**Bruce Isaacs – Television killed the movie star**

>> Welcome to the podcast series of "Raising the Bar Sydney". "Raising the Bar" in 2017 saw 20 University of Sydney academics take their research out of the lecture theatre and into bars across Sydney, all on one night. In this podcast you'll hear Bruce Isaacs talk "Television Killed the Movie Star". Enjoy the talk.

[ Applause ]

>> Ah, thanks so much for the introduction. That was very kind. I can't believe how many people are here to listen to a discussion about TV and cinema. My take is that all of you are probably having these conversations. Certainly when they asked me to do this talk and I. You know they said to me you can talk about anything you want, right. I thought to myself that if I was in a bar that was more familiar to me, let's say King Street, Newtown and I was with friends, we'd be talking about TV and movies anyway, right. So, this is a really familiar place and I think you guys will be a great audience because I'm hoping we connect on a lot of levels with our viewing in cinema, our viewing in television. And I'm hoping in question time that you let me know the kind of things you're looking at as well. I've got some notes. I can hardly see them to be honest. I'm going to wing most of this okay. First thing, I want to get a sense of how well we know each other right in terms of the things we currently watch. So, when I say the name of a TV show, long form television, the kinds of stuff that we download ad nauseum the kinds of things that we binge right, that become so much a part of our lives that we just have to talk to other people about it. I'm going to tell you my TV narrative. When I mention a title hand up or call out or just kind of let me know. So I have to start with "Breaking Bad" okay, "Breaking Bad"? "Breaking Bad" was a spiritual event in my life. I know that sounds, you know over the top but I, look I can't [inaudible] the hyperbolic when it comes to "Breaking Bad". That show kind of lived with me for such a long time and when I think about Walter White and those questions of morality. And we were just chatting here before and Doug [assumed spelling] was saying, you know he's such an evil guy and I said yeah well sure he's evil but I just love him so much, right. And if I was this bar and I could meet somebody, I would like to meet Walter White in spite of this very dark morality. So "Breaking Bad" was a special show for me. I think with all the other big HBO hits so, show of hands. "The Sopranos", yeah, "The Wire", I just finished "The Wire" recently and if you've not seen "The Wire" please put it on your list. With those two shows "Breaking Bad" seems to me the show that takes us into a place where television has never been which is a level of complexity and subtlety that I'm going to call Shakespearian right. For me, I'm pretty familiar with Shakespeare. I came through an English Lit background. I'm willing to put TV on that level and that I think has never been done, right. That's never been done in the history of television. Okay, I just finished "Mad Men".

>> Yeah.

>> Yeah, okay, a couple of things quickly, Mad, because I've got to move along. "Mad Men" is the best thing I've encountered recently on the ideology of American life, masculinity, gender, sexuality. What were the 60s really like, and the early 70s? The question that's been killing me, what the hell was that final sequence in "Mad Men" does anyone know what that was about? In question time, I've been debating this with people for about three weeks and I have a very strong reading of that final sequence in "Mad Men" so if there's time in the question time I want to hear what people think of that. Okay, my favourite show for the last two years, I'm lost in the show. Does anyone here watch "Transparent"? I know it's not getting the kind of attention that it should get so the most important part of this talk is what I'm about to say, please watch "Transparent", okay. I don't know how to describe it but I'll say this. And when I was trying to think about what all these shows mean to me and the differences in them. "Transparent" is a show that I can describe as immersing me to such a degree that I feel that I love the characters on that show. You know, I love those children who are so narcissistic and so damaged and I love the mother Maura who is just such a beautiful figure. And if you've seen the show the performance by Jeffrey Tambor is just beyond anything that television I think has ever produced. I'm obviously going to end with one show "Game of Thrones" right? Funny, "Game of Thrones" hah, but what can I say about "Games of Thrones"? There's nothing I can say that can add to the mythos of "Game of Thrones". I can't make it bigger than it already is. If there's one text that I think is causing trouble for cinema more than any other and I'll come back to this. I think it is "Game of Thrones". Quick story about "Game of Thrones", I was doing research in New York and my wife and I were walking down that street, where Radio City Music Hall is, so we're walking and I sort of. And I said to my wife oh, we just passed Jon Snow and my wife just froze like a statue, right. And I said, yeah, we just passed Jon Snow. She then started to retreat like, and I'm not making. This is a true story. She retreats and goes all the way back to where Jon Snow was standing and sort of, I think it was proximity. She just wanted to be near Jon Snow. And what I can, you know, I mean I was horrified. I was embarrassed you know and I went the other way. And when she came back after about a minute or so she said oh there was an Anthropology store and the door was right next to where Jon Snow was standing. But the truth was, I think it was this guy, Jon Snow and I think it was the mythology that surrounds his character, so this is no longer I think television that we take to be just part of our weekly life, we tune in for a show. This seems to have a hold on our psyche and on our communal identities unlike any other experience of television that I've had. I don't know that there's a character like Jon Snow that's gripped our sense of fantasy, of heroism. I mean I'm not saying I agree with you know Jon Snow as a representation but just our ability to commit to television on that level and to believe in this kind of figure. That's my overarching narrative. The last one, I just started "Twin Peaks". I did my honour's thesis on "Twin Peaks" when I was a student so to come back to it is so strange right. It's like coming full circle. I can't believe that honour's was such a long time ago and now, and in fact I should say really, lovely honour students of mine, a couple there and a couple over there that I've seen. So it's so interesting that I'm coming back to "Twin Peaks" all these years later and that forms a bookend to my life. Okay, the big question that I've got that I want to ask and that I want you guys to think about, especially for question time right. Why has television and this applies to me as much as you, why have its stories and characters, its myths, its mythic structures, its worlds captured our imagination in this way and with such intensity? So that when I now talk to people they're not talking to me about cinema, you know I really encounter people who want to just chat about the cinema. And my students, they don't really want to talk about the cinema either. They want to talk to me about "Stranger Things" right. They don't want to talk about "It" although we have discussions about "It" but they want to talk about "Stranger Things" and it seems to me that's engaged us as a level of art and entertainment that cinema really doesn't anymore. Much more importantly, why do so few of us invest this time in the cinema? I think that's, that's the big question right. A quick show of hands, who goes to the movies once a week? Yep, up at the back, so about three. Mattias [phonetic], he's not honest [inaudible] he's going like every second day to the movies. So two people up in the back, who is going once, let's say every two weeks? Yep, a few of you, who is going once a month to the movies? A few of you, who struggles to get to the movies say once, let's say you're going once every couple of months, every three months, every six months kind of thing? But I would guarantee, so that's the majority of you right and I've got to say that applies to me as well. Most of the stuff I watch, if I'm at home and it's Sunday and I've got nothing to do I'll throw on a film I've seen ten times. I'll put on Hitchcock. I'll put on "Jaws" right or things that I'm so familiar with. This is the big question. Why do so few of us invest the time in the cinema that we used to invest? So very quickly, and I'm going to make this as engaging as possible. Quick history, the movies appeared in 1895 right, it's a new art form. It's not as if the novelty has worn off in that short span of 100 years if you think about other art forms. I want you to imagine this scenario with me really quickly. You've been invited to a Parisian Salon. It's December. It's 1895. It's snowing. It's Christmas time right. So this is an actual scenario, this took place in Paris. It's exciting and it's fashionable because you've been invited to this event. You've heard it's the unveiling of something extremely new but you don't know what this thing is. You come in out of the snow and you take your seat in the space and it's probably a bit smaller than this. I've seen photographs of it. It's a bit smaller than this but it's a communal area, it's not in the way that we think about a multiplex right. You take your seat and then momentarily the screen suddenly comes to life for the first time, light and movement on a screen. This is 1895, a little bit more than 100 years. The story goes and this is a story that I love. People had such difficulty simply in comprehending what they were in the presence of. Does anyone know this story? Has anyone seen Scorsese's movie "Hugo"?

>> Ah, yeah, yeah.

>> Like I said "Hugo" does a really great recreation of this. The story goes. They sat there. They were you know, they were theatre attendees. They'd seen the other art forms, the great performances of Paris in the late 19th century you know, the art capital of the world. This image comes up on the screen. They don't know what they're looking at. They become terrified. They scream and they flee the theatre. They, like you're all here, imagine an alarm goes off, you've got to run right? This is the story now. It's a bit of romance right. Nobody quite knows if it's true. As a film scholar I choose to believe it's true. And when I teach first-year film studies I teach it as historical fact, right. Because I think it's important that even if it isn't true you understand what this history is. You understand what cinema means to us as a culture and to a global society. And I'm a film scholar I have a bias. I'm going to say we need to take stock of this transformation that's taking place right around us. Alright, so the image of the train comes into the station. You scream. You flee. Within a couple of years, so 1895 December, by about 1898 movies are a global phenomenon, so what strikes me as the wonderful part of this history and I suppose what I love so much about cinema as an art form is that we. It didn't evolve in the way that so many art forms evolved that we live with. It kind of ruptured our lives. It ruptured modernity. It came and you know the [inaudible] is the world changed overnight right. So overnight is an exaggeration but it changed dramatically. Within two years they were filming stuff in Melbourne, right. They were filming stuff in India, coronations. So, the apparatus of cinema itself was travelling the world globally at the speed that no art form had ever travelled. It will shock you I think if I said to you, when do you reckon the highest movie attendance took place in America, American pop culture? What decade saw the highest level of movie attendance? Anyone have an idea, someone over here?

>> The thirties.

>> The thirties? Someone said sixties, twenties, thirties? Okay, I'm going to give it to late twenties, thirties and into the early forties, alright. So, what's striking about this is not so much that a lot of people went to the movies then. This is the attendance at the movies, 60% to 70% of American culture in 1935 to 1943 roughly went to the movies at least once a week. Right, so kind of think of yourself, think of the context of your own life at the moment, went to the movies at least once a week. There are wonderful accounts of people in the thirties and forties writing about going to the movies. They would attend on average two to three times a week. So the key point I'm trying to make is film-going, actually getting up, going to the movies, sitting in front of that dark screen when the curtains open and being part of that, you know it's a word I'm going to come back to later, being part of that spectacle. That was also part of our social cultural identity. It was what we did. Attendance dropped right, it actually dropped in the 50s. Okay, so that's when we start to see things really plummet, concluding with the birth and increasing popularity of TV. So, it dips a bit World War II for obvious reasons, picks up again around about the 50s, '52, '53 we start to see a decline in attending the movies. And it's, you've seen "Back to the Future" right? You've seen, them coming back to 1955 and everyone is sitting around, having dinner in front of the TV? You've seen the intro "The Simpsons". "The Simpsons" is one of the great symbols of American popular cultural identity. You know if you've seen that intro, that great intro and that music score, like what'll they do? They're all doing their business around town. They all come together and they only become a family in front of the television, right? That's the model of "The Simpsons". So I guess what's really critical to, kind of get a hold on is, that goes back to the 1950s, this formation of family and identity around the 50s. But, that's also the crisis. That's the beginning of the crisis for cinema as we understand that art form. We know that the crisis of movie attendance worsened. It intensified. It's why movie studios are always at, you know they're at DEFCON 4, they're panic stricken constantly because they know they're fighting a crisis with a new medium that they simply cannot compete with. Has anyone seen "Blade Runner 2049"?

>> Yeah.

>> Ah, fantastic because I want to talk to you about "Blade Runner". I want to hear what you guys think about "Blade Runner". Regardless of what any of us in this room think about "Blade Runner" the best way I can describe it is, it is an unmitigated economic failure, right? It's, I mean I, look I've been waiting on "Blade Runner" for years. I feel I've been studying "Blade Runner" in its iterations including Final Cut for most of my adult life. So, "Blade Runner 2049" was such an event for me. When I heard that Denis Villeneuve was doing it I was so excited. For those of you who have seen "Arrival" you know that this is a guy to watch right, Denis Villeneuve. I'm shocked that they just cannot recoup the money. People are not attending the cinemas to watch "Blade Runner 2049". I'll come back to why I think that is but it's symptomatic of this larger crisis that we're facing. TV though continues to explode as long-form television and I suppose I keep asking myself well, what's the big point of transformation? What's that revolution that's taking place? I reckon it's us, right, I think we're the foundation of the transformation that's taking place. In the relationship between TV and cinema all of us sitting here, we're consumers of a totally new product so let's talk really quickly about how all of us have changed right. And of course I'm not saying we all watch things in the same way, or we all watch the same shows or we all spend the same amount of time watching. But, I'm suggesting to you we're part of a culture that is gradually changing its viewing habits and gradually changing its ways of consuming, right. So, in Sydney, Australia like any other, you know big city, big city of the world we live in a society in which I think we demand and we increasingly control how we get content. I think that's a deal-breaker. That battle has been fought and it's been won. Right, we want control over content and we want access to content. I'm, you know I'm a person who goes to the movies a fair bit and I suppose I have a history of being a film buff and of being involved in the cinema but if I describe my viewing practices to you, this is what I would describe. I'm currently watching a Beatles documentary on Sgt. Pepper on Netflix. I'm watching a Werner Herzog movie on Stan which I've seen probably three times. I'm re-watching "Seinfeld". Is anyone watching "Seinfeld" on Stan? I watch one episode every day, it's like the most pathetic thing I do in my life. It's so pleasurable. I'm on Episode 2 of "Twin Peaks" so I'm just starting that journey. I'm just starting "Electric Dreams". I've watched the first episode, the Philip K. Dick show. I don't know where this is supposed to stop for me. What would I not start to watch, right? And I was literally just talking to [inaudible] the year before, the worst part of all of that is I can say to you, in fact I will have to confess to you, I started "Minehunter" yesterday as well. So now I'm one episode into "Minehunter" as well, all of these things occurring at the same time, having some relationship to each other. But, it's such a radically new relationship in the way we watch things right and the way we view our entertainment, the way we pay for it, the way it comes to us. On a very basic level I think we're talking about a change in the way TV is produced, distributed but much more importantly consumed by us, the people who pay for it. We're nothing like our grandparents or our parents in the way we consume TV. Critics, I mean I have a problem with this but critics increasingly describe shows like "Mad Men" and "Breaking Bad" as ironically cinematic. Has anyone heard this? You know people who describe a show like "Mad Men" as cinematic which I understand but I also think it's problematic just to conveniently take an adjective from one art form and say, well you know TV is doing it now. But that's what happening, right, this is what we're drawn to. Why would we seek out the movies when we have access to the domestic space of our living rooms? I suppose next to binge watching and when I describe binge watching I'm talking about you watching episode after episode, you go through a series maybe in a couple of days. Has anyone done this?

>> Yes.

>> And you know this is a special experience right? My, the commencement of my binge watching, this is terrible to say, was when I was doing a PhD. My reward for finishing a chapter was to binge watch a season of "24". Does everyone remember that old chestnut? God, I love "24". I spent so much time watching "24" while doing a PhD. It was a really important part of that process. But that was my, I mean I've binge watched shows like "Lost". I was just. I was lost in "Lost" for you know, months and months right. So, I suppose what I'm describing is that bingeing is not also just about the production side of things. It's not about just access. It starts to define that process of consumption, right, the amount of time we're willing to spend, the fact that bingeing is connected to a kind of addiction. I feel myself addicted to certain TV shows I need to keep watching, it's hard to stop it, right. One time, so think about cinema. This is the problem with cinema, it cannot reproduce this experience. I'm not going to have that much time to go into precisely why but think about it. If it's between binge watching the current season of "Game of Thrones", I haven't started I should say, so please don't anyone in today's discussion give away anything in "Game of Thrones", that would destroy me because I do love "Game of Thrones". But I, you know I'm watching seven things at once so, but I guess the point is if you're going to binge watch "Game of Thrones" over a weekend or a long weekend or you're going to go out to the cinema, I can see why you would elect to stay at home. The domestic space of your living room, your kitchen, your bedroom, wherever you watch TV, what is convenient you add to that the logistics of leaving that domestic space, going to the cinema. You add to that the outlandish expense of the cinema right. I was at "Blade Runner" on the weekend. I bought one of those insanely large Cokes and I don't know what it cost but I think it was extremely expensive right. It was an outlandish amount of money. And I think when I saw "It" a few weeks ago I got one of those large tumblers of wine from Dendy, Newtown which they do these, they were just. You know it's changed movie-going it's so special. And I've got a, that tumbler of wine that I think that tumbler of wine is about $18 right so it's a large glass. I'm not talking. I'm not crazy it's not a bottle of wine but if you're talking about what they charge, they are treating this as a way to take the screen into a larger economic domain and we are spending. We are required to spend that money to access the cinema. Television doesn't require this, this access at all.

>> You're listening to "Raising the Bar Sydney" 2017.

>> Okay, alright so punchline for me, we binge watch TV because we're content junkies right, and cinema is going to increasingly struggle to keep up with binge watching. And I guess I'm going to call this a binge desire right, that television is responding to ways of accessing content that are just native to incredibly broad and varied parts of our life. But cinema, if you think about what it is, and I'm not going to go into the history of how it forms or the industry but if you think about what it is, it's an old fashioned economic consumption model. Exposure to a product one time controlled by a studio system and controlled by a distribution stream. You go on. You go to a screening at their behest and you pay money to do this. If you're watching television you start to take a modicum of control back into the ownership of entertainment. And I suppose I'm suggesting there's just a much larger sense of self in that. There's a larger existential part of the fact that I want to be in control of the art that I'm exposed to. Okay, the dominant experiences for me, I suppose maybe for all of you as well, are increasingly the dominant cinematic experience it seemed to me to be on domestic screens right, TVs, tablets, iPhones. I remember this vividly about two years ago, this guy came up to me. He was a student in second year I think, a lovely guy and he said he had watched that week's film. It was a, it was "Lawrence of Arabia" and he said he had watched it on his iPhone and I remember thinking, you know the greatest. Has anyone seen "Lawrence of Arabia"?

>> Yeah.

>> Okay, so the greatest wide-screen epic, I don't care if you turn your phone like that, it's not going to do it okay [laughter]. It's not going to work, oh I want to, so, so [laughter] my one plea, I mean I almost cried when that guy said that. But my one plea is don't watch a movie on your mobile or watch it on a tablet. But listen this is David Lynch, the great filmmaker, the iconoclast, the zany lunatic who I absolutely love on iPhones an watching movies. I just thought I'd play this for you because it's so much fun.

>> I started shooting small things with DV for my website with a Sony PD150, low Res DV. Now, if you're playing the movie on a telephone you will never, in a trillion years, experience the film. You'll think you have experienced it but you'll be cheated. It's such a sadness that you think you've seen a film on your fucking telephone. Get real.

>> That's my favourite movie. It's as if he's got all this pent-up rage and it just comes out. Well my favourite is when he says just 'get real'. And if you know the work of David Lynch, David Lynch has an art background and he's extremely committed to the aesthetics of cinema so he obviously rails against the mobile phone. Alright, so look the last part is I'm going to talk a little bit about where I think the movies are and why I think movies have a continued life and why they are vital to what we do in our lives. Most of the time as I said before, I just watch stuff that I've seen before, right I tend to watch films that I love. Most of the time it's for work, occasionally it's for pleasure. Fortuitously for this talk I've seen two films recently that were such profound cinematic experiences that it's such a kind of treat to be able to draw on them for something like this. So, the two films are, and I want to get a sense of whether you've seen them. The first is I think Nolan's best, best, best film "Dunkirk". Have people seen "Dunkirk"?

>> Yeah.

>> Yeah, I think, you know I can't believe how staggering that film is. And I want to talk a bit about "Blade Runner 2049" as one of the other astonishing experiences I've had in recent times at the cinema. So I guess I want to talk quickly about what do I think cinema can offer? I want it to continue to thrive. I think it's been challenged on every side, not just by television, by multimedia. But I suppose I want to make a claim here that cinema can still be cinema, that if we go back to its point of origin it is something that is unique and it's distinctive and we can make something of it, we just have to seek it out. You know I think when cinema is great, when it reconnects with what it can do, and so this is not, I'm not saying what it does. I'm suggesting when cinema reconnects with what it can do as an art form then cinema will always be bigger than television okay. And I'm using 'bigger' then metaphorically and I'm a [inaudible] TVs, right cinema will always be bigger than television. Alright, so this is my impression of an experience of watching "Dunkirk". This is about three weeks ago at Dendy. It was about 10 o'clock. It was a Tuesday. I went to the 10 o'clock screening. You know gloriously it was just me. There was no one else in the cinema. So it was in one of those mid-size cinemas at Dendy. It was me, the screen and nobody else. I could sit wherever I chose, s I sat in the front row, okay, in one of those you know really cushy chairs they've got. So I sat in the front row and the screen was just overwhelming, sort of, you know where that round [inaudible] is there and I was staring up at the screen with nobody next to me. Thirty seconds into the movie the assault on your senses begins and for those of you who have seen it you'll know what I'm talking about, right? The intensity of the sound of bullets firing, of bodies suddenly lifted from the ground as if they've been violently wrenched. Right, that was the experience and it was if as if these bodies had been wrenched off the ground, you know even though these were just images. My body was being bombarded by those images and those sounds. You know I can't describe it any other way. They were assaulted by audio-visual images. In the 20s, you know if we go back to that point of origin in the cinema, in the 1920s, early cinema, European intellectuals talked about cinema as a pure form of moving images. This is a big thing like pure cinema, what does it mean? It was the only art form they said that could produce a kind of experience in the spectator. No other art form could do it. With "Dunkirk" I guess I want to claim that Nolan has recaptured something of that experience, of the purity of just the power of moving images, to assault your senses, to kind of galvanise you in your body, in your relationship to the screen. What I love about "Dunkirk" and this is what I hate about a lot of other Christopher Nolan, the story is not great in "Dunkirk", I don't think. I think it's formulaic. I think the characters are interesting but kind of superficial but that's fine, I'm not watching that movie for story. I'm not watching it for character. I'm watching it for a kind of intensity that only a particular kind of relationship to visual images and sounds can give you. If you've seen "Dunkirk" Hans Zimmer's score in "Dunkirk" has to be the most magnificently experimental music score, I don't know in a decade right. When it comes to Hollywood I don't know who lets him do this stuff but you know he gets to do it, right. They give him the money, he does it. I think the movie seemed to want to strip everything away from cinema and this is. I've done a bit of work with people around Christopher Nolan and his team of people. This is certainly something that engages Nolan, he wants to strip everything off cinema and he wants to reduce that to what is that image? Right, what can it do? So it makes sense, he shot 90% of it on IMAX right, which is the biggest scale. But I don't want that to make you think that all that got me about that movie was the size of the screen. Maybe that had something to do with it but that was not the essence of it. The essence of it was a particular approach to using imagery and sound right, and the intensity of that experience. Alright, quickly "Blade Runner 2049" because I know that I've got to finish up, it's the most impressive and astonishing big-studio film I've seen in maybe 10 years. The reason I say this is the movie started and if, for those of you who have seen it, there's a guy [inaudible]. He comes in, Ryan Gosling. There are no spoilers here. Ryan Gosling has got to retire this replicant. Ryan Gosling is sitting sort of where you guys are at the bar, in front of a window. The guy comes in. The guy knows he's there because his car is outside, and he goes to the sink to wash [inaudible]. Now they hold that shot for I reckon 30 seconds, so unconventional in cinema. I'm not going to go into, you know things like this too much because it will bore you, you know the tears out of you. But, I was sitting there thinking, how were they able to do this? Who paid $150 million for this? This is going to tank. No one is going to sit for 30 seconds watching a guy in a chair, in a mainstream blockbuster Hollywood movie, it doesn't happen, right. So it doesn't surprise me, I raised this before. It doesn't surprise me the movie is struggling because it's made by a French director who in my opinion has the most interesting artistic sensibilities when it comes to cinema. If you've seen "Arrival" I just think that's such a gorgeous film right and it's just so provocative. The last point I'll make on "Blade Runner", there's a scene right at the end, I won't say what's happening but it's an action scene. It's a basic kind of rescue scene. If it was an average movie I could tell you this is just your formulaic Hollywood action scene that we're going to see, usually that leads into the final act of the film. The way that Villeneuve chooses to shoot it is, it's almost as if they're pure visual images. For those of you, anyone get a sense that this is very late in the scene they're almost kind of abstract images. So this is the scene where there's rain right, their bodies fighting in the rain, very high shots, kind of darkness and light cutting through things and then suddenly colours that wash over. And it's as if the film for a moment forgot it was a narrative film. It forgot there was a story and it became an abstract artwork. And again I'm thinking you guys are going to lose a lot of money on this because this happens in 'avant garde' cinema. This happens in art cinema, it doesn't happen in mainstream Hollywood. Those are two experiences I've had right. Two films that suggest to me that regardless of what we think of television, regardless of the addictive and immersive effect of it, there is an experience of cinema that you can't access outside of cinema and it's not purely because of the size or scale of the screen, it's because those films were made to be cinematic. I can't go into what that means right. We can chat about that further. But what I don't even know exactly what I mean by that but it's to do with a particular concept and philosophy of when image works on a screen that TV will never be able to access for a whole bunch of reasons. I wish we had an extra 30 minutes but we don't so thank you very much and we've got time for questions.

[ Applause ]

>> Thanks for listening to the podcast series of "Raising the Bar Sydney". If you want to hear more, search for "Raising the Bar Sydney", on your podcast app. For more free talks and forums from the University of Sydney as well as even more great ideas visit www.Sydney.edu.au/Sydneyideas Sydney Ideas brings leading thinkers from Australia and the world to the Sydney community. Thanks for listening and look out for "Raising the Bar" in 2018