

FESTIVAL DU FILM ANGLAIS

SAISON 4

Du 1^{er} au 9 décembre 2012 - Palais des Congrès d'Ajaccio

DOSSIER PEDAGOGIQUE

Jim loach – Drame – Britannique, Australien – 2010.

Avec Emily Watson, Hugo Weaving, David Wenham et Tara Morice.

Thème Principal :

On leur avait promis du soleil et des oranges. *Oranges and Sunshine*, c'est le titre du premier film de Jim Loach, fils de Ken, "les enfants invisibles" en français. Son thème : une histoire vraie. Emily Watson incarne Margaret Humphreys.. L'histoire vraie de la déportation de 130.000 enfants britanniques entre 1930 et 1970, aux confins de l'empire, vers l'Australie notamment

Le choix d'Under My Screen

Dans les années 80, Margaret Humphreys est assistante sociale à Nottingham. Elle anime des réunions d'écoute à l'intention des personnes ayant été adoptées. Un soir, elle est abordée par une femme qui lui raconte qu'enfant, les services sociaux britanniques l'ont expatriée en Australie à l'insu de sa famille...

Digne héritier de son père Ken, Jim Loach s'engage, avec ce premier film, à dénoncer les dérives politiques aux conséquences sociales désastreuses. Avec l'adaptation du livre de Margaret Humphreys «Empty cradles», il rapporte l'un des plus grands scandales britanniques du XXe siècle : la déportation d'enfants sans le consentement de leur famille. Au lendemain de la deuxième guerre mondiale, le gouvernement affréta des bateaux pour envoyer ses orphelins en Australie, au Canada et autres pays du Commonwealth où l'éducation d'un pupille était bien moins onéreuse qu'au Royaume uni. 150 000 enfants sont donc partis peupler les institutions du bout du monde. Or près de 10 000 d'entre eux avaient une famille. Des parents qui, ne pouvant plus subvenir aux besoins de leurs enfants, les avaient placés provisoirement en orphelinat. Quand ceux-ci voulurent retrouver leur progéniture, on leur annonça qu'ils avaient été adoptés par de riches familles comblant tous leurs besoins. Aux enfants, on affirma que leur parents étaient morts.

Synopsis :

Oranges and Sunshine tells the story of Margaret Humphreys, a social worker from Nottingham who uncovered one of the most significant social scandals of recent times: the deportation of thousands of children from the United Kingdom to Australia. Almost single-handedly, against overwhelming odds and with little regard for her own well-being, Margaret reunited thousands of families, brought authorities to account and drew worldwide attention to an extraordinary miscarriage of justice. Children as young as four had been told that their parents were dead, and been sent to children's homes on the other side of the world. Many were subjected to appalling abuse. They were promised oranges and sunshine: they got hard labour and life in institutions.

Oranges and Sunshine est une promesse. Une promesse faite à un jeune garçon anglais envoyé en Australie dans le cadre de la politique de migration forcée mise en place par le gouvernement britannique. **Oranges and Sunshine** raconte son enquête, sa traque des orphelins de l'empire britannique en Australie, sa tentative de réunir ces enfants et leurs familles. À partir du livre *Empty Cradles* de Margaret Humphreys, Jim Loach retrace cette histoire en partant de 1986. A cette époque, l'assistante sociale découvre ce programme par lequel le gouvernement expédiait des enfants à l'autre bout du monde, des enfants qui n'étaient même pas inscrits à l'école, qui étaient contraints de travailler et qui se retrouvaient victimes d'abus en tous genres, aussi bien physiques que psychologiques, dans un contexte de désert affectif total. Seule contre tous, la courageuse assistante sociale a alors contacté des milliers de personnes auxquelles on avait dit que leurs parents étaient morts, réunissant ainsi de nombreuses familles et attirant l'attention du monde entier sur cette horrible histoire.

(source : <http://www.lepetitjournal.com> ÉCRIT PAR FLORE GREGORINI)

Films :: Oranges and Sunshine
www.sixteenfilms.co.uk/

On a dark night in Nottingham, Margaret Humphreys, a social worker, is cornered by an angry Australian woman. It is 1986. The woman, Charlotte, tells Margaret, 'I want to find out who I am.' She says she was in a Nottingham children's home when she was put on a boat and sent to Australia, aged four. There were several hundred other kids like her. Margaret can barely believe her story.

A week later, Margaret learns of a man who was taken to Australia as a boy on another ship full of children. She starts to look more closely at the archives. What begins as an attempt to help Charlotte find her mother soon turns in to the discovery of thousands of other lost sons and daughters.

In Australia, on the first of many visits, she meets Jack, a closed, withdrawn man in his late forties. He takes her to the institution where he and other young kids were sent, and at a barbecue others who were told as children that their parents were dead start coming forward. They want Margaret to help them find their families, and their identities. They have learnt to distrust authority figures, but Margaret is a mother and working on her own – she slowly gains their trust. The migration, she discovers, was an organised scheme. Why has no one heard about it?

Back in Nottingham, Margaret and her husband Merv start to piece together what happened. Meantime, she has hundreds of names in a suitcase, all of whom want to know who they are. This could take years. Luckily, Nottingham Social Services are prepared to let her work on it full time.

At Margaret's prompting, articles start to appear in the press about the 'Lost Children of the Empire.' Pretty soon she is inundated with letters. She flies to Perth to meet some of the children, now adults. Margaret begins the process of listening, tracing birth certificates, giving people back their past.

In to the room strides Len, a dapper, good-looking man in his forties. He is not slow to inform her that he is 'just checking what you're up to.' He is also a child migrant but having employed the best private detectives money can buy to trace his mother he holds out little hope for Margaret. So why did he bother coming to her at all, she says. That floors him, at least for a moment.

Not everyone is pleased to see Margaret. Supporters of the Christian Brothers, who ran many of the homes for the child migrants, don't like her snooping, and aren't afraid to let her know it.

But as Christmas approaches, people of all walks of life keep coming to Margaret with stories of their lost childhoods. It's wearing Margaret down. She cries – but not in front of anyone. Back at home for Christmas though, it's plain to her husband that all of this is getting to her.

Jack turns up unannounced in Nottingham. Together he and Margaret continue to try and trace his mother. People remember her, talk about her and her little boy. But they don't know where she is.

Out in Perth once more, Margaret continues spreading the word. She visits the Ecclesiastical Office and is accused of running a slanderous publicity machine. Her work has forced the Christian Brothers to conduct an internal enquiry in to the boys towns at Bindoon and elsewhere. Anger and resentment are rife.

Margaret launches the Child Migrants Trust at a house in Perth. Now she has a base. And the first phonecall she gets is an anonymous caller threatening her.

Len appears at the Trust. He's prickly, difficult as ever. But he keeps coming back. Margaret suspects there's a hurt individual beneath the brash exterior. He takes her to the Perth docks and begins to tell the story of what happened when the steamers arrived and the children stepped off. By the end of the day, Len says, the Christian Brothers had him, an eight-year-old, cleaning out a rubbish tip at Bindoon. .

Later that day, Margaret meets with Jack to tell him that his mother is dead. She died last year.

Back in London, she and her husband meet with government and charity dignitaries. It is time to call them to account – Merv points out that the last migrants were shipped out only 14 years before. They're not there for recriminations, though, says Margaret. They just want the organisations to contribute to the Migrants Trust, for

help with counselling and finding families. But the charities and government close ranks, admit no mistakes and offer her nothing.

Len comes to England. Margaret has found his mother and they take a train to go and see her. It is as close as Len gets to emotion and Margaret is deeply moved.

In Perth, Margaret continues to get threatening calls. Then she gets a visit, is chased, petrified. This is getting serious. Merv wants her to come home now. But she won't: 'people are depending on me.' So Merv has a word with Jack. He is there in an instant, standing guard.

Of course, it takes its toll. Margaret is having panic attacks, crying at night, her hair falling out. The doctor tells her that she has post traumatic stress disorder, through absorbing other people's pain. Margaret is at rock bottom, and ready to give up. Then Charlotte – the lady who accosted her that first Nottingham night – and her Mum turn up. Margaret sees that both their lives have transformed, She realises she has to find the strength to carry on.

She returns to Australia, determined to do her job but protect herself from the its psychological damage. But then Len gives her an ultimatum. He wants her to go to Bindoon with him. Margaret is reluctant. – she's heard enough about the beating and the crying, the pain and the blood. But Len is not taking no for an answer – how can she really understand the migrants' childhood if she hasn't seen it, touched it.

It's a six-hour drive. Bindoon boys town is big, beautiful, horrific, – small boys put every stone of that building together. In a intense, silent show down she finally faces the Christian brothers who put children through so much pain – a pain, Len says, that he and the other migrants have lost the ability to feel themselves. Margaret is overwhelmed, but Len tells her that what she is doing is enough; what Margaret has done for him is more than anyone else has ever given him.

Margaret and family celebrate Christmas with the child migrants in Australia, her family say goodbye and Margaret goes back to her work tracing lost families.

Interview Jim Loach

How did this film come about?

I first met Margaret in 2002. I'd read her book and there'd been one or two small bits in the newspapers in Britain, but not much. Margaret's got a small office above a café in Nottingham so I went up to see her. At the time I was thinking about a documentary but I wasn't sure how I could approach it. We just sat there and chatted and at first I think she gave me fairly short thrift to be honest, but we warmed to each other. I stayed in touch with her over the next couple of years and got to know her better. And it was during that process I started to think that her own journey through the whole thing was a way of tackling it as a drama because she started to just speak more about her own experiences.

Camilla [Bray, Producer] and I met Rona [Munro, Writer] in 2005 and a few months later Rona and I came out to Perth and met Margaret again. We spent a couple of weeks with her and also some time with two particular former child migrants. It was really during that first trip that we started to see how we could build the story and the

narrative – how we could find our way through the material because we had a sense it was a great story to tell, but of course it was about how are you going to tell it. Rona especially spent a lot of time with some of the real former child migrants and heard a lot of their stories, so she had a wealth of material to go on. But we didn't have a script at that stage, just lots of ideas and text messages.

How did a script evolve?

Right at the outset we had a sense of how we were going to approach it: it was very much Margaret's story. It was going to be Margaret the character and seen through her eyes. So then Rona locked herself away and started to write.

What did the script development process involve?

Well we were trying to simplify it and boil it down because we never really wanted to make it a campaigning film. We were interested in exploring the nature of identity and what makes us who we are - and if you take all those things away from somebody how do they come to terms with it? It was also quite a challenging scripting process because of course the real events happened over a very long period of time, so we had to find a way of shaping it into a coherent, singular narrative. It was one of those stories that you could go spinning off into all sorts of different areas - you could look at the involvement of the Catholic Church, or you could look at the role of the state in caring for so-called less privileged people. We had to home in on our story.

How did Emily Watson come to be cast as Margaret?

Emily was top of our list right from the really early days and once we'd got to draft five or six we got in touch. Emily had just had her second child when we first met a couple of years ago. It was on the day that London ground to a halt with snow and so it was quite memorable. I trudged over the river and we sat in a café drinking hot chocolate and spent about four hours looking at it from all sorts of different angles. From that moment she was really committed to it.

Why was she top of your list?

Obviously there was all the basic stuff: she's the right sort of age and she has children. But I just fundamentally felt that I could believe her as a social worker. For an actor of a certain stature, it's a challenge to put them in a tower block in Nottingham and to really believe it.

Was it a conscious decision not to portray your two main child migrants as victims?

Definitely. The guy that became the inspiration for the Len character is just an absolutely fantastic man and the reason that Rona in particular was really attracted to his story was that he was emphatically not a victim. If you described him as a victim or even if you offered him sympathy as a person, he would tell you to F off! He's just not interested in being that person and we found that in a way much more appealing to write - much more complex. We really wanted to avoid victimhood, because that wasn't our experience of the child migrants that we met. They've got an amazing dignity and strength about them, they really have and they don't strike you as victims.

It's your first feature film, and you chose to shoot it on opposite sides of the world. What problems had to be overcome?

When you start these things you just don't really think of it in terms of the practicalities. Maybe I should have done! The biggest challenge I think was that when you're in the UK you focus on the stuff in this country and the Australian element seems so far away. It meant the Australian element could become quite unreal. And then somebody in Australia would have the same problem about the UK. We really didn't want to have a film with a split personality, so we put a lot of work in to trying to make it coherent in that respect.

What was it like when the government apologies were issued in the middle of your shoot?

It was just the most bizarre bit of timing because it was a project that we'd been working on for years and years. For it all to happen at the same time was really strange.

What about for Margaret? Were the apologies vindication for her?

She's not someone that would allow herself to be congratulated. She just doesn't think in those terms. She puts herself bottom of the list - she'd kill me for saying that, but she does - and so you didn't get the feeling there was any sort of triumphant moment for her - although in some ways it should have been.

As someone who has a background in documentaries, what does a drama add to this story that straight documentary couldn't?

Documentary can expose the facts and point the finger and bring people to account. But I think a drama can explore the themes in a much more interesting, human way – themes such as identity and the role of the church. For me it's a more rounded way of looking at it.

As a first-time feature film director, what are the upsides and downsides of having the surname Loach?

God. How do I answer this one? Well I don't know, that's been quite a big journey for me I think and it's a real challenge. In many ways of course it's the classic double-edged sword, but you just have to put to one side what you understand the perception to be because you just can't do anything about it. So now I just get on with it, though I wouldn't say it's beneficial. But my Dad is the first person I talk to about things and we talk about every aspect of filmmaking all the time. That part of it is great. But he's just my Dad.

RONA MUNRO

WRITER

What was it about this story that grabbed you?

In some ways I almost didn't want to do it because I did Ladybird Ladybird with Ken Loach years and years ago and because that's a true story of a woman having children ripped away from her I get offered an awful lot of true stories about women having children ripped away from them. While a lot of them are really, really worth telling there's that thing of you just don't want to keep telling that story. So in a way I was quite resistant to it. What sold it to me I think was the fact it was such an incredible story - and nobody knew it. Also it was not a story about people feeling sorry for themselves or people who saw themselves as victims; it was very much a story about survivors. Over and above that there was the moral question that Margaret's very existence presents because she was a very ordinary person basically getting on with her job and then this story landed on her. I don't think she ever had any doubt that she had to do what she had to do - just keep trying to get help to these people and bring their story out. Most of us might not even have engaged, and I think that was why I found her character fascinating.

What contact did you have with Margaret?

Well I met her, which was great and I think we had about six or seven sessions together in the end. I would travel up to Nottingham, sit and talk to her for however long she had and work through her take on things.

How closely did you follow Margaret's book?

I think film can probably only tell one story; books can tell about seven or eight, but in film you've got to decide what's your main story and just tell that. Quite early on we had decided we wanted to tell the story from one person's point of view and it should be Margaret's. So then it was about which of these myriad stories that were recorded in the book and all the other stories of the child migrants and what they'd been through and their back story... which of those do you then include to tell your main story? It was really about amalgamating and cutting and trying to keep finding what are the things that are the emotional core of this that'll actually play for an

audience? And of course, when it's a true story you end up going, 'That means that this woman's tale is never going to get told.' You almost feel like you're letting people down because you can't put everybody in. We could have made about 18 films out of what was there.

What sort of things did you learn about Margaret from your sessions with her that you couldn't have gleaned from the book?

She's a lot funnier than comes over in the book. She's a very attractive person in every sense: to look at as well as how she comes across. She's also really quite emotional. In the book and whenever we saw her dealing professionally with child migrants she's so level and so calm that there's always the worry that the audience are going to think, 'This woman's not feeling anything,' because she's so good at being a neutral receptacle for everyone else's emotions. But she herself is actually very emotional and that was a very useful thing to find out. It made my job a lot easier.

To what extent is your script factually accurate?

It's the sort of thing that sometimes people get very irate about, especially when you're asking them to care about something and distressing them. In terms of the facts there's nothing in the film that raised a question legally, otherwise it wouldn't be in the film. In terms of what characters did and said I saw my job as trying to decide what's the emotional truth. In other words, how would that character want themselves to be represented and what should we as an audience understand about where they are emotionally in this moment? You can't possibly answer a huge question like that by talking to someone for a few hours, but as far as I could I thought that was my responsibility: to make sure that it was emotionally truthful so that those characters would go, 'Yes, I recognise that. That is my truth as I understand it.'

Is this still a live issue or has some sort of closure been achieved for the people involved?

For a lot of the migrants there's never going to be closure because there's never anything adequate - which is again something I think we've tried to inject into the film. I certainly think there's still bad feeling on both sides. We obviously went up to Bindoon and though there was no sense of our way being barred from both the people taking us round and the very kind of peripheral encounters we had with people there, there's a real wariness. This is basically an open wound.

It is a startling story and one of the most startling things about it is that it isn't widely known. Did that surprise you?

Very much so. The apology happened just as we were in the middle of filming and yet how long had Margaret been trying to get that? That's a whole other film again about her battle with successive governments and successive Home Secretaries. It's like a series of British governments have basically hoped this would go away.

What do you think is at the crux of this film?

It's the moral question that someone like Margaret asks all of us: if you notice that something's wrong, how much are you prepared to do about it? And then there's the actual story of the child migrants and the fact that they can never have adequate restitution. But even over and above that was how easily it happened. You kind of think, well if that was happening then what's happening now, and what has happened throughout world history? I think what we all realised looking at this story, is if you take a child away from its sense of family and its sense of country and sense of self, that's an injury over and above any abuse.

You've worked with both Jim Loach and Ken Loach. You're one of the few people who can compare...

The similarities are they both know what they want, very clearly. They both communicate that in such a democratic, gentle, laidback, unfrontational way that you aren't even aware you're being persuaded of

someone's very steely vision of what should happen. Yet they both have a rock hard idea of the film they want to make.

CAMILLA BRAY

PRODUCER

How did you go about financing the film?

We had been developing the project since 2005, and by 2008 I made my first trip to Australia and we were sending the script out to cast. Because it was such an Australian/British story with Margaret travelling between the two countries we knew from the outset that we were going to make it as a co-production. So the key thing for me really early on was making contacts with people in the Australian industry: key talent that we would need in order to put together a really strong package for financing, making contact with Screen Australia, talking to the regional agencies there to try and work out where to shoot the film, and meeting distributors. The fundamental issue for me was finding the right co-producer. Most of all making a film on the other side of the world you know you're going to need a really solid partner to fight your corner for you. So finding Emile Sherman at See-Saw as our co-producer was crucial. We put together a pretty complex financing structure involving national tax incentives, regional funding in both the UK and Australia, private equity, pre-sales, gap, and equity investment from Screen Australia so having us both working on it round the clock was a huge advantage if rather exhausting.

What are the complexities of working on a real life story where the real character is in contact with you?

The relationship has to be based on trust. Jim is brilliant at that, he's the key to the relationship with Margaret and the child migrants that we have met, and who have helped with research both behind and in front of camera.

What was Margaret's involvement in the actual filming?

We showed Margaret all the scripts but she didn't come to the shoot and she didn't meet Emily. I think that was probably a good idea because it just meant that we could make the film and Margaret could have some distance. She has seen the film, and is hugely supportive, so her input when the film comes out will be invaluable. Margaret has been through a huge amount not least over the last couple of years with both governments apologising, so she was working flat out for the Child Migrants while we were filming.

How do you go about getting actors of the calibre of Emily Watson or Hugo Weaving on a film which has a comparatively low budget?

We had a beautiful script from Rona which is a good place to start. The fact that this story is true, and is so shocking, makes people want to get it told. It also helps that Sixteen Films and See-Saw Films have between them made a few films so the actors feel like there's a chance it might actually happen. After meetings between Jim and the actors the challenge was to keep everyone on board while we jumped through endless financing hoops.

What are the complexities of trying to produce a film on two different continents?

Getting money for an independent film is always going to be incredibly tough, but for this project the logistics were also daunting. We assembled our core team early on so that we could get as much in place before the production swung into action. Before the pre-production started we had the bulk of our cast in place, we knew pretty much our key locations and had done early work with the designer. The challenge was then budgetary as we had an unusually long production period for a film of this scale - about four months - because we had a split shoot first in the UK and then in Australia. But we had terrific support from all our cast and crew which made it do-able.

What it was like when you heard that the Australian and UK governments would be formally apologising?

When you've got both Australian and UK Prime Ministers standing up in parliament apologising and acknowledging what took place, that ends the discussion of, 'is this exaggerated, aren't you maybe enhancing one or two bad incidents in order to have a story?' We met that disbelief, implied or overt, when we were putting the film together, so I can't imagine how hard it must have been for the child migrants to encounter that attitude for all those years.

7 Nominations (*Allociné*)

Résultats annoncés

[Festival du Film Britannique de Dinard 2011 \(édition n°22\)](#)

Dinard, France I De 05/10/2011 à 09/10/2011

Nommé	Hitchcock d'Or	Jim Loach
Nommé	Hitchcock d'Argent du Public	Jim Loach
Nommé	Prix du coup de cœur - Mention spéciale	Jim Loach

[Festival International du Film de Beauvais 2012 \(édition n°22\)](#)

France I De 14/04/2012 à 17/04/2012

Nommé	Avant-premières	Jim Loach
--------------	-----------------	-----------

[Festival 2 cinéma de Valenciennes 2011 \(édition n°1\)](#)

France I De 10/10/2011 à 16/10/2011

Nommé	Prix du public - Longs métrages	Jim Loach
--------------	---------------------------------	-----------

Nommé	Prix de la critique - Longs métrages	Jim Loach
Nommé	Prix du jury - Longs métrages	Jim Loach
Nommé	Grand Prix du jury - Longs métrages	Jim Loach

[Festival International du Film d'Histoire 2011 \(édition n°22\)](#)

Pessac, France | De 14/11/2011 à 21/11/2011

Nommé	Compétition fiction	Jim Loach
--------------	---------------------	-----------

[Bande-Annonce en ligne :](#)

Lien : <http://www.filmsfix.com/2011/09/16/oranges-and-sunshine-bande-annonce/>

CONTACTS

ASSOCIATION “CORSICA FILM FESTIVALS”

MARIE - DIANE LECCIA

Téléphone : 06 26 56 22 24

mariediane.leccia@sfr.fr

contact@under-my-screen.com

Facebook : Festivalfilm Undermyscreen

Twitter : @UnderMyScreen

<http://www.under-my-screen.com>