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**Verity Lambert’s Thorn-EMI Films**

Thorn EMI Screen Entertainment’s (TESE) demise in 1986 marked another fascinating missed opportunity in the history of British film production. TESE had completed filming on what would become a critical and commercial success, *Clockwise* (1986), and was about to instigate an ambitious development programme when it was sold – first to the Australian entrepreneur Alan Bond and then a few months later to Cannon, bringing to an end fifteen years of TESE’s reign as the biggest film company in Britain (in one iteration or another). Despite this chequered history and the size and importance of TESE to the British film industry, relatively little has been written about it, with the work on the company’s productions confined to six main texts (Hill 1999; Moody 2018; Park 1990; Walker 1985; Walker 2004; and Wickham and Mettler 2005), all but one of which address the company briefly within the wider context of 1980s British cinema. This omission is due to several factors, most notably the complexity of TESE’s arrangements, which included commercial acquisitions alongside an in-house production department, blurring the distinction between what is and is not a TESE film. In addition, it has been argued that the company displayed ‘Thatcherite’ tendencies at a strategic policy level (Moody 2018: 202) and that this might have dissuaded left-leaning scholars from engaging with it critically, especially when 1980s British cinema is rich with examples of interesting non-commercial film-making. These factors have also combined with a lack of primary archival sources with which to fully assess this period.

 TESE’s Director of Production, Verity Lambert, is a similarly fascinating and opaque figure to research. In 2008, one year after her death, the University of Strathclyde was bequeathed a collection of her private papers and, while this is a useful resource of information on her television work, the material is striking in its complete absence of material from the TESE period. Similarly, there is only one monograph dedicated to her career (Marson 2005), which is equally light on her years at TESE. Andrew Spicer has highlighted the general neglect of the role of the producer in film history, noting that the ‘the producer is often seen as a highly suspect figure, hard-nosed, philistine and avaricious’ (Spicer 2004: 33) and this critical aversion, coupled with the general difficulty in defining the specifics of the producer’s role, has compounded the lack of information on Lambert’s film career. Lambert was also on occasion a difficult figure to associate with; the court cases and drink-driving offences she endured while at TESE are well documented (Moody 2018: 189-90; 193) as are her clashes with *Dreamchild*’s (1985) director Gavin Millar (Horne 2014: 101). However, she also inspired devotion in her closest confidants and built a coterie of production staff who worked with her throughout her time at TESE. One such figure was Graham Easton, her production executive from 1983 to 1985 who was instrumental in shifting TESE to a new financial model, in which it arranged completion bonds for each of its productions via the completion guarantors Film Finances. In researching this article, I have benefitted from a series of detailed interviews with Easton on his work with Lambert’s TESE and have consulted previously unreleased archival documents from Film Finances. In so doing, I aim more clearly to map TESE’s complexities in order to shed new light on its operation and demise; and secondly, I will engage more coherently with the themes and aesthetics of its output in order to reveal insights into Lambert’s work as a film producer.

A brief history of TESE

Barry Spikings formed a successful partnership with Michael Deeley at British Lion in the 1970s, resulting in their appointment to EMI Films in 1976 and their leadership of the company through a successful period of expansion into Hollywood, including securing a Best Picture Oscar for *The Deer Hunter* (1978). Electronics firm Thorn purchased EMI Films in June 1980 to form Thorn-EMI, retaining Barry Spikings as Chief Executive, but Deeley decided to return to independent filmmaking. Divorced from Deeley’s artistic nous and having soured relations with the Hollywood majors, Spikings led the company through a series of interesting commercial failures – including costly US flops like *Can’t Stop the Music* (1980) and *Honky Tonk Freeway* (1981), along with British dramas *Memoirs of a Survivor* (1981) and *Britannia Hospital* (1981). By 1982, Spikings had left the company by mutual agreement, and its film production and home video interests were restructured under the TESE banner, led by Chief Executive Gary Dartnall. In October that year, Dartnall appointed the successful television producer Verity Lambert as Director of Production on a three-year contract, making her, at the age of 46, the most powerful woman in the British film industry. Lambert had first come to prominence working with Sydney Newman at ABC Television, but it was Newman’s recruitment of her as the series producer of a new BBC science fiction show, *Doctor Who* (1963-) which was to establish her reputation. Her success at the BBC in the 1960s continued at Thames Television as an independent producer in the 1970s, where eventually she was appointed Head of Drama and was in charge of its film production subsidiary, Euston Films. She brought to the company a formidable reputation for both commercial success and artistic vision, both of which were desperately needed by TESE, which was facing significant challenges in a market that had been disrupted, ironically, by the home video explosion in which TESE was a significant player.

 This is where the complexities of researching the company’s output and Lambert’s role in these releases first surface. As Spicer identifies, the producer is ultimately the ‘mediator between commerce and creativity’ (Spicer 2004: 34), a liminal position that contributes to the general lack of understanding of the producer’s relationship to both the creative ‘above the line’ positions and the more bureaucratic business demands of the film’s investors. John Caughie has tried to resolve this disconnect with his conception of the ‘producer-artist’, a creative independent who, while conscious of the commercial demands of the industry, has an artistic sensibility which lends itself to the support of projects which the profit-oriented studios would not have invested in – a role that Caughie argues is a ‘specific feature of British cinema’ (Caughie 1986: 200). Easton has referred to TESE’s in-house production department in this period as ‘reflecting Verity’s wishes and tastes’ (quoted in Marson 2015: 243), placing her within the orbit of the ‘producer-artist’, but while this is a useful entry point for the films that Lambert greenlit, she had little control over the majority of TESE’s releases during her tenure. TESE was a studio owner, distributor and exhibitor of films, funding both commercial acquisitions and an in-house production team. Its acquisitions department, led by Robert Webster, had a budget which dwarfed Lambert’s and was still heavily invested in US productions, releasing several films during Lambert’s first two years at the company: the Oscar-nominated *Tender Mercies* (1983), *Cross Creek* (1983) and *Bad Boys* (1983) were useful to be associated with, whereas *Second Thoughts* (1982) and *Strange Invaders* (1983) did little to burnish TESE’s reputation. TESE also invested in a series of independent British productions of which Lambert had limited or no oversight; on her arrival, pre-production had been completed on the fascinating but flawed thriller *Slayground* (1983) and she had little input into *A Passage to India* (1984), *Comfort and Joy* (1984), *The Holcroft Covenant* (1985), or *Wild Geese II* (1985). As can be seen from this brief overview, the complexity of what was and what was not a TESE film, can make an assessment of both TESE and Lambert’s output problematic. This is complicated further by productions which TESE acquired, developed or invested in before its dissolution, such as *Highlander* (1986), *Castaway* (1986) or *Little Dorrit* (1987). As Easton notes, ‘I probably countersigned every cheque for *Little Dorrit*, but was it a TESE picture?’.[[1]](#endnote-1)

 TESE’s convoluted structure resulted mainly from the lack of volume that Lambert was able to produce with the limited resources of TESE’s in-house production department, which consisted of a core group of Lambert, Easton and the Director of Creative Development, Bob Mercer. They were supported by Production Accountant David Wilder (who reported to Easton), Frances Heasman (who worked with Mercer in development) and Lambert and Easton’s respective assistants, Sharon Bloom and Jo Burn. The relatively small size of this team necessitated an eclectic approach to acquisitions from Webster in order to provide enough material for release, especially as the projects that Lambert was able to instigate would take time to develop. As Easton notes, in this scenario, ‘every film is a flagship film…[which] is a problem for an in-house production department’, and this was reflected in much of the critical response to the five films over which Lambert had genuine control: *Morons From Outer Space* 1985), *Restless Natives* (1985), *Dreamchild*, *Link* (1986) and *Clockwise*. It has been argued that this slate represented a return to the approach taken by Bryan Forbes when Head of Production at TESE’s earlier incarnation, EMI Films, in which he forwent consistency in theme for a commitment to trusted individuals (Walker 1985: 28-9). In Forbes’ case, this method fitted neatly into a romantic notion of the ‘artist-producer’, a view of Forbes as a creative stilted within a word of besuited conformity which he did little to discourage. However, for Lambert, her reliance on collaborators who she had worked with before was used to discredit her, as she built her projects from figures more regularly associated with television, which her critics suggested showed a lack of understanding of how the film industry worked (Walker 2004: 35) – despite this being a trend which Forbes himself had applied for EMI’s first feature, *And Soon the Darkness* (1970), made by what was marketed as the ‘*Avengers* team’ of Brian Clemens, Terry Nation and Robert Fuest (Moody 2018: 28). To a certain extent, Lambert’s decision was predicated on television being the medium in which most British screenwriters found regular employment, and as the Hollywood studios had greater financial clout when it came to acquiring rights to published novels, TESE’s focus was on original screenplays. Lambert’s background in television also meant that she was used to working much more closely on productions than was the norm amongst film executives and, employing creatives who were familiar with these conventions, such as popular British television personalities Mel Smith and Griff Rhys Jones (on *Morons*), or writers indelibly associated with the small screen, like Dennis Potter (on *Dreamchild*), ensured that any potential disputes over her influence were kept to a minimum. While Vincent Porter cautions against auteurist attempts to discern a producer’s ‘signature’ on individual films (quoted in Spicer 2004: 47), this intimate involvement meant that while Lambert’s approach was similar to that of Forbes, there was in fact a far greater degree of consistency in her output than Forbes ever was able to produce for the company, represented most clearly in three of her five productions: *Morons*, *Dreamchild* and *Link*. I have separated these out from *Natives* and *Clockwise* which, while being in-house productions funded entirely by TESE and produced under Lambert and Easton’s supervision, were brought to the company as advanced packages with a producer and a script already attached. *Natives* and *Clockwise* still share thematic and stylistic connections with Lambert’s other productions, but it is important to indicate how these differences in their development distinguish them to a certain extent from these three films. To do so, I will address *Morons*, *Dreamchild* and *Link* in turn, exploring their production histories, themes and stylistic approaches in order to flesh out these connections further, before analysing *Natives* and *Clockwise* within the context of TESE’s final few months of operation.

*Morons from Outer Space*

*Morons* was the first film produced by TESE on which Lambert can be said to have been involved from start to finish. The pedigree of the cast and crew was promising – the writers and stars, Smith and Jones, were popular comedians on British television with a primetime BBC One show, *Alas Smith and Jones* (1984-8), which traded on the comic identities they had established in the popular satirical sketch show, *Not the Nine O’Clock News* (1979-82). In addition, Mike Hodges, then best known for *Get Carter* (1971) and the cult science fiction film *Flash Gordon* (1980), was directing. The premise was also ripe for comedy, cleverly subverting the notion of intelligent alien life by portraying the group of extra-terrestrials as idiots who accidentally crash land in the middle of the M1 motorway, followed later by Smith’s character, Bernard, who alights in America. Bernard is the only one with any semblance of reason, but, separated from the rest of the group, he finds himself ignored by the humans he encounters while his brain-dead companions become minor celebrities, assisted by an inept trainee television journalist, played by Jones, who senses an opportunity to make his name.

 It is well known that Lambert sacked the film’s original producer, Barry Hanson, and brought in an uncredited John Dark (who had worked on TESE’s *Slayground*) to help get the production back on track after a string of problems threatened to derail the shooting schedule (Marson 2015: 246). Dark described the film as being in a ‘bloody mess’ on his arrival and that all he could do at that stage was to ‘pull the reins in, install some discipline and make sure no more bad decisions [were] made’ (2007: 397). The extant paperwork confirms that *Morons* was a difficult film to make and that many of these issues were identified during the pre-production. As would become the norm for all of TESE’s projects under Lambert, the film’s Production Supervisor, David Ball, approached David Korda of Film Finances for a completion guarantee for what was then a £4 million-budgeted film entitled ‘Illegal Aliens’.[[2]](#endnote-2) Film Finances recognised immediately some of the obstacles that the crew would have to overcome, identifying that ‘the film is not easy to shoot. To a large extent, schedule success depends on provision of S.F.X. shots associated with main shooting being ready, properly tested, at times required’.[[3]](#endnote-3) As predicted, the complexity of some of the effects caused issues during the production, with the most notable incidents occurring when performing a helicopter lift of the aliens’ ship to simulate it rising into the sky. On the first attempt, at a height of fifteen feet one of the shackles failed and the pilot had to enact an emergency jettison of the ship, which crashed to the ground.[[4]](#endnote-4) A week later, a second attempt to lift it also resulted in failure when, as the pilot released the shackles to take off, the down draft from the helicopter pushed the tail section of the ship to the ground, damaging it again.[[5]](#endnote-5)

 Despite these issues, Film Finances was reassured by the presence of Hodges as director, describing his appointment as ‘probably an advantage’ and referring to the fact that no claim was made for *Get Carter*, which was also bonded by the company and regarded as ‘not easy’.[[6]](#endnote-6) As the initial review of the production concluded, Hodges ‘struck me as being a very practical film maker, which “MORONS” definitely requires. A great deal of the success of “MORONS”, so far as we are concerned, will rest on his shoulders’.[[7]](#endnote-7) The production files demonstrate that Hodges’s input was vital, with him taking decisive control from the start. Filming took place from 16 April to 19 July 1984, with model shots continuing until 25 August,[[8]](#endnote-8) and a letter from Hodges on the first day of filming details his suggestions for changes to 21 scenes throughout the script (although the files record only the final shooting script, so it is unclear what his changes replaced).[[9]](#endnote-9) Further deletions were made on 20 June,[[10]](#endnote-10) although these were minor comedic scenes and were probably cut due to time running out on the schedule. Regardless, the paperwork suggests that Hodges’s influence helped to keep the production under control throughout and, in a letter to Korda near the end of filming, Dark would argue that ‘in my opinion, it is solely due to the responsibility of Mike Hodges that this picture did not get into serious troubles’.[[11]](#endnote-11)

 The ‘troubles’ that Dark was alluding to mainly concerned an overspend in the Art Department, which, despite the aforementioned difficulty of the effects scenes, was identified during pre-production by Korda as being problematic, prompting a meeting with the art team at Pinewood to review the budget.[[12]](#endnote-12) Nonetheless, these issues persisted, and by the end of June, Production Designer Brian Eatwell’s contract had been terminated. Eatwell sought to explain the situation in a letter to Korda, locating the issues as resting with the production’s location at Pinewood. EMI Films had historically been associated with Elstree, having purchased it as part of its acquisition of the Associated British Picture Corporation (ABPC) in the late 1960s, and as far as Eatwell was concerned, ‘from the very beginning, under the EMI banner, we were always a somewhat unwelcome and poor relation at Pinewood’.[[13]](#endnote-13) He continued:

Much larger and grander productions had been allocated the bulk of the experienced labour and we inherited the residue. A pleasant and wiling gang, but in key areas lacking in expertise and composed of two-thirds apprentices…due to the total lack of labour in the plaster shop we were obligated to sub-contract at great extra cost…I continue to function as an absentee designer because I believe in the potential success of the project. If we all maintain that belief, and the picture shows a whopping profit ultimately, then I would hope this mess will be swept under the carpets of Golden Square.[[14]](#endnote-14)

 Hodges supported Eatwell and also blamed art department overages on exorbitant costs at Pinewood, but this was rejected by Dark, who believed Pinewood labour to be the ‘cheapest in the business’ and said: ‘I hate to think what our overages would have been if we had been at a four wall studio’.[[15]](#endnote-15) Despite this, Korda informed Eatwell that in some cases, the budget for sets were exceeded by over 50 per cent, dressing and props were over by 78 per cent and ‘locations were selected, against the advice of the Production Department, where logistical problems created yet further unbudgeted costs’.[[16]](#endnote-16) This was, according to Korda, despite several meetings between Eatwell and Easton in which the latter had asked Eatwell to deal with these budgetary problems. Korda concluded that Eatwell’s ‘concept of the film was not consistent with the amount of money available’, and decided that ‘only drastic measures would enable the financiers of the film and ourselves to bring the film back under control’.[[17]](#endnote-17) The final statement of production cost confirms that spending on labour for the sets and models department was £215,079 over budget, with special effects also £37,110 in the red, so there was justification for Korda’s actions; although, as had been identified from the outset, this was a film that was dependent on elaborate art design for its aesthetic, and, as such, an element of largesse was always a likely outcome. Despite this, TESE’s policy of bonding each of its productions ensured that budgetary overspend on a scale which could jeopardise the initial investment (such as with *Honky Tonk Freeway*) was extremely unlikely, as the completion guarantee provided security that the film would be delivered on time without the investors being asked to provide any additional funds at a later date (Chapman & Drazin 2014: 1). As Easton explains: ‘The reason for the completion guarantee was that aside from bringing an important discipline, you always knew how many films you were going to get for your money…the completion guarantor can’t be hassled for more money’. TESE had raised 50 per cent of its production finance for *Morons* from city investors, as part of a package deal for five films; the other four being *A Passage to India*, *Dreamchild*, *The Holcroft Covenant* and *Wild Geese II*. Thus, its financing arrangements also add to the aforementioned complexities of the company, with three of those productions (*India*, *Covenant* and *Geese*) effectively operating as package-units, whereby each film was an independent project which TESE had invested in. *Morons* and *Dreamchild*, while financed in the same way and therefore arguably provided with a degree of autonomy from TESE, were viewed as part of an in-house development ‘slate’, and the use of the completion guarantee by TESE ensured that Lambert was able to assert a degree of control which her predecessors had lacked. This can be witnessed on screen in her in-house productions, which have a tightness of execution which contrasts with much of EMI Films’s output in the 1970s and early 1980s.

 In relation to *Morons*, this discipline is reflected in the economy of storytelling, which separates the two main themes into distinct plot strands. With Bernard divorced from the rest of his crew, he is able to carry one of these strands singlehandedly, wandering alone through an American landscape that is both alien and alienating. His repeated attempts to tell his story fall on deaf ears – initially through his own lack of knowledge in attempting to speak to a dustbin after assuming that it is a sentient lifeform, but later, as he adapts to his surroundings, he finds himself systematically shunned by the public, who have instead become transfixed by his moronic compatriots. This second narrative path is an ensemble piece in which the remaining aliens, Sandra (Joanne Pierce), Desmond (Jimmy Nail) and Julian (Paul Bown), become vapid celebrities under the aegis of Jones’s lacklustre journalist, Graham. By portraying their rapid rise to fame and the public adoration of these beings who, despite hailing from another planet, have nothing of interest to impart to the human race, the film skewers the nascent celebrity culture which would become even more ubiquitous in the following years. Each plot strand offers a telling satire on modern communication, with Bernard’s failures serving only to emphasise the absurdity of the platform afforded to his crewmates. This, combined with his sense of dislocation in America, also introduces a subtle critique of the ‘special relationship’ between the US and Britain, which would become even more prominent in subsequent TESE films.

This satire on 1980s celebrity culture seems even more prescient from today’s perspective and has developed a small but devoted cult following (Spira 2019), but the film’s production difficulties appear to have been borne out by its critical and commercial failure on release. Morons struggled to find an audience and made only £2 million at the UK box office (Wickham and Mettler 2005: 26) from a budget of £4,451,921,[[18]](#endnote-18) in part due to scathing reviews, with the *Monthly Film Bulletin* describing it as an ‘attenuated half-hour TV special’ (Floyd 1985: 87) and US opinion summed up by the *Washington Post* declaring that the film’s ‘eight laughs’ equated to ’62 cents a laugh’ (Attansio 1985). As the first TESE production that Lambert could take full responsibility for, its reception was a major blow to her personally, as well as to the reputation she was trying to develop for TESE. As previously noted, Lambert was from the outset a ‘hands-on’ executive producer, but it appears from the archival record at Film Finances that the setback of *Morons* prompted an even more rigorous scrutiny of her subsequent productions, starting with *Dreamchild*.

*Dreamchild*

TESE’s follow up to *Morons* also dealt with the theme of communication within a highly stylised aesthetic. *Dreamchild* was written by Dennis Potter and focused on the story of Alice Liddell, the Reverend Charles Dodgson’s inspiration for *Alice in Wonderland* (1865), which he wrote under the pseudonym Lewis Carroll. Also like *Morons*, the film is effectively a dual narrative that takes place in both Britain and the US, on the one hand portraying Liddell’s (Amelia Shankley) childhood relationship with the reclusive Dodgson (Ian Holm), and, on the other, her trip to America as an elderly woman, Alice Hargreaves (Coral Browne) to speak at a Columbia University event commemorating the 100th anniversary of Dodgson’s birth. In addition to this, Liddell features in a series of fantasy sequences with characters from Dodgson’s novel, animated by the Jim Henson Creature Shop. Managing the complexity of these various threads within the film’s £3,450,832 budget was the responsibility of its producer, Rick McCallum, who had established a working relationship with Potter as executive producer of the Hollywood version of *Pennies From Heaven* (1981). The production appears to have run more smoothly than *Morons*, although the director, Gavin Millar, has described battles with Lambert over the scenes featuring Nigel Hawthorne (who played Alice’s father, Henry Liddell), eventually resulting in Hawthorne’s character being removed entirely (Horne 2014: 101). Millar attributes this to Lambert’s opposition to Hawthorne’s casting, saying that in each of his scenes, she was ‘down on it like a ton of bricks’ (quoted in Horne 2014: 101), and it has been suggested that Lambert’s objections were partly motivated by a simmering resentment towards Hawthorne, who had testified against Thames Television in an authorship dispute over one of its programmes, *Rock Follies* (1976), which Lambert had produced (Marson 2015: 253).

 The Film Finances archive provides an opportunity to investigate these production struggles, which in *Dreamchild* centred on decisions made at the scripting and editing stages, as opposed to the disputes over production overspend that exemplified TESE’s relationship with *Morons*. As the completion guarantor, Film Finances was entitled to receive copies of the shooting script as part of the documents provided by the producers and this reveals several of Hawthorne’s scenes as written, including dialogue between Henry Liddell and Dodgson which intimates that Liddell is aware of Dodgson’s feelings for Alice. For example, in one scene Liddell enters Dodgson’s office just as Dodgson is about to kiss one of the photos he has taken of her. Liddell questions him, asking: ‘What’s this my daughters have been telling me about?’, before following it with: ‘Tall stories, Dodgson. While you take their pictures. Very – tall – stories, eh?’,[[19]](#endnote-19) which, on the surface, refers to Dodgson regaling the girls with his stories of ‘Wonderland’, but which Dodgson also interprets as a reference to the nature of his relationship with Alice. Likewise, a later scene involves Alice’s mother (Jane Asher) attempting to tell Henry about Dodgson’s ‘writing’, but Henry ignores her and complains that Dodgson is ‘implacably opposed to almost any change in any thing [sic]. Even to objecting to the laying of a new drainage system for the college. I ask you – is there any merit in a stink just because it is an old stink!’.[[20]](#endnote-20) Once again, Potter’s writing allows for an interpretation that hints at a growing awareness between the Liddells of the potential for Dodgson’s interest in Alice to be unwelcome. These scenes and others suggest that Hawthorne’s role could have had a significant influence on the film, although this does not necessarily mean that Lambert’s insistence on his removal was solely for personal reasons. Easton argues that it was a ‘difficult film to edit, because of the different timelines and the different stories running in parallel. There were lots of attempts during editing to bring these threads together.’ McCallum claims that omissions were directed more by Potter attempting to mould Millar’s version more closely to his original screenplay (Cook 1998: 205), with Easton agreeing that Potter’s close involvement in all stages of the production meant that nothing would have been removed without his approval. Considering how much of Hawthorne’s role was present in Potter’s original script, perhaps a more telling reason for Hawthorne’s omission is related to Potter’s original interpretation of Dodgson’s character:

Great art can come out of discipline. Dodgson was a much more complex and heroic man than we think. I’m utterly convinced he never made any questionable physical contact with Alice, but he had what in these post-Freudian days would be called a sexual longing. (quoted in Harmetz 1985)

 *Dreamchild* as released is in keeping with Potter’s vision as expressed here: a subtle study of a character who is struggling with maintaining his own self-control, and Hawthorne’s scenes, which all tease out the boundaries of this restraint, lead the audience too directly towards a conclusion that Dodgson’s infatuation with Alice was becoming increasingly problematic. With this material removed, the film’s approach to their relationship is much more nuanced, and the production is able to demonstrate more powerfully the pervasive effect on the elderly Alice of Dodgson’s earlier attention. Thus, like *Morons* before it, the film effectively portrays the constraints on characters for whom communication is restricted in one way or another: Dodgson, who cannot express his feelings for a pre-pubescent girl, has a literal communication impediment via a stutter that becomes more prominent when he is nervous; and Alice, who has alternately the limited vocabulary of a child and, as an elderly woman, the culture shock of visiting 1932 New York and conversing with Americans who, as far as she is concerned, are speaking almost another language. It is notable that, also as in *Morons*, her guide through this alien environment is a journalist, Jack Dolan (Peter Gallagher), who befriends her and her travelling companion when they first disembark in America. Alice is troubled throughout her journey by visions of Dodgson, although reconciles herself with him at the film’s conclusion, in a fantasy sequence in which she returns to her childhood state after delivering her speech. By overcoming her own communication barrier (as the film begins, Liddell is extremely reluctant to speak about Dodgson at all), the now-deceased Dodgson is also metaphorically released in this imaginative environment.

Regardless of her motivation, it is clear from the archival documents and interviews with the crew that Lambert’s influence on *Dreamchild* was far more potent than her involvement in *Morons*, and this was reflected in its positive critical reception, with *The* *Times* noting that *Dreamchild* was ‘one of the most intelligent and enjoyable of recent British films’ (Banner 1986). In the US, Andrew Sarris commented that this ‘thoroughly intelligent movie’ gets ‘infinitely better as it goes along, rising inexorably to a rich epiphany’ (quoted in Horne 2014: 101), although a limited US release meant that the film failed to match its critical notices with commercial success (Harmetz 1985). Lambert’s influence on her films and her confidence in exerting it had increased with this production and, despite their disagreements, Millar notes that without Lambert ‘[fighting] for it…there wouldn’t have been a film’ (quoted in Horne 2015).

*Link*

McCallum’s stewardship of *Dreamchild*’s complex narrative ensured that he was recalled for TESE’s next film, *Link*, a horror story about an intelligent ape which becomes murderous after ill-treatment at the hands of his trainer. As such, this was, like *Morons* and *Dreamchild* before it, an especially complex film which, in this instance, required the use of live apes and a suite of special effects. It was directed by Richard Franklin, who had established himself in the genre with his well-received *Psycho II* (1983), and starred Terence Stamp as British academic Dr Steven Phillip, who hires an American research student, Jane Chase (Elisabeth Shue), to assist him in his studies of three chimpanzees at his remote country house. Franklin had optioned the original idea six years previously from Lee Zlotoff’s and Tom Ackerman’s treatment ‘Touch No Evil’, but the project had become side-lined when Franklin was offered *Psycho II*. He returned to the idea after completing filming on *Cloak and Dagger* (1984), and was eager to set the film in England, which he felt provided the perfect backdrop for a treatise on the tension between civilisation and savagery (Franklin 1989). However, Lambert immediately put her mark on the production, hiring Lynda La Plante (whose first television screenplay, *Widows* (1983), was commissioned by Lambert for Euston Films) for uncredited script rewrites. As was the convention with TESE, the project was also bonded with Film Finances, with pre-production starting in early 1985. In this example, the extant files are much more focused on correspondence between McCallum and Film Finances, charting an increasingly fraught production in which TESE appeared to indulge Franklin against McCallum’s better judgement.

Tensions between the production and Film Finances first materialised in April 1985, when the completion guarantor wrote to McCallum to complain that the pre-production period had lasted considerably longer than that for *Dreamchild*, and that the addition of the use of apes meant that a higher insurance premium would have to be requested.[[21]](#endnote-21) These delays prompted a visit to Shepperton by Jilda Smith of Film Finances, to discuss with Franklin questions regarding the schedule. This had been set for 69 days, 31 of which would be in the studio, with the remaining days on location in Scotland and London.[[22]](#endnote-22) However, when she arrived, Franklin was not there, and her concerns were ‘met with amazement’.[[23]](#endnote-23) Even McCallum appeared to be relaxed, telling Smith that he was thinking of ‘taking a week out’ of the schedule.[[24]](#endnote-24) As she would note, this was extraordinary considering that, for example, one sequence in Scotland required 78 individual set-ups in a single day as planned.[[25]](#endnote-25) Shooting was due to start on 21 April 1985 for a period of ten weeks, with the film budgeted at £5,024,009,[[26]](#endnote-26) but, as predicted, various issues befell the production and it ended up more than £300,000 over budget.[[27]](#endnote-27) Delays due to snow and fog in the Scottish locations occurred fairly soon after filming began and the daily reports describe a litany of accidents endured by the troubled shoot, including a member of the crew injuring their head on rocks while striking a cliff face set[[28]](#endnote-28) and a mechanical digger cutting through a power cable at Shepperton that plunged the studio into darkness.[[29]](#endnote-29) As the production developed, the difficulties of working with the live apes also became apparent, with two stages at Shepperton turned into what was effectively a quarantined zoo for the duration of filming.[[30]](#endnote-30) Shue was bitten by one of the apes,[[31]](#endnote-31) as was a crew member, who had to have a tetanus and a rabies injection as a result.[[32]](#endnote-32) On one occasion, an ape displayed ‘hooligan behaviour often attributable to chimpanzees, refusing to obey trainers’ instructions on frequent occasions…causing a series of delays’.[[33]](#endnote-33) These setbacks led to a production office review of which sequences could be cut, with a selection of minor scenes deleted.[[34]](#endnote-34) However, by 4 June, the overspend and delays had reached a point whereby excisions to important sections had to be considered, with McCallum intervening by writing to Franklin:

The only way I can see you finishing the film by July 4 [sic], is to cut down scene 92, which is 4 ½ pages and now scheduled for a day’s work. The scene is laboriously long as it is and I think with a few judiscious [sic] cuts, the scene could be made much more effective emotionally and dramatically, and we could possibly save half a day.[[35]](#endnote-35)

 The scene in question is a pivotal moment in the film, whereby Chase discovers one of the chimps, Imp, locked in a cage in the house with no food and water. After Chase has fed him and earned his trust, Imp gestures to a cupboard in the distance, inside which Chase finds the corpse of one of the other apes, Voodoo. Upon the discovery, the dominant and most intelligent ape, the eponymous Link, enters the room and hits Imp’s cage to shut him up, taking Chase away by the hand. While the essence of this scene remains in the finished film, there is an economy in its delivery that the original script lacks, with the events playing out at a more languid pace in written form and emphasising Chase’s developing relationship with Imp, who she saves at the end of the film. McCallum also suggested shooting several other scenes in only two days.[[36]](#endnote-36) However, these changes either remained unheeded or were insufficient, as, by the end of June, the situation had deteriorated further, with Richard Soames of Film Finances feeling the need to intervene with a letter to McCallum stating:

I was most concerned to learn that the production has dropped a further day as of the 15 June report. I have understood that all parties had agreed that the schedule [was] reasonable and that barring a serious and unforeseen accident, both Richard Franklin and yourself [sic] would strictly adhere to it. In light of the consequences of not finishing by 5 July, it is absolutely imperative that the lost day be pulled back and I must urge both you and Richard to re-examine the script and schedule to achieve this.[[37]](#endnote-37)

 The production had to stop shooting by 5 July for several reasons, the most urgent being that the stages on which they were filming on at Shepperton had to be cleared in time for the next production, which was due to start filming on 15 July.[[38]](#endnote-38) In addition, there were contractual issues that could not be avoided, with the animal wrangler Ray Berwick having to leave with the apes by 6 July in order to start a new job in the US, and the crew having to receive notice by 21 June that the shoot was ending, or otherwise they would have to receive daily overages.[[39]](#endnote-39) However, the most important reason for this date was financial: the budget allowed only £165,000 contingency, and £50,000 of that had already been allocated to post-production dubbing.[[40]](#endnote-40) As Soames would put it: ‘I am also extremely concerned at the worsening financial situation and no further deterioration can be allowed’.[[41]](#endnote-41) The final blow fell on 3 July, when, during the shooting of Phillips’s house ablaze at the end of the film, a fireball engulfed the set, with McCallum and Director of Photography Mike Molloy both receiving burns.[[42]](#endnote-42) Despite these problems, the film finally wrapped one day over schedule on 6 July. The post-mortem began soon afterwards, with McCallum writing to Soames in September 1985:

What can I say? I think the overages on this film were wasteful, indulgent, intolerable and worst of all absolutely unnecessary. The fact that the film has not in any way or circumstance profited qualitatively from these overages makes me despair even more.[[43]](#endnote-43)

Nearing the film’s release the following year, McCallum would add that the overages were approved by TESE and that, had he ‘been given the absolute authority to run the film’, he would have not approved them.[[44]](#endnote-44) In McCallum’s view these overages did not occur because they were ‘needed to complete the film or enhance the film creatively’ but instead were made ‘simply because the Director did not live up to his commitment either written or verbal throughout the whole making of the film’.[[45]](#endnote-45) As examples of this, McCallum noted the £80,000 allocated for Jerry Goldsmith to write the score, the extended post-production and dubbing, and what he felt were unnecessary air fares.[[46]](#endnote-46) This correspondence reveals an interesting dynamic at play, with McCallum suggesting that TESE (and therefore ultimately, Lambert herself) had approved the overages and had undermined his authority. It appears unlikely that this would have been the deliberate intention of Lambert’s actions, especially as McCallum had been retained for his diligent handling of *Dreamchild* and reports of the production suggest that Lambert also clashed with Franklin (Marson 2015: 246). However, her close involvement in the post-production of *Dreamchild* and her general ‘hands-on’ approach suggests that she felt these overages were justified in order to complete the film – regardless of whether this situation had been arrived at due to Franklin’s profligacy. The film was not a commercial success, partly due to poor reviews, with *The* *Times* noting that ‘The establishing section is long and tiresome, the denouement, with a tediously indestructible monster, seems interminable, and there is not much, apart from the apes’ performances, to admire in between’ (Robinson 1986). However, the main reason for its failure was that it became caught up in the mess of TESE’s disintegration, which hampered any opportunities for genuine promotion of Lambert’s final releases.

[Fig. 1. Chase discovers Voodoo's body with Link and Imp in one of the film’s many high-angle shots. (Source: DVD Screenshot)]

 Viewed from a more detached perspective almost 35 years after its release, the finished production is an interesting and suspenseful horror film, one which belies the difficulties on set and frequently displays Franklin’s Hitchcockian influences. These can be seen in the numerous high-angle shots of Chase, Link and Imp, framing them similarly to the characters in *Psycho* (1960) and suggesting the omnipresent eye of a malevolent force– but instead of Norman Bates’s mother, Phillips’s father figure is the dominant personality in this house (see Figure 1). As with *Morons* and *Dreamchild*, this aesthetic also features as a signifier of control, with the implication that Chase is merely another subject in Phillips’s animal experiments. Likewise, barriers to communication are also at the heart of this story, with Chase attempting to interact with a different species, with varying degrees of success, and Phillips attempting to ‘civilise’ these apes via a series of rudimentary experiments and conditions which ultimately turn one of the creatures into a rampaging killer. Note also that, once more, the differences between American and British culture are highlighted, embodied here by Phillips’s cultivated professor who lives in what is almost a parody of an English country house, contrasted with the intelligent, but more dynamic and caring American research student, Chase. The connection between these elements and the prevailing *laissez faire* political culture of the time has been noted elsewhere (Moody 2018: 199), but, fundamentally, this is a story about control through communication, linking it explicitly to the themes of Lambert’s other TESE productions.

*Constraint, Communication and TESE’s Demise*

The remaining two films produced under Lambert’s oversight were *Restless Natives* and *Clockwise* which, as previously mentioned, were slightly different in conception from her other in-house productions as they arrived at TESE as well-advanced packages with a producer and script attached. *Natives*, which began filming in September 1984, was a relatively smooth shoot despite the challenges of filming in the Scottish landscape in the autumn, which rapidly used up most of the weather cover allocated in the schedule. Easton recalls visiting one of the locations in Lochgoilhead a few weeks into the production, to find the editor assembling the movie in a truck parked beside the road, one of the measures the production team had taken in order to ensure that the schedule stayed on track. Similarly, the filming of *Clockwise* was relatively untroubled. Once again bonded by Film Finances, on a budget of £4,491,330,[[47]](#endnote-47) the only mishap recorded by the daily production reports for the entirety of the 50-day shoot was the lead actor, John Cleese, having to see his doctor due to a slight pain in his knee.[[48]](#endnote-48) Easton recalls that after reading the script, the question was not ‘will this film get made?’ but ‘will our company make it?’, and this sense of a production that was ready to go with limited intervention from TESE is borne out by the extant paperwork. Both projects bear several thematic similarities to the three other TESE films discussed here, most notably in *Clockwise* via the elements of constraint that are reflected in Cleese’s portrayal of the middle-class headmaster, Brian Stimpson, and the various obstacles that he faces on his journey to deliver a prestigious speech – played out amongst the numerous time pressures reflected in the film’s title. *Natives*’ depiction of two working-class young men, Will (Vincent Friell) and Ronnie (Joe Mullaney) in low-paid, demoralising jobs in the Scottish Highlands also presents aspects of constraint, which force the two main characters to search for an escape via their misguided hold-ups of tourist buses. The fact that many of these tourists are American, including a detective on holiday who takes over the case and becomes a major character in the film, is yet another comment on the ‘special relationship’ that is common to the other TESE productions discussed in this article.

As *Clockwise* was filming in the summer of 1985, it began to dawn on the in-house production team that not only were they not getting the green light for any new projects, but also that Easton’s and Lambert’s contracts were running out. Unbeknownst to them at the time, the end game for TESE’s involvement in the British film industry had begun. Against a backdrop of declining cinema audiences, the UK government’s 1985 Films Act abolished the British Film Production Fund (commonly known as the Eady Levy), which had provided financial assistance to British film production for over thirty years. In March 1985, a lacklustre response was prepared by the Association of Independent Producers, which instigated a ‘British Film Year’, designed to stimulate interest in homegrown cinema releases but pithily referred to by Alexander Walker as a ‘self-congratulatory trumpet flourish’ which did little to support new productions (Walker 2004: 25). TESE’s commitment to Lambert’s department had always been lukewarm, with Lambert stating that she was ‘told I had to make British films, [but] Thorn EMI didn’t want to distribute them’ (quoted in Edge 1996: 238) and it soon became clear that Dartnall’s response to these external pressures was to move away from in-house production towards a new system of development deals with freelance ‘satellite producers’, who would have access to a $150m rolling fund. Easton was offered a two-year contract as TESE’s Production Controller, liaising between TESE and these producers in what he believes would have been as much a ‘steering role on development as it was a production role’. The intention was to create a pool of developed ideas from a range of British producers, rather than having all the ideas channelled through Lambert, although by becoming one of these satellite producers herself, she retained a connection to TESE (and continued to work on *Clockwise* and *Link* throughout their post-production and exhibition in her role as executive producer). Projects that were being considered to benefit from this initiative included John Carpenter’s ‘El Diablo’ (which eventually was made in 1990 as a TV movie directed by Peter Markle) and Donald Cammell’s ‘The Last Video’, but these remained unrealised by TESE, as its purchase by Cannon in May 1986 brought to a permanent end EMI’s involvement in the film business.[[49]](#endnote-49) As the company folded, Easton was in the process of overseeing a production brought to TESE by United British Artists, *Castaway*, with McCallum once again producing. TESE’s sale a month after shooting began meant that this was released as a Cannon film, although Easton considers it to be the last true TESE production. Its focus on its characters’ self-imposed exile on a remote tropical island was consistent with the themes that Lambert had optioned in the preceding years, and it is another one of the tantalising ‘what ifs’ associated with TESE to consider how she would have exerted her influence over it had she remained at the company.

I have attempted to outline in this article the remarkable thematic and stylistic consistency of three of the films that were produced with Lambert’s full involvement, while noting how *Clockwise* and *Natives* also reflect many of the concerns expressed in those movies. Key to these productions is the notion of constraint, especially with regard to obstacles to communication. Thematically, this is portrayed in numerous forms, from Mel Smith’s alien in *Morons* trying to find human beings willing to listen to him through to Elisabeth Shue’s research student in *Link* trying to speak to apes in sign language. Even when the communication is between two human beings, there are obstacles in place. In *Dreamchild*, the crucial barrier is between an adult trying to communicate with a child, but even when this child becomes an adult herself, she faces her own communication difficulties because of the language differences between her and the Americans she meets. The communicative tensions of this ‘special relationship’ between the US and Britain are in evidence in each of these films to varying degrees, most notably in *Link*, and provides an additional layer which speaks of the political climate of the decade and the financial realities Lambert was operating under, with TESE eager to include elements which would appeal to the American market, despite Lambert’s subtle subversion of this. Crucial characters in each of Lambert’s productions also have communication as a key part of their working lives, whether it be the journalists that are instrumental in the narratives of *Morons* and *Dreamchild*, Dodgson’s author in *Dreamchild*, the academics working on human/ape communication in *Link*, or *Clockwise*’s headmaster who is about to deliver an important speech. *Clockwise* and *Natives* are also instructive in the unspoken but significant role that class plays in constraining the main characters, with Cleese’s Stimpson identified as the first headmaster of a comprehensive school to chair the Headmasters’ Conference, while the devastating unravelling of his ambitions emphasises the control exerted by these class-bound traditions as potently as do the problems faced by *Natives*’ Will and Ronnie. Powerful hierarchical structures can also be seen in Dodgson’s treatment by his university in *Dreamchild*, in the relationship between the apes and humans in *Link*, and even in the vapid culture of celebrity satirised in *Morons*.

These modes of constraint are replicated aesthetically throughout these productions in various forms. Spatially, these narratives play out within confined or detached locations, such as *Link*’s remote country house, the ship which transports the elderly Alice to America in *Dreamchild*, the Scottish Highlands of *Natives*, or the various cars in which Stimpson is transported throughout *Clockwise*. Each of these environments serves to confine the characters and dislocate them from their surroundings – even the extra-terrestrials from *Morons* are in an alien landscape on Earth and are separated from each other in two different countries. Various stylistic techniques are used to emphasise this confinement, seen prominently in Franklin’s use of high-angle shots throughout *Link* but also noticeable in camera set-ups such as the various car interiors in *Clockwise*, both of which were extensively storyboarded in this vein. However, the most important aesthetic choice that is featured in these productions is the use of animatronics and special effects led by the Art Department, including the UFOs of *Morons*, the ‘Wonderland’ characters brought to life in *Dreamchild*, and puppets working in tandem with live apes in *Link*. In each instance, this creates a visual fantasy that further dislocates the characters from their environment, and in turn presents additional obstacles to their communication with others.

Spicer argues that the ‘producer’s ‘art’ is elusive because it is, for the most part, invisible’ (Spicer 2010: 310) and, as I have noted, Lambert’s time at TESE is an especially opaque period of her career to research. However, I have attempted to demonstrate in this article the many consistencies in her TESE releases which betray her influence and reveal insights into how she operated as a producer. Notions of constraint and obstacles to characters achieving their goals are, of course, fundamental elements of dramatic storytelling, but my argument here is that these themes are given more prominence, and are featured more consistently, in Lambert’s TESE work than would be the norm. Consider the more expansive themes and aesthetics of some of TESE’s other productions from this period, such as *A Passage to India*, or the work with which EMI Films had become associated under Lambert’s predecessor – *Honky Tonk Freeway* or *Can’t Stop the Music* are hardly films which constrain their characters, either thematically or aesthetically. Lambert’s productions demonstrate a much stronger affinity with these themes, developing a consistent in-house production style in the process. One can only speculate about the reasons for the prevalence of these themes and approaches in TESE’s work under Lambert, however, the evidence presented here is suggestive of three main driving factors. Firstly, the importance of Lambert’s personal background, whether or not this was a conscious decision on her part, must be noted. As one of the few leading woman producers of her era, she had first-hand experience of the structures of control and hierarchy that had ended careers of less forceful personalities and, as Director of Production at TESE, she was also learning rapidly about the unique strictures of the film industry that contrasted with the more flexible and faster moving world of television. It is clear from her few interviews on the subject that she found her time at TESE frustrating, regarding her three years there as ‘the worst years of my life’ (Quoted in Edge 1996: 238), and the influence that this had over her choice of subjects can be seen clearly in the finished productions. As Spicer has demonstrated in his study of the influence of Michael Klinger’s Jewishness on his work (Spicer 2010 & 2013), the producer’s background is an important aspect of their professional life and is often reflected in their productions.

Secondly, Lambert’s formative years in television had a major influence over her TESE releases, with many of the creative personnel she worked with being indelibly associated with the small screen. However, her television career also appears to have informed her distinctive approach to film producing, which was able to apply a more involved ‘artist-producer’ style within the confines of a large multi-national production company. Her experience in a similar institutional context at the BBC and, to a lesser extent, Thames, would have been instructive here, and it is notable how she attempted to maintain this approach at TESE. Despite the complexity of TESE’s organisation, Lambert’s method enabled her to command a broader overview of the entirety of her department’s output, and her experience in producing television series had instilled in her the requirement for the producer to be the element of consistency in the production team. As Lambert noted when discussing the differences between directors and producers, the producer is the ‘person who is a constant’, and when producing a series, ‘you may use more than one director, so you are responsible creatively for seeing that there is a continuity of style and for keeping the standards up’ (quoted in Edge 1996: 234). TESE did not market its films as part of a consistent ‘slate’, but Lambert’s instinct, developed during her time in television, ensured that there was a coherency to TESE’s output that can be attributed to her oversight of these productions.

Finally, TESE’s corporate structure and procedures enabled Lambert to exert the authority needed to cultivate these conditions. Lambert operated within an environment that encouraged control via the completion guarantees offered by Film Finances, which, while being integral to the production of each of these films, also provided a conduit through which TESE could exercise discipline over bloated budgets. The evidence from the Film Finances archive presented here demonstrates how this power was wielded in practice, and how the completion guarantor ensured that Lambert’s productions were finished according to the plans that had been agreed with TESE and the films’ co-investors. Ultimately, the themes and aesthetics of Lambert’s productions were inexplicably tied up with these realities of her working environment and, while the archival record remains tantalisingly sparse with regards to documentation from Lambert herself, I have aimed to show here how her brief time at TESE produced a consistent body of work that to date has been unacknowledged. That she achieved this while TESE and the wider British film industry was rapidly disintegrating around her is remarkable, although it is of little surprise that this environment produced some of the most interesting commercial treatments of themes of constraint and barriers to communication made during 1980s Britain.
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1. **Notes**

 Unless otherwise identified, all quotations from Graham Easton are taken from a series of interviews and discussions with the author conducted between 29 July 2019 and 29 May 2020. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Letter from David Ball to David Korda, 6 January 1984., Film Finances Archive, London. All subsequent files referred to in this article are from the respective collections on each TESE film held by Film Finances. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Initial review of the shooting schedule, March 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Daily progress report No. 9, 11 May 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. Daily progress report No. 14, 18 May 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Initial review of the shooting schedule, March 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Initial review of the shooting schedule, March 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Production schedule, 25 August 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Memo from Mike Hodges, 16 April 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Letter from TESE to the unit crew, 20 June 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Letter form John Dark to David Korda, 4 July 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Letter from David Korda to David Ball, 26 March 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Letter from Brian Eatwell to David Korda, 27 June 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Letter from Brian Eatwell to David Korda, 27 June 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. Letter form John Dark to David Korda, 4 July 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. Letter from David Korda to Brian Eatwell, 9 July 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. Letter from David Korda to Brian Eatwell, 9 July 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. Statement of production cost, 7 September 1984. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. Undated Shooting script for *Dreamchild*. [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. Undated Shooting script for *Dreamchild*. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. Letter from APG Robey of Ruben Sedgwick Insurance Services to Rick McCallum, 2 April 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. Draft production schedule, undated (circa March, 1985). [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. Note from Jilda Smith for production file, 28 March 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. Note from Jilda Smith for production file, 28 March 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. Note from Jilda Smith for production file, 28 March 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. Draft production schedule, undated (circa March, 1985). [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Soames and Jilda Smith, 26 March 1986. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Daily Production Report, 4 May 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. Daily Production Report, 20 May 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. Graham Easton, interview with the author. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. Daily Production Report, 15 May 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
32. Daily Production Report, 22 May 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
33. Daily Production Report, 26 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
34. Memo from the Production Office to Richard Franklin and Rick McCallum, 23 May 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-34)
35. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Franklin, 4 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-35)
36. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Franklin, 4 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-36)
37. Letter from Richard Soames of Film Finances to Rick McCallum, 20 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-37)
38. Letter from Richard Soames of Film Finances to Rick McCallum, 20 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-38)
39. Letter from Richard Soames of Film Finances to Rick McCallum, 20 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-39)
40. Letter from Richard Soames of Film Finances to Rick McCallum, 20 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-40)
41. Letter from Richard Soames of Film Finances to Rick McCallum, 20 June 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-41)
42. Daily Production Report, 3 July 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-42)
43. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Soames, 3 September 1985. [↑](#endnote-ref-43)
44. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Soames and Jilda Smith, 26 March 1986. [↑](#endnote-ref-44)
45. Letter from Rick McCallum to Richard Soames and Jilda Smith, 26 March 1986. [↑](#endnote-ref-45)
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