest to say all of it. And with everything we did for 20 years I was at the Foundation, no idea was developed without a curriculum basis to it. Now kids watching a program wouldn't see that, or wouldn't have any feel of it. It was never overtly didactic or educational. However, there was a really strong educational intent with all those programs. And the materials that we developed to go with them. Now gradually there was a group, an expanding group of teachers who did draw on these programs. Going back to *Winners*, which was the first series, and here I was setting up the Foundation with a whole principle that kids would watch good children's programs which the industry said they wouldn't. That it was all castor oil television. And they wouldn't want to know about it. And I wanted books written to go with each one of the anthology series that was in *Winners*, we finished up doing eight

one-hours. Every publisher I went to said, 'You are out of your mind'. The idea of releasing a single children's book, but to release eight children's books at the same time was just something they just thought was stupid. In the end, McPhee Gribble who were a small independent group took it on after I got rejection after rejection. Hillary McPhee who really became very important in Australian literature and publishing, she worked with the writers, who had never written books, most of them. And the books came out with the series and those books stayed in print well over ten years. Certainly the writers got more return from the book royalties than they got from their script fee. It launched Morris Gleitzman's career, he'd never written a book, he was helped to write a book. Now he's a very famous children's author. And it began a whole approach to, to television and books which was, you adapt from the original story, you don't just take a book and adapt that for television. So that was *Winners*, that was *Touch the Sun*, that was *More Winners* and every series that was done had books associated with it. The only one that was a little different was *Round the Twist* and that's a separate story.

Q How do you think in today's world, what other connections would you be able to make?

00:19:31

Patricia In my five years at the Foundation I did two things, because I certainly from late, ah yeah, late last century, I saw the game had totally changed. And that there was absolutely no point to just cranking out further children's programs like sausages. So we developed *Cahoots* and that came out of Paul Keating's creative nation, we were given a quarter of a million dollars and told to do something with it. Well I went to the marketing at Cannes with Paul Nichola

who worked on many of the Foundation's projects and come out at the special effects side of the industry. And I said, I want you to walk all around this exhibition and I want you to tell me what isn't here, and what we might be doing that is original. And he walked around, we spent a couple of days and at the end of it he said, you know, they're all trying to fill up the internet with all this stuff, but really what we should be doing is drawing on the kids to create the material to put up there. And so *Cahoots* was really the electronic pencil case, if you like, it had all of the – its library of things kids could use to make their own expressions. And that was the beginning of the concept which really later YouTube and others drew on. So that was one thing we were doing, it was a real struggle to get that together, to finance it, to get people to understand it. But the second thing I thought, well you have to integrate what is happening in the interactive world with traditional storytelling and work out how you connect all of that. And so I came up with a concept which was really about – the sociologist in me, the kind of phenomenology of who you are and what kind of roles do you play in different contexts. So that was just a simple premise for, okay go on the internet and who are you, you meet somebody, who are you then, and how does a relationship develop. And this was back in 2000. So um, *Noah & Saskia* came out of that. And the idea that there was somebody in the UK, the boy in London, girl in Australia, they met online, there was the web world they met in but there was also these virtual worlds they projected of where they related to one another independently. So it was really about searching a whole range of different notions of who you are. And in its time it was an extraordinarily revolutionary idea and thing to do. What I wanted to do was to take that through to the next series and actually have the real interaction with people who were interacting online with these characters. And that didn't happen because time overtook me. But that was where I saw it

all going. With *Cahoots*, *Cahoots* was like a closed box, like, you know, the workings of a car on the inside because of all the concern about that world out there that – and the fears for kids. But really, what needed to happen with *Cahoots* was for that to be totally opened up and for the kids to be able to draw into that *Cahoots* world all of the other things they needed in order to expand what they were doing. And the technology didn't continue to evolve. Paul Nichola was the visionary on that. And I guess, I mean I was always attracted to the mavericks of the world, the people who really wanted to break new ground and do things differently. And they were the people I sought. And so when I found one I would work closely with them for quite a long time, and Paul was certainly one of those people.

Q As your audience grows up – we have a C classification – what are your thoughts about children in the teens?

00:25:23

Patricia Let me just go back to the beginnings of C. I chaired the program advisory committee on program standards which came up with the idea of C. That was 1975. So then, I became a member of the broadcasting and trial board, that was abolished when Whitlam went, in came Bruce Gyngell who was really – he embodied the industry, he loved the industry and they loved him. And the interesting thing about him, he'd had a really important effect on my life and the direction that I went. That he too liked mavericks, he liked people who stuck their neck out and had ideas, he would listen to ideas. And he thought the C classification was a good idea. So I then got appointed to chair the committee that established the regulation, that went on for five years and led into the Foundation. Now, the C classification was an extraordinary thing in its time,

the envy of producers around the world, it served its purpose. It is long overdue for reform. Now there are several reasons for that. But the internet and the changing nature of childhood is the major reason. That, like, in the '90s you could protect a child in a sense when we had the C classification. It was possible for parents to contain the boundaries of what children were exposed to. That is completely unrealistic now. So what you've got, working with increased commercialisation of childhood, is children at a very, very much younger age being aware of the ways of the world and what goes on in the world. And they very quickly tire of the sanitised politically correct boundaries that children's television have now fallen into. It wasn't that way, it certainly wasn't that way when I did *Round the Twist*, for example. But that's the way it's become. And kids don't want that. Now kids are watching television still, but if they're watching, and 10, 11, 12 upwards, they are watching *Rove*, they are watching *The Simpsons*, they are watching *The Biggest Loser*, they're watching what adults are watching. They do not want what kids are watching, and it's only the little kids who are confined to that. They are out and about now, and they love the interactivity, you know, whether it's SMS with the mobile phone, whether it's just chatting in um, groups you know, or playing games interactively. The game market in that timeframe has just gone boom, you know, huge explosion in the game market. So that's what kids want, they want to interact, they've got their iPods, they've got their mobiles, they've got their virtual spaces, they can go and watch YouTube, they can create stuff, and they can do this by the time they are sort of 10, 12 years of age. So what we should be doing is developing multi-platform products that they can use – we should be making games, we should be creating virtual worlds, we should be creating spaces where their, the content that they produce can be put up and they can exchange it, they can look at what everybody else is doing. So they're

going to go to YouTube and they're going to do these things anyway. But we are not taking advantage of the real potential of these media for kids enjoyment and education.

00:30:15

Education is so far behind, it is just so distressing you know, that they have no idea. It's a world apart and when they talk about an education revolution it's purely about technology, it's not about this sort of content going into schools, it's not about the transformation of learning, about kids being able to power up for school, it's all about the teacher being apprehensive about what on earth they're going to do with this stuff. So there's a huge gap, a chasm which exists. And I, I think – see producers, too many producers in the independent industry are still hanging on to the old formats. 'Cause they know they pay off for them. You've got subsidy, you've got regulation, you've got the C classification, there are so many hours the networks have got to do. So they can crank out a series and recycle plots and you've got kids on the beach, on a horse, on the basketball court. So you change the location, but you don't substantially change the subject matter of what the series is really doing and what it's all about. And um, it's had its day, it's just – these things should be there, they can be done later when kids want to watch them, they do not want to be – and the idea of a digital channel where kids have got so many hours of television is never going to be their first choice from now on. Not at all, they're off all sorts of other places. And you know, the ABC will just shift what's on ABC1 onto the digital channel, they'll extend the hours but the kids will be doing other things by then anyway. And then they won't take the ratings, so you won't know how many are watching.

Q Let's go back to the beginning. What inspired you in this industry?

00:33:05

Patricia Well, my career was entirely accidental, every bit of it. I was a girl from the bush, I grew up in Mildura. Being a girl, being in Mildura in the '50s, I mean you didn't really aspire to anything much except that I knew I didn't want to do what I saw all the women around me doing. Having tea parties and such. And it was really my father who conspired to keep me at school so I went to university and what girls did was teaching, nursing, oh you're a secretary. And so I was a teacher. And I enjoyed teaching actually, I had a lot of fun teaching. And then got married, met Don, got married, we had a couple of kids, and he decided he wanted to go to the United States to study sociology, 'cause you couldn't study sociology in Australia. So we – he'd written a textbook which had hit the mark so we actually could afford to get our fares together and go. And we went to Stanford, which is a university in California, south of San Francisco. And I discovered that I could study film. Now I had always absolutely been addicted to films and I would go to films every chance I got which in the end turned out to be once a week with my father on a Friday night, we would see whatever was on, didn't matter what was on, we'd see the double feature. And I just had this passion for looking at films. So when I discovered I could do this, I did it but it was purely out of – never any career idea involved it was just something I wanted to do. So while Don was doing his PhD I did a masters degree in film and television. Within that I learnt how to make films, plus I had to do an internship at - I did mine at KQED in San Francisco. Which was a public television station. So I was - I was doing all the odd jobs but I was editing and I was going out with crews, directing and so on. And at the end of that – I also did research too, there was a very strong element of communication research. But then we went to Chicago where Don

taught, I couldn't find anything in film so I did other things. Eventually we came back to Australia after three years. And I looked around and thought, 'What am I going to do?'. And I saw a job advertised which was the Centre for the Study of Media and Communication at La Trobe. And I had a degree in film which would have been the only degree in film in Australia at that time. Nobody else had such a thing. And a very adventurous Dean who decided to give me a chance and I set up the centre for the study of media and communication at La Trobe, introduced the first film courses. They were very basic. And they were super 8 courses. But students loved them. I was never short of students, which was my main defence because there was a lot of opposition to the idea of film studies being introduced at a university. And it was like, who is this young woman, she's got a degree in film she must have bought it from somebody or another and it means nothing. So in those years it taught me a huge amount about the politics of the university and sort of how to fight for something. And then Jerzy Toeplitz came on the scene, and I found a way to get him at La Trobe as a visiting professor while we were waiting for the film school to be set up., and through that I got involved in the film school, I got involved – I did a PhD because you could never go anywhere in the university structure being called Mrs anything. So it was better to be called Doctor.

00:38:19

So that was a very motivating reason as to why I did a PhD. But it was about kids perceptions of violence in film and their understanding of what they saw and what they felt when they watched violence, which I was very interested in as a subject. So I did my PhD and one thing sort of led to another. I got asked to talk a lot about women in the media, because the women's movement was really growing apace. And I got tired of talking about it so I did a book called

*Media She*, again with Hilary McPhee as the publisher. And I then with Whitlam, who was appointing women to various things for the first time where women had never been before, I got appointed to the broadcasting control board, which was the regulatory body for broadcasting. So I was the first woman appointed. And these were all things that just sort of came out of the blue. And so I got very interested in policy and the way it was developed. That led me into the children's program committee, that led me into getting to know Bruce Gyngell and being appointed there. So I spent a number of years working out how do you set up a regulatory structure and realising that you're never going to do this unless you could show the sort of programs that you meant. So I started writing about the need for a children's television foundation, about the sort of programs that could be produced for kids. And once again, it was just sheer luck that a minister, Norman Lacey, the Minister for the Arts, read a lecture that I'd given, a public lecture. And he rang me up and called me in and said, 'I want to talk to you about this, I think it's a really good idea. I'm going overseas, who should I go see?' So I gave him a list of names. He came back, he said, 'I've already drawn up the proposal'. So I then got involved behind the scenes working out how to assist him in various states and get the support in place. And it went through the Australian Education Council, they agreed that they should set up an interim committee and give it a try. And he rang me up and he said, 'What do we do now?' So I came in and I was still working full time for La Trobe, but I took half-time leave and worked for the Minister to work out a strategy, the way we set up the Foundation. And gradually it sort of just came to be accepted by the committee, by the Minister, by me, that I would want to run it. And so after a year or so I moved into that role. And then, it was alright, well, now you're here, what do you do. How do you start these programs, which really should demonstrate what children's

television could look like. So it all happened by accident.

Q Do you remember the first time you were in charge of something that was being filmed?

00:42:16

Patricia Well I'd had that experience at Stanford where I'd made short films and at La Trobe I got a research grant which actually included money to make a series of documentaries which I did with the students. So I've certainly worked at that level. But there was something very intimidating about the idea of sort of ringing up Bob Ellis and Doug Williamson and Carl Schultz and John Dyke and saying, 'Alright now, I want you to come and work on a children's series and we're going to get you together and we're going to brief you', which we did, and then for me to go around and assess what they were doing. And so I employed two script editors because I wasn't familiar with that process with drama. And a series producer to help me and sort of be my eyes and ears. But I went through that and I thought, well, I understand what this is about. And certainly with the scripts it was, I could write, I'd done a lot of writing but I'd never written a script, but the principles are not that different. So your story, your character development, one thing must follow from another, everything must be relevant to its central purpose, all – so I learnt how to read a script. And I trod on a few toes in not understanding the protocol of what I should be doing. And I remember getting ticked off because I went and looked at footage that the director hadn't yet looked at, and got a big rap over the knuckles from the producer on that. But I sort of bounced back. And I got a big surprise when I found that she and the director had decided they didn't like the end of one of the films and they changed it. And then presented the cut. And I said,

‘No, no way’. So we did get into quite a hassle. So I learnt, I learnt very quickly that I had to make very clear and stand by what I wanted and what I meant. And I did that. I mean I did learn to be tough.

Q You had many collaborations – talk about *Round the Twist*?

45:40

Patricia By the time that I came to *Round the Twist* we had done – we’d done *Touch the Sun* and that had been extraordinary successful. The thing that I didn’t predict that they would actually be successful outside Australia. And one of the *Touch the Sun* films, *Captain Johnno*, directed by Mario Andreacchio, won the International Emmy. That was only the second Emmy to come to Australia, the first was *A Town like Alice*. And we’d won awards all over the place and they had been all sort of fairly worthwhile or worthy projects. And I thought, well the Foundation has really established itself, it’s got a name, it’s got some security, now I really want to make something that taps into what I think Australian kids are really all about. And I was reading books that I had someone sort of scouting for me and I was reading this stuff all the time. And I didn’t like any of it, I didn’t think any of it rose to what I was looking for. Then Lisa Berryman who was working at the Foundation put a Paul Jennings collection of short stories on my desk, and I remember I was travelling to New Zealand. And I took it with me and I starting reading these stories on the plane, and I was laughing out loud, you know laughing and laughing. And I thought this is it. However, Paul Jennings stories, they did not have a common set of characters, they did not have a common location, they were just short plot-driven clever ideas. But they were the sort of ideas that were fresh and different and that really appealed to kids. So I thought I want to meet Paul Jennings, so I

did. He was still teaching at that point. We met for lunch in Melbourne and I told him that I would like to option his short stories. And he said, yeah I could do that but he wanted to write all the scripts. And I – and his son, very quiet, but very intense character, and I could see it was serious but at the same time he'd never written a script, he knew nothing about the industry. But I thought, alright, well if we can strike up a deal where I give him a go, but if he fails we've got the right to employ somebody else then, okay. So that's the way we began. Then I thought, now who can work with Paul Jennings and actually help him write scripts, introduce him to all of the elements you're going to need for the series, and go on and realise that series. And I'd worked with Esben on, he'd done a *Touch the Sun*, he'd done a *Winners*. And I just really liked Esben, and I liked the way he worked, I liked his relationship with kids, I thought he was very funny and very attuned to kids humour and I thought, now if Esben will do this he's the person. So I approached Esben and he said yes. And so we put the two of them together. Now that collaboration just worked brilliantly. 'Cause Paul was keen to learn, Esben was sort of youthful, vital, terribly committed. And he was going to make it work.

Q Return to the collaborations?

00:50:45

Patricia Yes, and it was one of those collaborations sort of made in heaven if you like, in that Paul was so willing to learn and Esben was such a perfectionist. And they would write and write multiple drafts and inject so many jokes, and it was just laden with jokes. And they came up with this idea that they lived in a lighthouse and the elements of the Twist family and so on and that was really important because all of those ingredients, concept of the series, then the

characters belonged to the Foundation, they didn't come from Paul's books. So often in a script, a half-hour script there would be three of Paul's story plots because they were, some of them were, quite slight. And the characters of the Twist family were all devised. And the story spread across the twins Linda and Pete and Bronson so that each of the kids didn't have to carry main roles right through the series, and that was – we had to think about all those logistics. Then in fact *Round the Twist* was the first of the 13-part half-hour series that became the staple of the Australian children's drama industry. And it was so successful. And I had a really, really difficult time getting a partner to buy it because everyone who looked at the ideas on paper said, it's disgusting, it's alright on the page but you can't do that on the screen, cannot have people vomiting spaghetti, you know, you cannot have all this kind of poo joke stuff. And because nobody had done it at this point. But in fact eventually it was the BBC and I'd developed a relationship with a woman who was head of the BBC, Anna Hume. And she could afford to take a risk, I mean it wasn't going to affect her. And so she did, they just bought it as an acquisition. And the BBC buying *Round the Twist* gave it a certain cache that you wouldn't have got any other way. And when the BBC showed it it just went through the roof in England. So Paul Jennings was able to market his books in England, but that then sort of had spin off value to Europe and France, they bought it and various other countries bought it. I don't know where it finished up but I remember at least 80 territories acquired *Round the Twist*. And this was quite phenomenal. So we fairly quickly did another series, but then we had to face for the first time the issue that the kids had grown in two years beyond their character, so we had to replace the kids. And people hadn't done that sort of thing before either. So we had three new kids, we then found we had to get a new Mr Gribble because Frankie J Holden couldn't do it and so we – we were replacing

all sorts of characters. But it made no difference, the audience accepted all of that and it was just as funny. But the big difference was that Esben and Paul had a falling out in that series. It was that Paul's confidence grew, and he'd got so much attention and glory for the series. And Esben really had not got what he deserved. So Paul said, he would offer Esben a co-writing, scriptwriting credit, which Esben fully deserved. But then he felt, 'Oh maybe he shouldn't have done that and maybe he was just there'. And so all this sort of stuff began to interfere with the relationship. And by the end of the second series they really weren't talking to one another. However, again it was so popular they wanted to do more. Took a little while but they wanted to do more. And I took them out to a restaurant in Lygon Street to have dinner to see if we could reconcile. And we were barely in our seats and they were off. At one another's throats, Esben said everything he felt and he felt good about it, he felt, 'Well, I've got that off my chest'. And Paul heard it all and he felt very bad about it. And he was not in a mood to forgive and so, it just wasn't going to work. And then Paul had this totally impractical idea that he was going to work through the publisher at Penguin, he was going to write a script for a movie, we were going to see it, we were going to give feedback and was going through this intermediary process. Well of course that was never going to work. But the demand for *Round the Twist* just did not stop. So every time we went to a market I'd get, 'Well, when are we getting more *Round the Twist*?' So 10 years went by and I said, 'Okay, there's no reason why we can't do more *Round the Twist*'. We can't do it with Paul but we can just workshop and do it with a series of other writers. So Esben led that workshop and we developed all the scripts which then became, we did two back to back, two more series back to back. So we could use the same kids. By the fourth series, Esben didn't play Mr Snapper, the teacher, but he did in the first three. And all characters

had rotated and not only once but, in some cases, three times. We had three Bronsons. But the things still went through the roof, it still sold and there is not a child that I meet who has not seen *Round the Twist*. It really did achieve cult status with kids. And then, a whole lot of people tried to emulate *Round the Twist*. They tried to do workshops and copy the kind of writing and it didn't work, just didn't work, it never does.

Q Do you think there's such thing as a unique Australian voice in children's entertainment?

00:01:16

Patricia I do. And I think that *Round the Twist* exemplified it. I think it's captured, even it's captured in something like *Li'l Elvis and the Truckstoppers* in an animation with colour of the landscape and the style of it. But it's, it's the nature of the characters and it's um, it's a language. The first scene in *Round the Twist* they're actually paper – putting posters up on the lighthouse, and they say, 'Oh Mr Twist is going to chuck a wobbly', but they use language that is Australian. And it's not kind of understood in the international world. Now *Round the Twist* was full of that, totally full of it. Plus the style of humour. I mean you couldn't do that sort of thing with American television. And even the English were a little bit twee about it all, a bit concerned about how far we were going. But it's um, it's hard to describe but it was something that I was, certainly with that series, very confident that we were capturing and it's something that worked. I mean the extraordinary thing is it worked in Brazil, it worked in Finland, it worked in China, it worked - everybody related to it. But they couldn't produce it, and they couldn't have done it out of those cultures. Later I became absolutely convinced that we were losing it completely through

co-productions. And the committee structure that you get that over overlies every co-production where everyone wants their say. My first experience with working with Disney I hated it, absolutely hated it. 'Cause they were putting up so much of the money that they had a big say. They chose the leading star who I didn't want, they chose the director who I didn't want. At the end they said, 'Well, it would have been good without the star and the director', which I agreed with, but they had a literal approach to everything they did where everything had to be both on the screen and spoken. And I just found that really diminished what you were doing. And so I never found it easy working with them, and the problem became that to get money you had to work with people, they had to have their say, so you finished up with this kind of international blancmange and I think we've – I think we've lost our voice in children's programming today, definitely. We had it for a decade maybe.

Q Had there been examples where that has worked? With the Canadians? Wouldn't they want you to replicate the Australianness of it?

00:05:23

Patricia See the really interesting thing about that, the first two series of *Round the Twist* were so popular that, that was in the era when the children's channels were all starting up and they were starting up in Europe and they wanted shows that were popular in Europe that would be a drawcard. So Disney, who had the most money, wanted to buy *Round the Twist* for all its Disney channels in Europe. And they – but they did, they wanted to do exactly that, they wanted to water down the scripts and I would only have them in as a partner on the condition that they couldn't do that. But there were some very, very big stand up rows, they did not want – because Little Squirt was one of the really popular

ones, which was the boy's peeing competition. They did not want to see any streams of urine in the series. And one – in the opening series, third series, there's an episode where Pete becomes pregnant to a tree sprite, and he becomes pregnant because he pees on the tree. And the day that they were doing that they hadn't brought the right equipment and they used a hose, so it was quite a big stream. And Disney were intensely upset about that. But it wasn't only Disney, by that stage the ABC people had gone, Nick Collis-George, who had bought the first two series, and I was dealing with somebody else and they were as bad as Disney. And there was another episode where Bronson's conducting a science experiment and Linda and Pete take part and their brains get sucked out through straws and they independently go kind of hopping around the countryside. He's left with this zombie brother and sister without their brains and he's got to try and recapture their brains to get them back in. And the brains go hopping onto a hotplate on a barbeque and they're bouncing around and Mr Snapper, who is Esben, comes up with a big knife and is going to chop up the brains. Well the ABC went ballistic, absolutely ballistic about this. And so we had to cut because they said, alright, they wouldn't take the episode. And so it was modified. But ridiculous comments, utterly ridiculous comments about political correctness kept coming back. And if they'd been followed through it would have just absolutely taken the whole heart and soul out of *Round the Twist*. And likewise with Disney, who desperately wanted it to get numbers but then wanted to kill the very ingredient. I don't think you could make *Round the Twist* now. I don't believe that with the system that works, with everybody having their say it would just be destroyed in the process. When I did the first series of *Round the Twist*, there was nobody, it was all Australian money except for this one BBC pre-sale. And it was for Channel 7 and Channel 7 were meeting their quota requirement, they

didn't even look at any of it. It had this freedom with the network to do what you wanted because they really weren't interested. And so we got away with quite a lot. And continued to get away with quite a lot. And Esben kept pushing the boundaries and Paul pushed the boundaries as well when they were working together. And they came up with stuff that kids - it's indented in their minds, engraved in their minds.

Q In the new media platforms is there another opening?

00:10:11

Patricia No, I think that's a really important ingredient in what attracts kids and they go on YouTube and the word of mouth in the playground is what's the funniest video, what's the most popular thing that's on at the moment. Well I've got four grandchildren who are 14, 12, 10, 8, who have shown me some very, very funny things on YouTube that I would never have found. But they are out there, and this, this is just territory they love, they love anything that's funny, they love humour, they love the outrageous, they love the ridiculous, the slapstick and so they're right into that kind of thing. And television isn't doing it for them. At all. That's why they like *Rove*, they get a bit of that sort of thing on *Rove*. But no, I think that children's television has become so formulaic and so politically correct that the kids are looking for different things, and they're finding it.

Q Do you think there's storytelling in interactive games?

00:11:43

Patricia I think there is. There are strong storytelling strands in games and it would be

very good to see the film industry and the games industry come together because I mean the people working in games are now so far ahead of the people who are working in kids' television. In really understanding what it is that kids are tuned into, what they link with, the sort of challenge that they want and enjoy. I look at some games and I think there could be a lot more narrative, structure to it that could be a lot more interesting, but then I talk with the kids about it and there's a lot more going on in those games than I understand when I look at them. And there's a lot more subtlety and a lot more character play than is obvious immediately to the untrained eye. And in fact, I've become a real convert to games. I think that kids are getting a lot out of games and games would be a terrific vehicle for a lot of what they are learning or trying to learn, or should be learning in school. And we ignore these things. It's just crazy.

Q What do you do when you're not in this business, not involved in production?

00:13:32

Patricia I write. When I finished at the Foundation I was really keen to just write down a whole experience because it had been quite an extraordinary experience in so many ways. And so many challenges, so much excitement and just nothing quite like it, the ability to take something from an idea right through the whole process and then actually sit and watch an audience look at it is quite an amazing experience. And it shouldn't be as difficult as it is to achieve these things but it is difficult. So I wrote about that, that was very good for me, it was quite cathartic, but it also helped me organise – I mean I was a hoarder both as an academic I'd kept everything, been sort of trained as a researcher to keep stuff, so I sorted all of that out, when I finally got finished and got through that we were able to move house because I half emptied the house.

And most of the papers went to the State Library to the archive. So I did that then I was very interested to do a book about the way children had changed, just how I saw childhood as being different. And Don, my husband, was Director of the Institute of Family Studies, so our areas of activity were always very related. And compatible, so I talked him into doing this book with me about the way families had changed, the way technology had changed. And so that was called *The New Child*. So right – it's funny but until I took on the job with the Foundation I suppose I had spent a lot of that previous time writing, I'd done a number of books and it was the only thing I missed. That time when you're actually totally on your own, in your own head and your own world, writing. There wasn't anything else about the experience that I felt I was missing out on anything, I enjoyed all of it. But I did enjoy that writing experience, so I've really come back to that. And I spent quite a lot of time writing. And sort of churning out an article or two here and there. But I still chair the world summit on media for children, which is an international group that runs a summit every three years. The next one is next year in Karlstad in Sweden. And the one after that is likely to be in Bali but it will be in Asia somewhere. So I still keep involved with that, and that just keeping in touch with people, that takes some time. For ten years until last month I chaired the Breast Cancer Network of Australia. And I finished up then cause I thought, I've done what I can do there. And I've been involved with all sorts of odd things. People get in touch to ask will I help with this or that, and I often will. So I'm not short of things to do. And then the grandchildren, there's four of them, and I really enjoy being with them and they don't live too far away. So we spend time with them and they will come here and stay. And they – the eldest one is making films and so I encourage all of that, and he's doing quite amazing stuff. So there isn't any shortage of things that I want to do.

Q The young people who have come in as actors, has there been any impact on them? Have you followed their careers?

0:18:43

Patricia With most of them I don't know where they've all finished up. I do see the occasional one in different acting roles. Nicole Kidman actually appeared as a 15-year-old in the first series of *Winners*, John Duigan cast her in a film called *Room to Move* and she was a runner, she was quite a curly-topped, quite gangly girl at that point, you would never have predicted what she was going to go onto. But there are quite a few who went onto the soaps or into various other roles. And quite a few that have gone into the technical side as well, into directing and into writing. Jeffrey Walker who was Bronson, the second Bronson, is directing. He was always very keen to get into the film industry from a very young age. The kids who were in *Lift Off* were very young. The youngest was four but they were actors who were four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, they were all in that age group. And of course there were many people who thought that I was absolutely raving mad to try and work with kids like that. And it was – Steve Jodrell was the series director on the first series of *Lift Off* and he certainly had a challenge and it was – it was a difficult job, but he got remarkable performances from those kids. And they, they went onto do quite a few things. Little Paul Cheyne who was – he was four – five, he was five, and he was Nipper in the first series, he went onto the stage and so he was in quite a few musicals and performances. It's um, some of them just do that role and that's it, but with a lot of them it does sort of set up an idea they wouldn't have thought of. The thing I always found with kids, you have to cast them to play themselves, a kid cannot play something they are not. So the –

you get the best performance out of a child when they are being natural and just doing what they would normally do. And they, they're quite unnerving to many adult actors because they are so – they memorise not only their lines but everybody's lines. So they can prompt and come up with the line people have forgotten, they're right on their mark, they can do it over and over and over. They're quite astonishing when you get the right ones, they're quite amazing.

Q That would be important to casting the adult actors and how they work with the children?

00:22:22

Patricia We used to like, we'd always cast the kids first because they were the main actors. And then you're looking for sort of characteristics in the adults that – they've got to look like a parent or they've got to fit. And it's easier to do that by working that way, but the kids always had the bigger roles, certainly in the shows that I did. Because that was one of the important ingredients, they were shows that were about the kids, they were the kids' stories, they were not just kids who were in another story.

Q What would you be advising young people now who were looking at getting into programs?

00:23:35

Patricia Then they've got to look at the new technology, they've got to look at what kids are doing, and what kids are interested in, and forget about the old models, like don't go into children's television thinking you want to do a series like you know, what's on now. You've got to look towards the future and to certainly

reduce budgets, don't aspire to be working with the same kind of budgets that were producing the big series because if you want to do anything original, you have to have control. And to keep control you've got to work within a reasonable budget, so you've got to be innovative and experimental, and that's where the new ideas will come from, they won't come out of conventional formats at all.

Q When you've tried to convince networks of the value of what you've been doing, how have you been getting your message across?

00:25:18

Patricia I made a big song and dance out of everything to do with children's programming. Because one of the problems when I went into it, it was certainly the Cinderella, it was the sort of graveyard of television. It's where you went to die or if you'd failed at wanting to do better you went into kids and thought, oh well that will be alright, I'm exposed to showbusiness. But to really elevate the profile and to get the very best people working in the area it had to be given status and media coverage makes – helps create status, it also – I went out of my way to get very high profile people on the board of the Foundation. It was one thing for me to be saying to politicians who know it's important to do this, but they certainly in the early days could dismiss me as this – once I got called this doctor of clothes pegs who didn't know which end she was talking out of – on air I got called that. And so, you had to have people along side you who they couldn't talk to like that. And I mean you couldn't say that to Dame Beryl Beaurepaire. You couldn't say that to Hazel Hawke, you couldn't say it to Dame Margaret Guilfoyle, you couldn't say it Phillip Adams, Ken Watts, who'd been head of the ABC, John Morris head of the South

Australian Film Corporation. And it was, like, really important when these people called upon a politician they took the call. If it hadn't been for Dame Beryl Beaurepaire I'd never have got the money out of Malcolm Fraser to start up the Foundation. But she managed to secure three years' funding. So then it got to a point where they at least had to take seriously the topic of children's television. And then when we began to win some awards then I certainly made sure that everybody knew about that. And when we did a launch they were high profile launches. Now that meant an investment, which I just think that it's really important to do it and the fact that they don't do it anymore is an indication too of how children's programming has got no profile, not talked about in the way it used to be talked about and should be talked about.

Q What would you say your strongest personality trait is? What makes you good at what you do?

00:28:46

Patricia Well I'm very determined. I don't take no easily or I don't take no, I'll find another way. I'm quite a lateral thinker, so that if there's an issue and the obvious way to do it is closed off or not clear, I'll find another way to do it, or I'll reshape it or I'll think about it. And I like people, I like working with people who are like that. So I'm actually very attracted to people who are the sort of, tough minded and visionary, stubborn, pig headed. If they've got ability, if they're like that and they don't have any ability well it's certainly, you don't want to work with those people. But I'm prepared to put up with a huge amount if a person can really deliver. And I wouldn't get precious about the way you know we work, dealing with the relationship, I wouldn't care what, you know, I'd go anywhere, do anything to keep in touch and you know make

it work.

Q Explain where we are?

00:30:43

Patricia We're in a study where I work. And these two – they're called burial poles but they're highly detailed or they're painted by an artist from Yirrkala in Arnhem Land called Gulumbu Yunupingu. And Gulumbu is Galarrwuy Yunupingu's older sister. And when I was trying to get the feature film *Yolngu Boy* produced I could not get Galarrwuy to meet with me. He wouldn't respond to any phone call to any attempt to arrange a meeting, and I'd been up there a number of times and the advice was that the only person who really could get him to see me would be his older sister. And the daughter, Gulumbu's daughter, who we met through various associations with the director, Stephen Johnson, took me to meet Gulumbu, she was at that point engaged in a burial ceremony and she was painted and dancing around with the group. Which was a remarkable experience in itself but to witness something like that and for her to come out of that and talk to me, and we all agreed that we would go camping together for two or three days into Arnhem Land. So we got together sleeping bags and steaks and um, flour and the water and things we might need, just took off and drove for three hours and we camped by the side of the inlet there, there was a river and the open ocean.

00:32:52

And we slept side by side. And we talked and I told her about the film. And the next day she said she wanted to take me hunting which she did. And we went and gathered bags of oysters and crabs that were walking across the ground with the river. And she cooked a feast, it was an absolute feast, she

made damper, and we had oysters and crab and sat under the mangroves. And after that, when we went back the next thing I heard I was summoned to a meeting with Galarrwuy and that was the first step in getting the film made. Well, Gulumbu was around the community all the time that we were there, the whole film was filmed around Yirrkala and she also came to Melbourne for the launch. Now up until that point she hadn't been painting, she'd been making craft, but she began to paint full time and she does a lot of these, these logs, this star motif is her particular motif. And she's become such a well known recognised artist now, she has got a panel in the French Musee d'Orsay. So I just wanted something that Gulumbu had painted. And so I got these directly from Yirrkala. So every time I walk past here I think of Gulumbu.

Q What was important about *Yolngu Boy*?

00:34:49

Patricia *Yolngu Boy* is about three young boys within the Aboriginal community who are faced with choices about which direction they're taking in life. But it is a full cast of Aboriginal people from the community, the boys were found in the community, they'd never acted. And the only actor, the only white actor was Jack Thompson who plays a cop and he was paid a dollar for the role. And Jack was quite a mentor with this, he got along very, very well with Galarrwuy, related to him extremely well. But he stayed around for quite a bit of the filming up there. And it is an absolutely remarkable film by director Stephen Johnson. Which I hope with the renewed interest in *Samson and Delilah* and other films that people will look again at *Yolngu Boy* because it has got an enormous amount to offer, in fact it is a film that I'm really proud to have been involved in. I can't watch that film without weeping because I know what

that meant for those three boys and their families.

Q What was that, is it to do with their journey outside the film?

00:36:28

Patricia Yes, both within the film and outside the film. But one of the boys was a petrol sniffer, who came off that. Another one of the boys, there was incredible violence within his family. And with the death of his father soon after the film was made and, it just, life is just so, so tough for those kids. And the opportunities that they have got are so few. But one thing I was told by the art director at Yirrkala who helps run the art centre up there is that every single day that film is taken out by some kids and they look at it. So that indeed it is saying something to those kids in those communities which I hope is important and helpful.

Q With *Yolngu Boy* was the main principle of using young actors, I don't want to say typecast?

00:37:54

Patricia Yes, yes, I mean this was unique in that there were a thousand boys that the director and Gordon Glenn who was working with Stephen Johnson put in front of the camera. They actually went right through the islands and around the community. And in some places Stephen used a loudhailer to call people, call them in from the bush because they weren't in school, many of them didn't go near the school, but he was trying to entice them out to do a screen test. And then we brought a few of them into Darwin where we workshopped and worked with them, but they didn't speak English of course. And they had to

listen through the headphones to the dialogue. And we reduced the dialogue to an absolute minimum so that they wouldn't have to, as did the director with *Samson and Delilah*. I mean that's I'm sure not only an artistic decision but it works because the kids do not have to express themselves a good deal in words and they can convey – and they were so clever and so good at understanding what was wanted. And understood the roles and had a lot of fun. Their health just blossomed throughout the making of the film because they ate good food and they were well looked after. And the boys at the end of that film just absolutely glowed with good health. You could just see a transformation.

00:40:20

Patricia So you just want me to talk about all the things that are hanging on the wall?

00:40:30

Patricia Well, this is actually a little sketch from Christopher Robin, AA Milne. This um, really sort of echoes my feminist days and ah, it's a poster I got in Santa Fe with Georgia O'Keeffe hitching a ride on the back of a motorbike. And it's a poster about seminars in the American southwest, it's desert country that I absolutely love and maybe that's because I grew up in the mallee, and on the border of the desert in Australia . So I've always liked the outback. *Noah and Saskia* is a very special production to me. And this was the series where I was trying to bring together the conventional narrative structure and the world of the internet and interactive platforms and merge the two or the three lives. So that these are really his alter egos, that was a comic he produced called Max about how he'd represent his life through this comic online and this was his character as she saw him. She saw this fantasy of this guy she was communicating with

and this was her in the comic strip that he created and this was the way he saw her until they gradually got more and more realistic understanding of one another. So it was quite a complex thing, a series that I'm very fond of. This was a joke. It was the art director, David Hitchcock, did this while we were working in London on *Noah and Saskia* it was an incredible heatwave. So it was just a bit of fun about being hot in the UK. This is sketches of Stanford where we were students and I did my degree and Don did his degree. These are gifts that were given to me from people who attended the world summit on media of children. The first one, they came from 72 countries. And we just didn't know where they would come from, but they came from all over the place and quite a few of them brought little gifts. This was a Leunig cartoon that I had in my office for a very, very long time. But its, its message is still pretty valid today, it's about the stolen children but it's the way in which so much of what's made for them just takes their imagination and rapes it, that's Leunig's view.

00:44:18

Patricia And this is a cartoon sketch by Peter Viska who did – Peter did a lot of work for the Foundation and that's another collaboration that I haven't really talked about. But he was involved with *The Hedge and Mr Snip*, he was involved with all of the *Lift Off* animations and he was the creative director on *Li'l Elvis and the Truckstoppers*, so he had a lot to do with the Foundation. And at one stage this would have been when I was looking for money of course, he's got Mr Snip cutting the hedge character into the beggar with his hat. And this was taken after the second series of *Round the Twist* and that's Paul Jennings with me. And one of the, one of the kids who'd been involved in a small role. Then this was the movie that didn't get made, the script got written, but the movie

didn't get made and it was um, about Bronson saving the world from the attack of the green slime. And I think it would have worked extremely well but it was very, very difficult to get the money, and we didn't get the money. But we've got the poster. That's the first original drawing that Ron Brooks came up with when we were beginning to think about the marketing for *Round the Twist* with the lighthouse and the seagull. But we never ever used that in the end. But it's a great drawing and it was a great idea. Then my favourite character of all time, EC, the doll, the amazing puppet. That came out of the workshops. It's called EC, meaning 'Every Child', and it's the rag doll that's been much loved and discarded, but repaired and passed on through the family. So it's about sort of imagination and love of a toy, and this EC came to life when he was with the children. And they would talk to him and relate to him or her, as it was meant to be gender free. And certainly anti-commercial, you know the commercial notion of what a doll would be like. So it was a scruffy old doll. And it was a character that was very much loved by the kids.

00:48:02

Patricia At the launch of *Lift Off* Bruce Petty spoke and he drew a cartoon which represented the philosophy of *Lift Off*. *Lift Off* was very, very complicated. And much of this has disappeared because he's used a pen that has faded. But right in there is Patricia, great best wishes from Bruce. Doesn't make much sense unless you really understand what you're looking at. Didn't make much sense but that was his point. Now these six drawings are by Ron Brooks and they were used for a prospectus for *Touch the Sun*. Had to launch a prospectus to the market to raise the money for these films, it was six feature films, one representing every State in Australia. And the Northern Territory, and these drawings were alongside the synopsis for the films. I used to have these on the

wall in my office at the Foundation, and when I left the Foundation they were presented to me. So I enjoy having those and looking at them and they sit around the poster for *Yolngu Boy* which represents, well it's the main character, Sean Yolngu, and it's a very striking image of him dancing. Very dramatic image. There were two posters, that was the art house one, but that was my favourite.

00:53:05

Patricia We're now where I work. I work off two computers, a laptop and a desktop, I'm not particularly technically competent, but I get my emails on one and write on the other, and quite like the interruptions of the emails to give me a break. But um, I'm not very tidy. I'm not very good with my files but I know where everything is. And I have around quite a few of the photos and things that were taken over the years. Want me to go through them?

00:53:57

Patricia Up the top was ... that was a very significant moment. Malcolm Fraser was giving us the first cheque for ....

00:54:15

Patricia And um, again, this was again we were talking about earlier the importance of getting media coverage of an important event or what I saw as being an important event. That was half a millions dollars and to give half a million dollars to start up an organisation may not be deemed worthy of much media coverage but we decided to do it in the Treasury Gardens, make a big cake of the logo, which Alex did, and Philip Adams had donated. And to have Malcolm Fraser with a group of kids, well unfortunately as he sat down the

bench gave way and he fell. That's me right behind him with my head in my hands and I can still remember the moment thinking, 'Oh my god'. But we were front page of the paper with "Fraser loses his seat" because at the time he was being pursued by Andrew Peacock for the leadership. And so everybody knew one way or another about the launch of the Australian Children's Television Foundation. And I've been told that Malcolm's back didn't quite ever recover. But that was a very, very important moment for us. And then two down from there is a picture of me with the Wackadoo puppets that were designed by Terry Denton and made by Ron Mueck, who is now quite a significant sculptor. He went on to do huge pieces which are now in a number of museums around the world. But they were great characters. And below that is another famous launch because we were indeed launching *Round the Twist* and two other programs that the 7 Network had agreed to buy - that's Christopher Skase in the middle with Janet Holmes a Court and myself and that was the invitation which went out something along the lines of you know, how would Christopher Skase, Janet and Patricia be in bed together. But it was a launch that got some attention. And then below that is my favourite Prime Minister, Paul Keating. At the Foundation's tenth anniversary and that was at Parliament House that immediately followed the screening of *Lift Off*, which he attended. And then he came - cut a cake with those kids who were with him there were characters from the *Lift Off* series. So that's a favourite image as well. And then on the wall is a picture of me with the Emmy, that Emmy which was won by *Captain Johnno*, which is a South Australian film in the *Touch the Sun* series that Mario Andreacchio directed. And he did an absolutely wonderful job with that. Mario did a lot of good work for the Children's Television Foundation. And the Emmy, it was quite a story because I actually was in hospital diagnosed with breast cancer. And they'd come back

and told me that I did need to have further surgery. But the Emmy award ceremony was to be in New York the next week. And um, we got a very hot tip by the French that we were going to win. And it had been a French co-production partner. So I sort of had to make a choice, am I going to immediately have the further surgery or do I go to New York to get the Emmy. And knowing very little about breast cancer then, which is twenty years ago, I thought I'd better get this thing out. And so I had surgery. And David Hill accepted the Emmy for the ABC and didn't mention the Foundation's name, he got himself full coverage which was shown on the ABC, on the news cast. And then he lost the Emmy at the party afterwards, so he came back to Australia without it. And you can imagine the words I had to say to him on the telephone when he got back. And somehow or other, I do not know whether that was the Emmy lost or whether they managed to get another Emmy. But it came and so we had a celebration with the people who had been involved with the film. And that's a picture from that.

END TRANSCRIPT

AH