

The Phosphorus Alights' model for making a movie

There are many separate actions involved in making a movie. And in this document, Warren and Fred want to describe enough of those actions to give you a broad overview of how they make movies. Yet, on the other hand, this document is not intended to be a film school course. So, this document will be sufficiently extensive for you to understand Phosphorus Alights' approach, but will not overwhelm you with details. This document is divided into separate numbered segments, which are arranged in chronological sequence: each one describes a separate aspect of the process, and each is located in the order in which it occurs when a movie is made.

:—————:

A. Pre-production. There are three main phases in the process of making a movie: pre-production, production, and post-production. The first phase, pre-production, commences with the initial search for a worthy story, and ends just before the start of the rehearsals.

1. Make sure that all the work is performed in a dynamic manner. Warren and Fred had much work experience before starting this company. And based on that prior work experience, they knew they wanted their movies to be made in a dynamic manner. What is being dynamic? It is experiencing, in each daily activity, all the quality sensations life offers: among which are thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment.

All of the activities we humans do can be placed into four categories: personal (done alone), work, social, and spiritual. And each of these four categories offer, in addition to the quality sensations mentioned in the previous paragraph, specific quality experiences: in activities done alone one learns how to be autonomous (to be true to yourself at all times); in work activities one learns to be productive, and skilled, and creative, and contribute to others; in social activities one learns to be intimate (feel rich or full when with others), and to love (to deeply value another person), and how to have one's relationships be a community (you empower the other members of the community, and are empowered by them); and in spiritual activities you learn to have faith, and confidence about eternity, and awe about God's handiwork, and so forth.

So, when Warren and Fred claim they want the work on Phosphorus Alights projects to be done in a dynamic manner, they mean they want everyone involved to consistently experience being productive, and skilled, and creative, and contributing to the people who watch Phosphorus Alights movies (the worker's clients); as well as to experience thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment in each activity they do while working.

How does work get to be dynamic? By pursuing a worthy product. How does one identify a worthy product? By finding a product that benefits the consumers of that product (adds value to the consumer). And, how about the quality experiences of productive through fulfillment; how do you en-

sure those experiences occur while one is working? It is a simple equation: enter a given field of work; discover what is a worthy product in that field; commence a project and ensure that it produces worthy products; and eventually the workers will feel productive, and skilled and creative, and know they are contributing to the consumers; as well as experiencing thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment in all the work tasks they do.

What is the status quo's approach to work (the status quo being how the majority of people operate)? It is to pursue money and power and fame; and, rarely if ever, to provide value to the consumer, or to provide each worker with a sense of being productive and skilled and creative and contributing to the consumer. The principals of status quo projects may give lip service toward providing the consumer with a quality product, and toward providing their customers with good service, and toward having their workers have a quality work experience; but close examination reveals, that making money and achieving power and fame always supersedes quality and good service. Since the status quo always pursues money and power and fame, its work projects never produce an authentic worthy product; and no worker on such projects ever experiences authentic versions of the aforementioned quality sensations: productive, etc.

At this point a question arises. Why does a worker have to be oriented to giving the consumer a benefit, in order to experience those aforementioned quality sensations while working? And the answer is as follows. All quality sensations arrive from God (they are never generated by humans themselves). And God only sends them to humans who operate as God intended them to act. Now, there is an additional aspect to this equation, that is important to mention here. God sends limitations (physical, emotional, mental, or attitudinal discomforts), whenever any one human doesn't operate as God intended that person to act. **(All such limitations are given to encourage the disobedient person to return to following God's will. And as soon as that return takes place, the limitations are removed.)** It is a simple equation: you operate optimally (a synonym for operating as God desires) in some daily activity, and you receive quality sensations as a reward; or you operate sub-optimally, which only occurs when you disobey God's will, and you receive some limitations (as a hint that you are operating in error). The limitations bit is mentioned here, because many people assume they can just follow their own agenda, and suffer no consequences. And Warren and Fred wanted to inform you readers of the falseness of that opinion.

Hopefully it is obvious, to you the reader, that pursuing money and power and fame is fundamentally incompatible with wanting to contribute to one's clients. In other words, no one ever pursues accumulating money and power and fame, while at the same time pursuing contributing to her clients. The former pursuits are for personal gratification, and the latter is for others being gratified. Fundamentally opposite approaches, that never lead to the same product (the same outcome)! Furthermore, the pursuit of money and power and fame is contrary to God's will; which is why people who approach work in that manner become progressively miserable, the longer they maintain that pursuit.

What makes a product worthy was mentioned earlier. Here we want to expand on what is a benefit

(what is a value). A benefit is not a temporary thrill, nor a temporary feeling of any “positive” emotion. A benefit is only present, when what the consumer gleans, from using your product, can be applied to various areas of her life, in a way that improves those areas permanently. Let us also, briefly, define all the quality experiences that were mentioned. You are productive, when you consistently produce an acceptable product (you are effective), in the most direct manner possible (you are efficient). You are skilled, when you can produce an optimal product in any area of your field of work. You are creative, when what you bring into existence, out of your personal inspirations, allows all the providers in your field of work to perform at a new and superior level. You are contributing to people, when your products add value to their lives. You are experiencing thorough enjoyment, when you are observing, and taking advantage of, all the beauty and refinement that is available in the activity you are in currently. You are content, when you produce the optimal product that is available in that activity. You are fulfilled, when you are clear you have refined that activity as much as you are personally capable.

Let us sum up what has been presented so far in this section. When you work in a dynamic manner, your primary goal is to contribute to your customers. And when you succeed at that pursuit (you finally make a worthy product) you experience being productive and skilled and creative, and that you contributed to your clients; and you also experience thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment; and all seven of those quality sensations came directly from God. On the other hand, if you pursue money and power and fame you never make worthy products, and you experience limitations, that progressively increase in severity as long as you continue in that path (those limitations also coming from God).

Dynamic work has other characteristics, in addition to those already mentioned. One, each worker is his own quality control inspector. In other words, management positions (supervisors) do not exist. Why is this? Because all management positions are based on the following assumption: workers will not work properly if not closely supervised. The status quo claims that managers are people who stimulate workers to rise to their optimal potential. But that is a lie! The underlying truth is that management positions only came into existence after owners of companies began to presume their workers were inherently lazy, and then decided that someone needed to keep an eye on the workers. There is not a manager (company executive) in the world, in the entire history of work, that experiences thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment while operating as a manager. For a given project to be done in a dynamic manner, each involved worker (employee, or principal of the company) has to perform tasks that directly relate to the making of the product.

Another characteristic of dynamic work is that it cannot occur in a company that is incorporated. Incorporation was commenced as a business entity close to five hundred years ago. And its initial form was called “limited liability companies”. The primary reason limited liability was developed was to protect the capital of people who financed large projects, such as shipping expeditions. The underlying premise was that once you were incorporated, only the money you tendered for that corporation’s projects could be lost. In other words, if person A gave money to a corporation, even if the people who work for that corporation cause significant damage to people and property, no one

who was damaged by that corporation's actions could sue and collect from A, above and beyond the amount of money A invested in that corporation. By the way, the apologists for limited liability claim that no investment would ever occur without the limited liability.

Warren and Fred strongly object to that logic, considering it self-serving. They claim there are plenty of people, including themselves, who fund companies without those companies being incorporated. As an example, Phosphorus Alights is not incorporated, nor is it a limited liability company. Warren and Fred further claim, that the underlying basis for limited liability is exclusively greed and irresponsibility; and never, as its proponents claim, a motivation to grow the economy, or to grow some company. Greed, because you can obtain large returns for relatively little investment (an example being the money that is obtained when company goes public —initially sells stock—). And irresponsibility, because you significantly limit what you can lose and for what you can be personally held responsible.

Now, no human can be be motivated by greed and irresponsibility, and, simultaneously, be motivated by making products that contribute to the consumer. Therefore, you cannot be incorporated and perform dynamic work.

A further characteristic. Dynamic work can only be done by people who pursue having daily life be optimal: by people who perceive life as an opportunity to personally develop (to become more and more of a master of daily living). Such people, by the time they are in their mid-thirties, are clear there is a Supreme Being, God, who runs the universe; and are also clear their individual essences are spirits (which will continue to exist for eternity). Only such a person, one who has all of these just mentioned orientations, will pursue making worthy products, as well as experience thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment. Now, if a given person, makes no effort to pursue personal development; that person has no option, while working, but to be oriented toward accumulating money and power and fame. Described in other words. You will only pursue dynamic work if you are pursuing being dynamic in every area of your life; if you are pursuing personal development. If you are not pursuing personal development, than you cannot avoid acting as the status quo does. Which, in work, involves pursuing money and power and fame.

Dynamic work cannot occur in a company that offers “benefits”. What exactly are “benefits”? They certainly are not actual benefits, because you only receive them if you experience personal misfortune. “Benefits”, such as life insurance, and health insurance, and disability insurance, and free perks (car, expense account, etc.), all came from a mind set that assumes employers have a responsibility toward their employees, above and beyond providing reasonable compensation and a viable work environment. Another word for such a mind-set is “I want something for nothing”. Which, if you consider it for a second, is just another form of pursuing money and power and fame. If you want someone to be responsible for you, you can not, at the same time, be oriented to making worthy products, and to experiencing contentment and fulfillment while you work.

Dynamic work cannot occur in a company that buys insurance: as in loss insurance, or liability in-

surance, or malpractice insurance, and so forth. The purchase of insurance always arises out of a mind set of wanting to avoid full responsibility for one's actions. And such a mind set cannot occur in a person who is pursuing contributing to his customers, and also pursuing the experiences of thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment.

Dynamic work cannot occur in a company that allows inefficiency be part of the work process: allows work activities to occur that have nothing to do with producing a worthy product. An example of inefficiency would be to allow certain workers to specialize (to only doing tasks within a particular area). And this produces inefficiency, because all people who specialize ignore the overall picture of the project; which always leads to being increasingly impractical and esoteric; which prohibits making products that contribute to the consumers. Another example of inefficiency is management (supervisory) positions. Because no one who occupies a management position, or a supervisory position, performs tasks that directly contribute to the final product made by that company. Or, another example, spending money on items that have nothing to do with authentic productivity: such as trailers for "stars", or per diem payments when work is being done in the same location where the workers live, or providing personal assistants to perform non-work personal errands.

Warren and Fred are both committed to dynamic work. And, as a result, Phosphorus Alights projects all function in accord with the guidelines that were presented in this segment.

2. Find a story and make sure it is significant. When Warren and Fred first entered the movie business back in 1996, they were already aware that they wanted to provide their customers with worthy movies (movies that add value to the lives of the people who watch those movies). And they had that awareness, because their work experiences, prior to entering the movie business, had taught them that all valid work produces worthy products. So, one of their first actions, back in 1996, was to search for the ingredients of a worthy movie. That pursuit took several years, but eventually was successful; and here is what they discovered: a movie is worthwhile if it tells a significant story in an entertaining manner. Okay, but what's a story? It's a description of a series of events that have a common theme (a common thread). All right, then what makes a story significant? It is significant when at least one of the main characters learns how to live some aspect of daily life in an optimal manner. I got that, but what makes a movie entertaining? It is entertaining when the viewers are drawn in from the very beginning, enjoy the movie throughout, and are refreshed at the end. At the time this document is being written, *The Empiricist* is almost finished; and Warren and Fred are convinced that its story is significant and told in an entertaining manner.

Let us explore stories a bit more, to further flesh out the ingredients that must be present for a movie to be entertaining. It was presented in the previous paragraph, that a story is a description of what happens to one or more characters, as a series of events unfold. In other words, an interesting phenomenon involving some people manifests (develops), and then unfolds over time, and is, eventually, brought to resolution. Now, all stories are told through the dialogue (told by what the various

characters say). But, some aspects of a given story, especially in a movie, can be told through sounds that are not speech, and through visuals that don't have any associated dialogue.

For decades, movie people have promoted a saying: "show and don't tell". By which they mean, "if it is possible to communicate a story point with visuals alone, then don't express that point with dialogue". However, when Warren and Fred first heard this concept they were confused. Obviously it isn't valid to have a movie without any dialogue, or silent movies would still be made; and almost no one makes silent movies any more. And, therefore, some dialogue is required. But, what story points should be communicated with dialogue, and which with just sounds or visuals? Here is what Warren and Fred eventually concluded. When the story point is a common physical sensation (such as pain), or a strong emotion (such as anger or sadness), it can probably be fully understood by most viewers with just a gesture, or a facial expression, or a body posture, or some sound effect; and no dialogue. But, when the story point is a feeling (an experience of beauty and refinement), or a thought (a concept), or an attitude (a potential outcome for a given situation), that type of point must be communicated with dialogue, or the viewing audience will not grasp the communication. So, to sum up this paragraph, present the story points visually when you can, and with dialogue when verbal communication is necessary, but ensure that all the nuances of the story are clearly communicated.

More thoughts on the subject. There are three primary means by which people learn. One is through one-to-one exposure over time, which is how we learn from our families and peers. And from such encounters we learn about our cultures: appropriate lifestyles, appropriate types of work, appropriate social relationships, appropriate spiritual experiences, and so forth. Another way we learn is through formal education (school in other words). And with this method we learn specific skills: especially skills that are useful in work situations. The third method by which we learn is stories. And through the stories we're told, we learn about people and situations we don't personally contact; especially learn things that can be gleaned in a relaxed environment. And Warren and Fred insist, that the "relaxed environment" is an important ingredient of stories. The stories that movies tell can be profound, but need be presented in a relaxed manner. If what was just stated is true, then movies don't work well as propaganda: should not be used as a vehicle for beating the viewer over the head with "important" information. **Movies are to be enjoyed.**

Something else needs to be emphasized here. The stories must describe reality: must describe how humans can actually live. The stories can be metaphorical (not a literal recounting of real events), and can be animated, and can be about animals; but they must have underlying themes that are about real life, if those stories are to be authentically entertaining. On the other hand, the stories shouldn't be a verbatim accounting of what occurred, because that is journalism and not story telling; there needs to be a dramatic (entertaining quality) to the stories that are told in movies. Incidentally, giving audiences a thrill is not entertainment, it is drugging people (facilitating them in escaping the miseries of their daily lives). No viewer feels genuinely refreshed at the end of a movie that was designed to be a thriller.

One last point about movies being entertaining. Many modern movies have sexual scenes (implicit and explicit), obscene language, and violence. Warren and Fred believe, that such activities almost always eliminate the possibility of a movie being entertaining. They claim, that you cannot show the intimacy of a sexual interaction, not even implied sexual behavior, in an entertaining manner. And further believe, that obscene language is rarely, if ever, entertaining. And, also, that violence is almost never entertaining. So sexual behavior, implicit or explicit, will never appear in a Phosphorus Alights movie; and offensive language and violence will rarely, if ever, occur.

So, to sum up this point. First find a tale about real people; people who encounter some adversities, and then process those adversities in a manner, that results in them becoming more successful in some area of life. Then discover how to tell that tale in an entertaining way: the viewers are drawn in from the beginning, enjoy the story throughout, and are refreshed at the end.

3. Gather compatible and responsible workers. Making a movie is a collaborative effort, in that, no one can make a movie by himself. And since it is a collaborative effort, if an excellent release print is to be achieved, the people who work on the movie must be compatible. *(*A release print is the movie industry name for a movie that is ready to be shown in cinema: has quality images and sound.*)* Why do the people who work together on a worthy movie have to be compatible? Because, if they are not compatible, the final outcome will not be excellent, and, as a result, will not contribute to the consumers of that product. And why is this? Because of the following. Compatible people pursue common goals (it is the pursuit of a common goal, that makes two people compatible). Incompatible people pursue divergent goals. If the workers on a specific project all pursue separate (divergent) goals, it is impossible for that project to arrive at an excellent result. And if any one project's result is not excellent, then the consumers of that result (product) will not be benefited. Now, why must each worker be responsible? Because, unless they are responsible, they can't each be her own quality control inspector, and make her own decisions.

Following are some of the principles Phosphorus Alights follows, in order to ensure that everyone who works on their projects are compatible and responsible:

(a) **Never sign a union contract.** Warren and Fred have had extensive exposure to unions; and, based on that exposure, they insist that dynamic work cannot occur in projects in which union contracts have been established. Given how pervasive union contracts are in the movie business, this may sound like an outlandish premise; but here is the reasoning behind the premise. Why do unions come into existence? Because workers are being significantly mistreated by their bosses. Why do unions continue to exist? Solely to ensure that workers are not significantly mistreated by their bosses. What is the possibility, that the principals of a company that is set up to produce worthy projects, coupled with being set up to have all the workers (company principals as well) experience thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment while working, will mistreat their employees (much less significantly mistreat

them)? **ZERO!** Since there is no chance of the workers being mistreated, there is no basis for the presence of a union. And, in such cases, to sign a union contract would be inefficient. And anytime work is inefficient, a worthy product cannot manifest.

Furthermore, all unions in the movie business, in even their basic contracts, require specialization, and require the “benefits” be provided to the union members. And, as was presented earlier in this document, those two items unavoidably lead to inefficiency; and once inefficiency is present it becomes impossible to arrive at an excellent product; which makes it impossible to have the movie add value to the viewers; and if that occurs, the workers will not experience thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment, since those three experiences only manifest if the result contributes to the consumer.

(b) **First come, first serve.** Whenever a job applicant contacts Phosphorus Alights he is sent some literature. Then, if after having read that literature he still wants to work on Phosphorus Alights projects, a series of interviews is conducted. If, after those interviews are completed, that person still continues to desire to work on Phosphorus Alights’ projects, a letter of agreement is formulated and signed. Each applicant gets to choose what work position he wants. And the first person to sign a letter of agreement, for any one available position, is assigned that position.

Why does Phosphorus Alights operate in this manner? For several reasons. One is that Warren and Fred want to avoid any personal bias when they choose who works with them. Two, they are of the opinion that God creates and runs everything; and, further believe, that God will ensure that each person who signs a letter of agreement adequately performs all the tasks she is assigned. Incidentally, at the time this document is being written, Phosphorus Alights has completed two shorts and one feature movie. And all of the tasks, in all three of those projects, were assigned as just described. And every task, in each of those projects, was done well. So this approach does work, regardless of how strange and ridiculous it may appear compared to how the status quo operates. Warren and Fred emphatically claim, that anytime a situation is set up to allow God to determine what occurs, such situations always work out in an optimal manner.

(c) **Have all the interviews be with the person who will do the task; and have that person be the one who signs the letter of agreement.** In the entertainment industry, many actors and crew people have agents and managers: agents to find them work, and managers to “manage” their careers. Phosphorus Alights follows empirical principles (as in both Warren and Fred are committed to pursue life as empiricists); and when one operates as such, one never has someone else find one work, or tell one how to approach one’s career. It is reasonable, from the perspective of empiricism, to have a personal assistant if you are a busy person; and, also reasonable, to pay a person to provide you with job leads;

(after all, that is exactly what is occurring when you buy a newspaper with the intention of perusing the classified ads; or what is occurring when you pay a fee to an employment agency to tell you about available work). But, it is unreasonable, from the perspective of empiricism, to ask someone else to obtain your jobs for you; and very unreasonable to ask someone else to negotiate your work agreements for you, or to tell you what direction you should take in your career. So Phosphorus Alights only interacts with the people who will actually perform the work tasks; and does not negotiate with agents or managers.

Now, on the other hand, Warren and Fred have no desire to tell people how to behave. So they are more than willing to work with people who have agents and managers. But they will not allow an agent, or a manager, to be involved in the staffing of any Phosphorus Alights project.

**(At this point in this document, it is relevant to provide information as to how the principles that Phosphorus Alights follows are established. As was stated elsewhere in this document, Warren and Fred operate from the position that God creates and runs every situation in the universe; including each activity of every human's life. They further perceive, that God has established rules for each type of human endeavor, including how work should be approached and accomplished; and that God reveals these rules to humans through their life experiences. Whenever Warren and Fred encounter a new type of activity, they pursue a variety of approaches until they discover the approach that leads to a worthy product, while also providing experiences of thorough enjoyment and contentment and fulfillment. Then they note what guidelines were followed in that last approach (the successful one), and those guidelines then become principles they follow every time they repeat that type of activity. Once they experientially establish any one principle, they never compromise in following it.*

Following is some evidence that Warren and Fred have collected, that, from their perspective, significantly validates their approach.

- (i) Every single person who makes movies as the status quo does, that Warren and Fred have heard speak (or read about), describes the final release print as being vastly inferior, when compared to the concept of the movie that first arose. Working as the status quo does is, obviously, undesirable. A new model is needed.*
- (ii) Warren attended a conference sponsored by the WGA (Writer's Guild of America), an organization made up of all the people who write movie and television scripts for the major studios and production companies. Over the three days of the conference, during which many major screenwriters spoke, not once did Warren hear a screenwriter describe that his, or her, role was to tell stories. They exclusively discussed making money, and being paid to write scripts, and having the scripts they wrote be made into movies and television shows. The status quo model*

prohibits screenwriters from being skilled storytellers. A new model is needed.

(iii) Every human has within herself, an organ that informs her as to whether or not the story she was just told was nourishing or lacking in nourishment. Each story you are told, whether via an in-person presentation, or by reading a book, or by watching a play, or by watching a movie (on the screen, or via a video or DVD), or by watching a television show, is supposed to nourish you. When's the last time you saw a studio movie that left you with a clear sense of having been nourished? A new model is needed.

(iv) Warren and Fred have been involved in many projects in the past. some failed, the majority succeeded. In each of the failed projects, the original guidelines were compromised. In all those that were successful, the original principles were followed without compromise.

*(v) When Warren and Fred started Phosphorus Alights, they only knew of the status model of movie making. As they progressed through all the courses they took, and on through the two shorts they made, most of the specifics of the status quo model were revealed to be unworkable (if a worthy release print was to be obtained). Each time they realized that one aspect of the status quo model was unworkable, they would inwardly open up to receive inspiration from God. And each such time, an impulse would arrive; which, when followed, produced a new and viable alternative to the unworkable status quo aspect. "The Empiricist" was done in a manner, that is fundamentally different from how the status quo makes movies, and it is a worthy movie. A new model has been found.)**

(d) Require that all agreements be kept. Every human being, in every situation he encounters in life, follows a specific plan of action (whether or not he is aware he is doing such). If any situation eventually succeeds, it is solely and only because the plan of action that was followed was viable. And, any life situation that fails, fails solely and only because the plan of action that was followed was not viable. And, for a given situation to become successful, each point of that situation's plan of action has to be maintained without fail. Now, from Warren's and Fred's perspectives, each time you establish each point of a given plan of action, you are establishing an agreement.

In all agreements that are established in a Phosphorus Alights project, first everyone involved is asked to fully express himself. And, once everyone has expressed all he wishes to state, an agreement is formulated. At any time, prior to a given agreement being implemented, any one who is involved can contact everyone else involved, and present a proposed amendment. And if everyone involved agrees to that amendment, it is implemented; and that action is not considered breaking an agreement.

(e) **Always take every disagreement to resolution.** Warren and Fred are crystal clear, that any time two or more people interact, disagreements will occur on a regular basis. So, to them, disagreements are not perceived as unpleasant and avoidable events; but more as necessary (and valuable) aspects of each process they get involved in. Life had taught Warren and Fred repeatedly, that every disagreement offers an opportunity for improving one's experience of daily life; but, only if that disagreement is processed correctly. Therefore, in Phosphorus Alights projects, a specific procedure has been established for disagreements; a procedure that, based on Warren's and Fred's life experiences, always leads to a successful resolution of each disagreement.

The procedure is as follows (and in this example it is assumed that only A and B are involved):

- (i) B notices that she disagrees with how A is proceeding in situation Q, and goes to him and presents her perspective.
- (ii) A responds with his point of view, responding specifically to the issues raised by B.
- (iii) B listens to what A expresses; and, then, building on what A just stated, describes how she now sees the issue.
- (iv) Then A, having listened to what B presented, gives any new views he now has.
- (v) And B then responds in kind.
- (vi) This alternating dialogue continues until neither A and B can think of anything to add about the issue being discussed, also continuing until both are fully clear about each other's perspective.
- (vii) Once point (vi) has been completed, A and B will both sense they agree to agree, or that they agree to disagree; one or the other. But, if neither agree to agree nor agree to disagree manifests by this point, then either A or B, or both, have failed to fully express herself. In this latter situation, the entire process, if it is going to be successful, has to start from scratch.
- (viii) Once point (vii) has been successfully completed, whomever has final authority for situation Q decides how to continue, and the other person willingly and enthusiastically goes along with that decision.

Once step (viii) has occurred, if both A and B have been open and honest, all emotional heat (if any had been present) will have disappeared. Furthermore, the new decision made during point (viii) will produce an improvement in how situation Q is approached, compared to how situation Q was being approached just prior to the disagreement arising. This last point may sound strange to most of you readers, but Warren and Fred have repeatedly observed this phenomenon. Even when the resolution is agree to disagree, there will be an improvement in the involved activity. And, when the resolution is agree to agree, the improvement is often a

significant one. This fact, that all resolution processes produce improvement, is the basis as to why all Phosphorus Alights' release prints are significantly superior movies, compared to what each movie's potential appeared to be when the story idea was first conceived. During the process of making any movie there will be many disagreements. But, if each disagreement is taken to resolution, the final release print will be a worthy movie. Such is how superior movies are made.

(f) **Give each person final say in the tasks for which he is responsible.** In the vast majority of status quo businesses, there are people who are labeled as managers. And the status quo claims that these positions exist so as to stimulate the workers to perform optimally. But, as was presented earlier in this document, Phosphorus Alights disagrees; claiming that the real reason for managers is that status quo bosses assume workers will not work, or will work quite ineffectively, if not supervised. So, the real reason managers exist is to keep the workers in line. And, unfortunately, most people who work under managers work as little as they can.

Phosphorus Alights is unwilling to have managers. And, therefore, expects each worker to be his own supervisor (his own quality control inspector). Phosphorus Alights tells everyone who applies to work on one of their projects, during the first interview, that they will be expected to supervise themselves. Each person who works on a Phosphorus Alights project has final say in how she does her tasks. Now, anyone, including Warren and Fred, can approach a person who is working on a Phosphorus Alights project, and present that person with an observation. And, with each such presentation, the resolution process that was described in the previous section is to take place. But, after each resolution process is completed, the person who does the task has the final say as to how that task is performed from then on.

On the making of *The Empiricist*, as well as while making the two previous shorts, all the tasks were done in a quite competent manner. And the movie turned out well. So the no-management approach works.

(g) **Compensate people with either a salary or with co-ownership in the movie.** Warren and Fred have a major objection to volunteers. They have each observed many situations throughout the world where volunteers were used. And in every one of these situations, it was obvious the use of volunteers created unnecessary complications. Therefore, everyone who works on a Phosphorus Alights project is compensated: either paid an hourly wage (equivalent to what the status quo pays for that skill); or made a co-owner of that movie. Everyone who works on a Phosphorus Alights project is strongly encouraged to become a co-owner; because Warren and Fred both know, that the work experience of a co-owner is significantly superior to the work experience of an hourly-wage worker. However, they al-

low each person to decide whether to receive an hourly wage, or to become a co-owner. And they never favor co-owners over wage earners in assigning any of the work positions in a given production.

Each movie Phosphorus Alights makes is set-up as a separate project (a separate business entity you might say). And, therefore, each movie has its own co-owners, separate from the co-owners of any other Phosphorus Alights project. Being a co-owner of a movie is the same as being a partner in the making of that movie. Phosphorus Alights is also set-up as a partnership, but being a co-owner of one of Phosphorus Alights movies is not synonymous with being a partner in the company Phosphorus Alights. Now, in most business partnerships, for efficiency of operation, one partner is made “managing partner”; and all the other partners assign their ownership rights to the managing partner. These assignments allow the managing partner to be the only person who has to sign any legal documents, which makes for great efficiency. As an example, only the managing partner signs the required documents when a movie is sold to a distribution company, or when it is licensed to a network television company.

In each of Phosphorus Alights’ movie projects, one of the Phosphorus Alights partners (co-owners) becomes the managing partner of that project. And that person establishes all the legal agreements that are necessary when making a movie: film permits, location agreements, establishing credit with companies who rent equipment, contracts with distribution companies, and contracts with all the various media that exhibit the movie once it is finished, and so forth.

In a given project, each person who chooses to become a co-owner is assigned a hourly rate; an hourly rate that is related to the level of skill necessary to perform the tasks that particular co-owner will do. Let us use person M as an example, and assign her hourly rate of \$40.00. For every hour that M works on the project she is credited with \$40.00. And, at the end of the project, all of the hours that M worked are totaled; and that total is called her CCV (*creative contribution value*). Continuing with our example, let us assume that M’s total hours, for the entire project, was 400 hours. That 400 hours, multiplied by M’s hour rate of \$40.00, equals \$16,000.00. Therefore, M’s CCV for that project is \$16,000.00.

In each project, once it is completed (which is defined, in all Phosphorus Alights projects, as the day the first dollar of income, from that project, arrives in the Phosphorus Alights office), all the co-owners CCV’s are totaled; and that amount is called the *final budget*. Then each co-owner is assigned a share in the movie, which is calculated as follows: each co-owner’s CCV is divided by the final budget, and that figure is multiplied by 100; to have the specific share amount be a percentage figure. Continuing with our example from the previous paragraph, let us assume the final budget was \$600,000.00. Then, M’s share of the movie would be her CCV (\$16,000.00) divided by \$600,000.00, multiplied by 100; which would equal 2.67%. Out of every \$100.00 that is received by Phosphorus Alights as income from that

movie, M would receive \$2.67. So, if the movie that M worked on earned 2 million dollars, then M would receive \$53,400.00 (the equivalent of having been paid \$133.50 per hour).

On Phosphorus Alights projects, Phosphorus Alights pays all the expenditures. And, based on those expenditures, Phosphorus Alights is also assigned a CCV (called a *funding CCV*). Phosphorus Alights also receives a CCV for administering the movie. In summation, the *final budget* is a total of the CCV's that were earned in place of a salary (*sweat equity CCV's*), and the CCV's that were earned by providing the money that was spent while making the movie (*funding CCV's*).

To further explore that validity of Phosphorus Alights' approach to co-ownership, let us review the status quo equivalent. The status quo has a version of co-ownership, and it is called *gross points*. And each gross point is considered equal to a single percentage of ownership. But, there are major differences between the Phosphorus Alights' co-ownership, and the status quo's gross points. First of all, gross points are exclusively arrived at via negotiation: the person who has the most power gets the most points. Such points are never arrived at by an unbiased accounting of how much work is done. Secondly, the only people who receive gross points are considered to be stars of the production: star actors, directors, occasionally writers, producers, and so forth. The majority of workers on a given studio movie never receive gross points.

In addition, in every situation that Warren and Fred have read about, or heard spoken of, gross points are never distributed until after the studio has recouped all the "expenses" it incurred (while making and distributing the movie). As you might expect, the accounting that is used to determine when all of the studios "expenses" have been recouped is quite questionable. *(As a person once said: "*there are three positions in the movies where original creativity occurs: the screenwriter, the music composer, and the studio accountants*".)* Whereas, in each Phosphorus Alights project, any person who works on the project can become a co-owner; and each co-owner receives disbursement, each time money earned from that project is received in the Phosphorus Alights office. So gross points are not at all similar to the co-ownership shares people have in Phosphorus Alights projects.

Before we leave this section, it is necessary to review the concept of *residuals*. Residuals are payments people receive, above and beyond the compensation they were paid when the project was done. They are, usually, only paid to people who were perceived to have made a creative contribution to the project: musicians, writers, actors, directors, producers, and so forth. Rarely, if ever, do "non-creative" people receive residuals: the crew, and the administrative people. Warren and Fred consider residuals to be a pernicious phenomenon. And have this opinion, primarily because residuals are the epitome of wanting a guarantee, while at the same time wanting to share in the income of that project as well. Even more perversely, the income portion of residuals is not, typically, based on profits; but is almost always a specific figure that is paid each time the product is shown to the

public. Take a commercial as an example. Each time that commercial is shown, those people who receive residuals for that commercial (typically the actors who appeared in the commercial, the composer, and the people who played the music), are sent a specific payment (one that was arrived at through negotiations, which were conducted before the commercial was even made).

Life has taught Warren and Fred, that to have a life filled with quality, very specific guidelines must be followed. And one of those guidelines are as follows: be an employee, received compensation for your efforts regardless of whether or not that project's product earns any income (and, therefore do not take any financial risks), and have no participation in the income the project earns, and have no input into the how the project is set up and run (except for how you do your individual tasks); or, be a co-owner, receive no up front compensation, have all of your compensation be based on the income the project earns (taking financial risks), and have considerable input into how the project is set up and run. One or the other, never both. Residuals are an attempt to have people receive a guarantee income, as well as participate in the income of the venture; thereby wanting to share in the rewards without taking any of the risks. Another example of "wanting your cake to still be available, after you have eaten it".

Residuals are, therefore, immoral. And, being immoral, if allowed to be present in any project, will guarantee that that project's outcome (its product) will not be worthy; but will be significantly inferior, compared to what could have been produced in that project if it had been run in a proper manner. And, as well, everyone's experience in a project that offers residuals will be one of great misery. Phosphorus Alights' projects do not offer residuals.

When *The Empiricist* was made, all the points delineated here on point 3 were followed. And, Warren and Fred propose, that the quality of this movie validates their approach.

4. Breakdown the script. This involves examining the script, to determine how the movie will be made. And from that examination you determine a number of facts. One, you find out what specific sets are needed (the physical layout of each set). Two, you determine how many of those sets can be built on a sound stage. The reason for determining this second fact is that Phosphorus Alights shoots as many scenes as they can on a stage; only going on location if certain sets can't be built on a stage (because those sets are too expensive to build on a stage, or because a given set has an appearance —outdoor scenery is part of the set, for example— that makes it impractical to build that set on a stage). Warren and Fred have a bias toward shooting on stages for several reasons: it is much less expensive (with some exceptions) than shooting on location; and much easier to obtain the visual images you want, and to record clear (usable in the final movie) dialogue.

Not all locations are reliable. Remember, the interval between the day the location agreement is signed, and the day that location will actually be used for filming, is, in most cases, many months. And for a location to be reliable, the person responsible for renting that location has to be serious

about being in the movie business. (“Gee, we’re sorry Warren; but aunt Sally came into town unexpectedly, and the house can’t be used next week, as we promised”.) Reliable locations, at least in the area Warren and Fred are familiar with, Southern California, are rarely less than \$5,500.00 per day. And that doesn’t include any of the set dressing that will be necessary. No stage is going to cost that much per day, for the equivalent space (square footage wise). And, the cost of the set building materials, that are rented when you build sets on a stage, don’t cost that much. Also, when you are on location, everything you need (bath rooms, eating facilities, storage for props and costumes, electricity, places to conduct your administrative activities, etc.), has to be brought in; and in its transportable form, is much more expensive than the cost of such items when you are shooting on a stage. As an example, compare the cost of renting a motor home, to the cost of a motel room with equivalent facilities.

Recording a visual image on film, especially an image, that will give the movie goers the impression that what is on the screen is a real situation, requires a special environment: specific lighting, specific camera locations, and so forth. Needing that special environment, because film does not record images as the human eye records images. It is much easier to place the needed lights, and to place the camera where it needs to go, on a stage, where the sets were designed with those requirements in mind; compared to the difficulty you have placing lights and a camera on a location, where you have to act within the confines of the permanent structure that exists at that place.

A similar situation exists with sound. Microphones do not record sound as the human ear hears sound: microphones records many sounds the human ear doesn’t notice; and microphones cannot filter out many of the sounds that the human ear filters out. Therefore, when you are recording dialogue in a movie, you want to only record the dialogue; recording almost no environmental sounds: traffic noise, sounds of objects hitting a table surface, clothing noise, fan sounds, and so forth. It is much easier to obtain pristine sound when shooting scenes on stage sets, then when shooting scenes on location.

As soon as the script breakdown determines which scenes will be filmed on the stage, and which scenes require a location, you begin to search for an appropriate stage and appropriate locations.

Script breakdown is also done to determine how many characters have speaking roles greater than one sentence or phrase. Warren and Fred have decided, based on what occurred during the shooting of *The Empiricist*, that most of the one-line roles (where the character only speaks one line) can be played by an extra: an actor who had no awareness of the line until she shows up the day of shooting; an actor who is obtained through an extra agency; an actor who is not signed during the regular casting process. These one-line roles can be played by an extra, because speaking one line doesn’t require going through the rehearsal process. There is an exception, however; which is when the actor, who speaks that one line, is present on camera throughout the entire scene, and has actions, if not words, that are significant to the story. In this latter case, that actor is signed during the casting process and attends all the rehearsals for that scene.

Once it is determined how many actors need to be signed, everyone who is an affiliate of Phosphorus Alights is contacted, and asked if they want to be in the current production. If the number of affiliates who respond are equal to, or greater, than the number of actors who are required to cast the movie, then no public advertising is done. If that number is less than the number of roles that exist in the movie, then advertisements are placed in the industry trades.

(Phosphorus Alights considers itself to be a film making cooperative; hoping, eventually, to have sufficient numbers of members, so the same people make one movie after another. For this reason, Warren and Fred welcome people to sign-up with Phosphorus Alights at all times, even when no current project is planned. Each person who joins the cooperative is called an “affiliate”. The procedure to become an affiliate is described in the section of the main menu Working for Phosphorus Alights.)

5. Design each of the sets. In this segment, you determine the initial physical layout and decor of each set. Considered “initial”, because the set dimensions can’t be finalized until the camera paths, and the lighting requirements have been completed; and those two items will be completed later in this model. Incidentally, the decor (which is called *props* in the movie industry) includes everything you would expect to see if the set was a real location: all the items of furniture, all the built-in items (cabinets, etc), all the little items (knickknacks and photographs as examples), people’s clothes and personal items, the color scheme, and so forth. Now, once you have designed the set layout, and chosen which props are required, you search the local prop houses; so you can determine which prop houses carry the items you need. (“Prop house” is the movie term for a business, that rents the props that are used in movies and television). In the case of special sets, such as the 18th century sailing ship that was used in *The Empiricist*, contact the places that manage those special sets, and find out which calendar dates each such set is available.

6. Determine the gross staging, and the camera paths. In the Phosphorus Alights model, each actor is given final decision on all aspects of his character’s personality: his voice tone, gestures, and mannerisms. And all these traits are finalized during the rehearsal process. However, the general movements of the actors, as in where, on the set, the actors will be at all the different point of the scene (which is called *the gross staging*), cannot be determined during rehearsals. Because the gross staging will determine where the camera is placed; and the locations of the camera paths will significantly influence the final design of each set. These camera movements are ascertained here in point 6, and the location of the set’s walls are determined during the next point, point 7. And both of these points must be completed before you finalize the production schedule (the document that tells you how much time it takes to do each aspect of the production). And that schedule is finished before the rehearsals are even scheduled. Hopefully, each of your readers can now perceive, that the

actors aren't involved in the process when the gross staging decisions are made. Who, then, makes these decisions? In this model, the cinematographer. Why he is assigned to make this determination will be explained shortly, but first some background information.

The first piece of information. In the status quo approach to theater and movies there is a position called "the director". And the director is responsible for the overall look of the production: what final story is told, how the actors perform, what the camera captures, the look of the sets (the actual design of the sets being done by the production designer), and so forth; including the gross staging. The Phosphorus Alights' model does not have a director. In its model, the screenwriter is the author of the story. And, once the screenwriter has finished writing the script, Warren and Fred claim there is no more story vision left to create. Also, in the Phosphorus Alights model, the actors have responsibility for how their individual characters are portrayed. And, also in this model, the person who designs all the sets has final say in that area. And the cinematographer determines what the camera captures, and the lighting set-up for each set. And the overall look of the film is left up to God; in that each person does her individual tasks, and the overall look of the movie is not revealed until the release print exists.

Therefore, in the Phosphorus Alights model, there is no director. And so, there is no director to decide the gross staging.

Next, let us look at what decisions the cinematographer makes here in point 6: he decides what aspects of each scene to film, and where his camera will move (the *camera paths*) as he records all those images. We mentioned earlier in this document, that the picture editing process involves the following: selecting the specific shots that are desired; and then selected in which sequence you will place those shots, in order to create the release print. The material, from which the picture editor selects the specific shots he wants, are the shots the cinematographer records when the movie is filmed. Here in point 6, is when the cinematographer decides what he will film. In regard to each scene, he takes several actions:

- (i) He determines all the frames he wants to capture: each significant moment of each actor's performance; and any significant item in the set's decor. *(*An individual frame is what you see on the screen at any one moment of the movie.*)*
- (ii) For each frame, he decides how far away from the subject he will place the camera, and what lens he will use. And, also, what type of illumination will be present.
- (iii) He groups all the chosen frames into shots, based on the following criteria: throughout any one shot he wants to use the same lens; and, whatever movements the camera has to take must be smooth, and must be possible (the camera can't suddenly leap to a new location). *(*A shot is all the material that is filmed, from the moment the camera is turned on, till when it is turned off.*)*

(iv) He keeps re-arranging which frames will be recorded by which shots, until the following criteria is met: each shot films material from the beginning to the end of the scene; and, there are as few shots as possible. He wants as few shots as possible, for each scene, in order to be both effective and efficient. Incidentally, the manner in which the camera moves, as it captures each shot, is called the *camera path* (also called the *camera angle*).

(A short side bar may be informative. When you are filming a movie, each time you turn the camera on and record some images that is called a “shot”. Yet, the same word, “shot”, is used to refer to segments of the finished movie: all the images that exist between any two cuts (a switch from one view of that scene to another view). To distinguish between these two types of shots, Phosphorus Alights calls the shots that occur while filming “film-shots”, and the shots that occur in the finished movie “movie-shots”.)

So, the cinematographer has decided, for each scene, what frames he wants to capture; and then arranged all those frames into as few shots as possible. Obviously, to accomplish all this, he has to first know where the actors will be throughout each scene. He has to know the gross staging.

Let us return to the question that commenced this segment: why do Warren and Fred assign the gross staging responsibility to the cinematographer? Let us look at still photographers. Most of you, probably, have observed a professional still photographer at work. If you did, you observed the following: he operated the camera; he determined what lighting was necessary and set it up; he dressed the environment; and he determined what general actions were taken by the subject being photographed. In other words, he makes all the choices that relate to what is present in the finished photograph. Realizing this, Warren and Fred concluded, the cinematographer ought to be responsible for the same decisions on a movie set as well. After all, a motion picture is 24 still photos per second. The mind-set (the primarily focus) of a still photographer and a cinematographer are identical. Hence, the cinematographer determines the gross staging.

At this point, let us review how the status quo handles shots, and shot selection. In most status quo productions, the individual film shots rarely last longer than 20 to 30 seconds; and there are usually dozens that are selected for each scene. And, most ridiculous of all, they often film two actors, who in the final movie will appear to be talking to each other, each one on different days. When Warren and Fred discovered the status quo’s approach to shots (camera paths), it was immediately obvious to both of them, that the status quo approach was very inefficient. And being inefficient, they knew they couldn’t follow that approach and end up making a worthy movie. Each of you readers think about this for a bit. How effectively could you communicate to another person, if you had to speak to him in 20 to 30 second sections? Or, in another case: if what you had to express required a five minute presentation, how effective would your communication be, if you had to deliver it in 30 second segments spread out over a day or two of time? Or, in a still different case: how authentic could your communication be, if the other person wasn’t present while you were talking?

Don’t for a minute presume, that acting skill somehow provides this ability. Acting skill is in the

realm of successfully portraying the personality nuances of a real person. Acting skill has nothing to do with being able to communicate in a disorganized situation. Actors repeatedly describe, that whenever they play a two person interaction, the other actor's responses are very valuable: those responses add a lot to the performance of both actors appearing authentic. Why is this? Warren and Fred suggest, that it is because of the non-verbal communication that occurs between two people who are interacting with each other. To film two people on different days, who are supposed to portray a bilateral interaction, makes the portrayal virtually impossible to appear real.

Warren and Fred knew there had to be a better way. They looked at how plays are done. And they talked to many actors. And they studied movie scenes they perceived to be done well. And they came to the following conclusion: an actor performs best, if all the actors involved in that scene are performing at the same time (even if the others who are present can't be seen throughout any one camera path); and also performs best, when the performing goes from the beginning to the end of each scene without stop. Having made that decision, they decided to have all their camera paths last for the entire length of the scene; with two exceptions. The two exceptions being as follows: when the scene lasts longer than the maximum amount of film the camera could hold at one time (ten minutes of scene time with the camera they use); and when the actors movements, as a scene progresses, is so extensive, that at a specific point in the scene the camera has to be turned off and moved.

Let us review this segment. First the cinematographer determines the gross staging. Then he selects all the specific frames he wants to record: specific actors at particular moments in the scene, as well as scene decor items by themselves. Then he groups those frames into specific shots, with each shot designed to last from the beginning to the end of the scene; attempting to end up with as few shots as he can. Incidentally, while shooting *The Empiricist*, the number of shots (camera paths) per scene rarely exceeded three, occasionally were two, and a few times were just one. And, every once in a while, were up to six.

7. Determine each set's final dimensions. Once the camera paths for all the scenes are finalized, the cinematographer then determines what equipment he will use to transport his camera for each path: tripod, hand held, on a dolly (a small wagon designed to transport camera), on a crane, and so forth. And now he knows exactly where he and his camera and his camera equipment will be at each moment of the scene. At this point, it becomes apparent which set walls can remain for the entire time the set exists; and which set walls have to be moved between separate camera paths, so the camera can be moved as planned. And, at this time, it also become apparent how much space is needed outside each set's walls, to allow for the camera paths (the camera equipment, and the lighting for that set, and so forth). This information gives a final floor space dimension for each set. Given all of this, the set designer (called an *art director* in movie terminology, or, on big budget movies a *production designer*) then finalizes each set's design.

A few words about set construction. In the movie business, there are businesses called “scene docks”. These businesses rent set structural items: walls, doors, windows, counters, all sorts of architectural details. Scene docks differ from prop houses in the following manner:

- (a) Scene docks rent structural items that make the set look like an actual room.
- (b) Prop houses rent decor items that make the place look lived in (or worked in).

Or, an alternative description:

- (c) Scene docks rent items that create tell you what type of space you are in: a bedroom, a living room, a kitchen, an office, a hallway, etc.
- (d) Prop houses rent items the actors use to authenticate their presence in that space.

Certain items can be found in both places, but the delineation just presented, by and large, distinguishes what the two businesses offer.

You can rent whole sets from some scene docks. But, typically, scene docks rent you individual units (modular units you might say), out of which you construct the set walls: plain walls, walls that contain doors, wall that contain windows; rarely a wall that contains both a window and a door, because such units would be too unwieldy to work with. The wall units are typically 10 feet high (occasionally 12 feet high), and have standard widths: 2 feet, 4 feet, 6 feet, 8 feet, 10 feet, and 12 feet. The wall units are kept erect by screwing side by side units together; as well as by “L” braces, that are screwed to the back of the unit, and to the floor of the stage. As a side note, good stage floors are made of cork; because cork is a material, which can be screwed into repeatedly, and still bounce back and have a pristine appearance.

Once you have erected the walls of a set, and taped and spackled all the joints, and painted all the walls, and decorated the set realistically, and lit it properly; everyone in the viewing audience will presume it is a real room. Studios rarely use these units from scene docks to construct their sets. They, typically, build actual rooms and buildings on the stages.

8. Determine the final lighting plan. The lighting plan describes several items. One, the lighting fixtures that are used for each set (each fixture’s location, and each fixture’s settings when that set is lit). Two, each set’s location on the floor plan. Three, the location of the power sources on the stage (and at each of the locations: where most often it will be a generator). Four, the layout of the cables, that run power from the power sources to the light fixtures of each set.

Here in point 8, you also decide what lighting fixtures and cables need to be rented. Phosphorus

Alights owns a number of lighting fixtures, but certainly not enough to shoot an entire movie without renting some fixtures.

9. Determine which sets will be part of which stage phase. Back in point 4, you began to investigate what sound stages were available. If by this point, here in point 9, you have not picked what stage will be used, it must now be done. After you have selected which stage you will use, you obtain a preliminary agreement with the stage owner; and you obtain that stage's dimensions. Now you can determine how many production phases will occur. There are two ways you can set up the production schedule for the stage portion: one is to find a stage big enough to erect all the sets at one time; and the other is to find a stage that can't hold all the sets at once (and in this latter case, the stage portion is done in several phases). *The Empiricist*'s stage portion was shot in five phases.

During each stage phase the following happens: first, all the sets of that phase are constructed and painted; then each set is dressed (all the decor items used in that set's scenes are placed in the set; and adjusted until that set looks like a real location); then the lighting fixtures are hung, and each fixture's shooting day settings is determined; then you shoot all the scenes that took place on the sets of that phase; and, finally, all you strike all the sets of that phase (the power cables are removed, the lighting fixtures taken down, the dressing items removed, the set structural elements are torn down, and everything is stored for the next phase). In between each phase, the props, and the sets' structural items, and the costumes that will no longer be used, are all returned to their respective rental houses. And any such items that are needed for the next phase are picked up from their respective rental houses. After phase one is over, the exact process is repeated for phase two, and then phase three, and so on. This process worked out quite nicely when *The Empiricist* was shot.

If you properly schedule for the construction through lighting aspects of each phase, (everything that takes place before the first shooting day of each phase), you will then have considerable time flexibility: extra, unexpected, activities can be added to the schedule, without requiring more days. There is not much of this time flexibility during the actual shooting days. During the making of *The Empiricist*, on a regular basis, there were problems that arose. But, with the aforementioned time flexibility, all of those problems were solved without having to go behind schedule. If you rent a large stage, sufficiently large to hold all the sets at one time, then there will be less time flexibility available. In this latter case, it is recommended that you schedule a free day, every four to five days of shooting.

The final dimensions of each set were determined back in point 7. And those dimensions are now used to determine which sets will be built during which phase. In the Phosphorus Alights model, the goal is to shoot the movie in sequence. Doing so, primarily, to facilitate the performance of the actors, whose characters mature over the course of the movie. But, also done, to facilitate the creative inspirations that repeatedly appear as the shooting progresses. So, when you are planning the first phase, you attempt to go with sets that are used early in the movie. First, you place the first scene's

set on the floor plan. Then you place the second scene's set on the floor plan, and so forth. At some point there will be insufficient floor space for the next scene's set. But, there may still be sufficient floor space for the set of a scene that appears latter in the movie. In this case, you place that latter scene's set in the first phase's floor plan. Doing so, because it is more efficient to shoot out of sequence than to waste valuable floor space. Remember, by remaining efficient you ensure that the release print will be an excellent movie.

After the floor space layout has been determined for the first phase, you establish the floor plan for phase two. And so on, until all the stage sets are placed in the floor plan of some phase. Now, once you know how many stage phases are required for the movie, and you further know which sets are part of which phase, you then calculate the number of days necessary for all the aspects of each phase: you determine how many days will be required for constructing and painting, and dressing, and lighting, and shooting of the scene(s), and striking the sets. And the results are recorded in the preliminary production schedule: called "preliminary", because the final production schedule will not be set until latter in the process. The calculations you did, to determine how many days are necessary, are based on what took place in previous projects; or, if this is your first project, from reference material.

10. Commence making the administrative arrangements for the movie. There are many such items that exist when making a movie: finalizing what locations will be used, determining what permits will be required (filming permits, location permits, etc), establishing credit with the rental houses, obtaining insurance, and so forth.

**(At this point, let us take a short side bar, to discuss insurance. Warren and Fred have a moral objection to insurance. And their objection is based on the following reasoning. Insurance was created as a hedge against unexpected misfortune. Both Warren and Fred perceive that there is a Supreme Being, God; and, further perceive, that God creates and runs everything in the universe (every single event that takes place in the world; whether that event be excellent or thoroughly undesirable, or somewhere in between these two extremes) This means, from Warren's and Fred's perspective, that whenever a given misfortune occurs God causes it to exist; and he brings that misfortune into existence, in order to guide the humans, who are impacted by that misfortune, toward more successful living. As soon as any human, who experiences a misfortune, heeds the hint and returns to obeying of God's will, God removes that misfortune. Furthermore, all humans who process misfortunes as was just suggested, will experience their lives becoming more rewarding and fulfilling once the misfortune is gone, compared to how their lives were prior to when the misfortune first appeared. Warren and Fred are clear that God is the epitome of love; so, everything God does, he does for the benefit of humankind.*

Warren and Fred have experienced much misfortunes in their personal lives. And, the vast majority of those individual misfortunes eventually turned into significant long term benefits (the ones that were properly processed, of course). Based on all those experiences, they now follow a specific process with each misfortune that appears: a negative event shows up in some area of your life;

you notice it, and immediately realize that you have been avoiding some opportunity; you put no effort into fixing the negative event; and, instead, you immediately begin to look for a new approach to some area of your life, an approach that you had never previously considered; and you keep looking for a new approach, until all of your life is back to being rewarding and successful. You will not, in many cases, ever become consciously aware of what was the opportunity you were avoiding, at the time the misfortune appeared. But that is not important. What is important, is that you process the upset by looking for a new opportunity, and spend no time fixing that apparent difficulty. In addition, please be clear, that the new opportunity doesn't have to be related to the area in which the misfortune initially appeared.

Warren and Fred, based on a review of their lives, have concluded the following: all maturity, all increased personal development, all expanded horizons, all new levels of excellence and thorough enjoyment, that they have individually accomplished, arose out of properly processed misfortunes. Therefore, Warren and Fred now know that misfortunes are a regular part of any project or situation. Life has also taught them, that all misfortunes, that are properly processed, will not require more money, nor more effort, nor more time, than what is available. So, they never attempt to set up ways to avoid misfortune; and they never set up ways to compensate for misfortunes. Hence, they never voluntarily purchase any form of insurance: health insurance, car insurance, home owner's insurance, disability insurance, credit card insurance, liability insurance, theft insurance, and so forth.

*But, having presented all of this, the facts are that almost all the owners of locations and stages and equipment supply houses, that exist in the movie industry, require insurance: liability insurance by everyone, and equipment replacement insurance by the vendors who rent equipment. In such cases, Warren and Fred obtain the required insurance. But they would never use that insurance policy to pay for any expenses they incurred during the production process.)**

Now let us further explore credit. In all well run businesses, only a few people have the authority to write a check, or use a credit card, to make a purchase for that business. But, during production, it is often impossible for those few people to be present every time an item is picked up. Therefore, having credit, with all the various providers, makes for running an efficient business. This credit is not obtained so there can be long delays in reimbursing providers, because Phosphorus Alights pays its bills as they arrive in the office. The credit is obtained, more so that one person at the home office can pay all the bills at regular intervals. This approach also greatly simplifies bookkeeping, compared to the bookkeeping that is required when there are dozens and dozens of petty cash expenditures.

11. Finish the production schedule. At this point in the process, the production schedule describes the number of days each stage phase will take (that calculation having been done back in point 9). Here in point 11, you determine how many days it will take to do the non-stage segments

of the production period: the rehearsals, the location days, and the days needed to return all the rented items at the end of shooting the movie. The actual calendar dates, for any one day in the schedule, still aren't assigned, because that step comes latter.

12. The reading session. This event can occur, as soon as enough actors have been signed to fill all the speaking roles, and the script is ready for its final draft; (both of those actions having been described back in step 2). And, during this reading session, the actors are assigned to their specific roles. Now, in the status quo, role assignment almost always occurs via someone's personal choice (a star is powerful enough to select her own movies, and what role she will play in that movie; or a specific actor is chosen by the director or producer), or via auditions (many actors show up at a location and read lines, and then the casting director and the director and the producer selects who plays what role). Personal choice is totally unacceptable to Warren and Fred, because all personal choices come out of an agenda; and they never make a choice based on an agenda (they make all their decisions by following the inner impulses they individually receive). And auditions are equally unacceptable, because that process requires clairvoyance. Why do Warren and Fred believe this latter point?

Let us review the audition process. Warren and Fred interviewed hundreds of actors over the past four and one half years. And every single one of them agreed with the following premise: one's performance in an audition (which, by definition, occurs without any role preparation having taken place) is never predictive of one's performance after extensive role preparation (studying the character, memorizing the lines, rehearsing extensively, and then having the performance take place on a real set). Therefore, the audition process cannot predict how the actors will perform when the movie is filmed. So, any casting choices that are based on auditions have to be clairvoyant.

Warren and Fred know they are not clairvoyant, and know they don't want to make any decisions based on personal preference. So, once they were clear about the actual potential of auditions, they knew they had to find another way to cast the actors in Phosphorus Alights projects. What were they to do? They chose a procedure that has been used in the theater for ages: first sign all the actors that are needed to cast all the roles; and then assign the specific roles during a reading session, which all the cast attends. Now, because the actors are signed on a first come : first serve basis, there is no guarantee you will sign males and females, in the same male : female ratio as was written into the script. But Warren and Fred have faith that God will ensure that it all works out in the end. And in the making of *The Empiricist*, that's exactly what took place. By the time the final draft is written, you know the sex of the actor who has been assigned to each role; and the final draft is written with that information in mind.

Once sufficient numbers of actors have been signed, (there is an actor for each role), a reading session is scheduled. And is attended by all the signed actors and Warren and Fred. Following is what should happen at that meeting. Pick the first role in the script, and have all the actors who wish to read for that role come to the front of the room. Have all the actors who came forward read the same

lines (lines that come from the dialogue that character will speak in the movie). Once all these actors have read the assigned lines, they return to their original seats; and everyone who is present, including the actors who just read for the part, votes. Have it be a secret vote, by having everyone close their eyes except for the person who counts the votes. The actor who receives the most votes is assigned that role. Repeat the process for the second character in the script. And, so on, until all the roles have been cast.

Now, technically, each voting person uses as much guess work in this approach, as occurs in the audition process. But, with this approach, no one person gets to consciously grant a position. By having everyone vote with their eyes closed, God is allowed to choose who plays what role. Incidentally, this is the method by which the actors were assigned roles in *The Empiricist*; and that movie is almost completely finished at the time this document is being written. Having seen *The Empiricist* many times, Warren and Fred are of the opinion, that everyone played their role in an acceptable manner, and many played their roles quite competently. So the process works.

Before the reading session is over, a feedback session is scheduled.

**(At this point, it is relevant to describe how Phosphorus Alights schedules meetings. Each meeting is scheduled for a date that everyone has free (no previous engagements have been planned as of yet). Let us use “The Empiricist”’s reading day as an example. Somewhere close to December 5, 2000, the 34th actor was signed; 34 being the number of actors that were needed for the production. Immediately all the cast was called. And each person was asked to list all the work days she had free for the next two to three months; and, further, to not accept any appointments for those days during the next few days. As soon as everyone was heard from, which was within 24 to 48 hours, the first day that everyone had free was then set-up as the reading day; which turned out to be about six weeks latter (January 22, 2001). All of the actors were then called and informed of the January 22 date.*

*By choosing meetings in this manner, Phosphorus Alights never inconveniences anyone; nor requires anyone to break a previous agreement. And, yet, Phosphorus Alights’ projects take no more time overall, than the lengths of status quo independent movie projects (all of which involved deadlines, and frequent inconveniences, and frequent broken agreements).)**

13. The feedback session. This session lasts five days (Monday through Friday); and during those five days, each scene in the movie is reviewed. And, during each scene’s review, all of the actors who play characters in that scene are present, along with the screenwriter, the cinematographer, and the co-owner of Phosphorus Alights who is assigned to administer that movie. First the actors read through the scene. Then each person who is present is asked to present any comments she has about the scene: what is good about the scene as it has been written, as well as what doesn’t work; what can improve the scene; and what specific dialogue should be eliminated or added. After the en-

tire feedback session is over, the screenwriter then writes the final draft of the script.

There was a feedback session for *The Empiricist*. And the improvement in the final draft was phenomenal: when you compare the final draft, to the draft that existed just prior to the feedback session. Given this experience, Phosphorus Alights will **ALWAYS** have a feedback session, for every movie they make. Here again, the collective wisdom of the ensemble had a beneficial impact on the final story.

13. Decide on the production dates. After the final draft of the script is written each actor is sent a copy. And, then, a meeting is arranged, that includes the entire cast and crew; and called *the production scheduling meeting*. The purpose of this meeting is to set the calendar dates for the production schedule. During the meeting everyone is asked, “what is the first 20 week period you have free? (The 20 weeks figure used here was the length of *The Empiricist*’s production period; but this time period, in all likelihood, will be different for each movie project). The first 20 week period everyone is free becomes the production phase of the movie. There is one variable here, and that is the length of time it takes for the actors to memorize their lines. The first day of the production period is the first day of rehearsal; and by the first day of rehearsal each actor must have all his lines memorized. Now, all the actors were sent the final draft of the script, before this meeting is scheduled; and the date of this meeting is probably several weeks after each actor received that final draft; and the first day of the chosen 20 week period will probably be weeks after this meeting. Consequently, the first 20 week period that everyone has free, will probably not commence until all the actors have had enough time to memorize their lines. But, make sure, that the beginning of the production period doesn’t start, until all the actors have sufficient time to complete their memorization responsibilities.

Once the production time period has been chosen, everyone writes in each relevant calendar date on their individual schedules. This way, from that day on, everyone knows exactly what dates they are due at rehearsals, or at the stage, or at the locations. During the making of *The Empiricist*, the production scheduling meeting was held on May 20, 2001, the first day of rehearsal was July 30, the first day of shooting was September 19, and the last day of shooting was December 14.

As soon as this meeting is over, you begin to establish the final arrangements with all the locations, and all the equipment (and set decor item) rental houses; and finish all the administrative tasks that are required to make the movie.

:—————:

B. The Production Phase. During this phase, the movie is rehearsed and then shot. This period ends once all the rented items, that are used while shooting the movie, have been returned.

1. Have rehearsals. When Warren and Fred made their two shorts, the actors rehearsed until each actor was fully ready to be filmed. The length of those rehearsals was then compared to the length of the short. And that comparison revealed the following relationship: 1 hour and twenty four minutes of rehearsal for each minute of screen time. As an example, if a scene lasts five minutes in the movie, then that scene requires 1 hour and 24 minutes $\times 5 = 7$ hours of rehearsal time. Rehearsals are divided into three separate sections, each of which lasts two weeks. And each scene in the entire movie is reviewed during each of those two week sections.

When each actor show up for the first day of rehearsal, she is to have memorized all her lines, and have written and memorized a *gesture script*. A gesture script describes each significant gesture and facial expression (the gestures and facial expressions that convey aspects of the story), that actor will manifest while playing her character. Warren and Fred developed the idea of a gesture script, after they had become aware of the following phenomena:

(i) In Phosphorus Alights' model almost all camera paths extend from the beginning to the end of the scene without stop.

(ii) At some point, Warren and Fred decided they did not want close-ups in their movies: a *close-up* being the movie terminology for a movie-shot in which the actor's face fills the whole screen. They object to close-ups, because they perceive that such movie-shots tell you nothing about the environment that surrounds the actor. And they perceive the environment as being quite important, in communicating the full story to the viewers. As an example, compare these two shots:

(a) The movie-shot opens and all you can see is the actor sitting with his arms squeezed into his sides, and his legs squeezed together. Then the camera pulls back, and reveals that the actor is on a crowded subway car.

(b) The movie-shot opens with the actor in the identical posture as in (a); but when the camera pulls back it reveals that the actor is sitting alone in the middle of a large sofa.

In (a), you, as a viewer, would not assume that the actor's posture provided you with any information regarding his character's personality. Whereas, in (b), you would assume that the actor's posture tells you much about his character's personality. In almost all the movie-shots in Phosphorus Alights' productions, the camera is far enough away from the actors, so the viewer can see the environment that surrounds each actor. And, often, the camera is back far enough, that more than one actor can be seen in the shot.

(iii) A camera sees much less than the human eye; and, as a result, for the viewers to be in-

formed of all that occurs in a given scene, in the movie there is a need to regularly switch (“cut” in movie industry terminology) from one aspect of the scene to another. And this cutting can reveal continuity mistakes, if any are present. An example being: actor H is rubbing his chin just before a cut, and rubbing his knee just after the cut; and both movie-shots are presented as happening at the same time. Whenever a continuity mistake is present, it is always because an actor did not have identical behaviors before and after each cut. Remember, what you see on the screen before a cut comes from a film-shot, let us call it film-shot G. And what you see on the screen, after the same cut, comes from different film-shot, which we will call film-shot H. And please further remember, that film-shot G and film-shot H were, probably, shot hours apart.

(iv) Each camera path extends throughout the entire scene. And, although, the goal is to capture each camera path’s material in one take, there may be times, for a given camera path, where more than one take is necessary. Also, because each camera path captures images from a unique perspective; a set wall(s) that is present in one film-shot, may have to be moved to make way for the camera path of another film-shot. And the same with set decor items. Moving walls and set decor items takes time; which adds to the total time it takes to film all the material associated with a particular scene.

Given all of this, the time that transpires between filming the first take of the first camera path of a given scene, and filming the last take of the last camera path of that scene can be many hours. And, yet, each actor who plays in that scene, to avoid the aforementioned continuity mistakes, has to, at each similar moment of the scene, express identical words and gestures in all the camera paths.

If you combine the information presented in points (i) through (iv); it becomes obvious, that for each actor to have identical performances in all the takes of a given scene, that actor has to have all his lines and facial expressions and gestures indelibly recorded in his mind, prior to the shooting day for that scene.

Some of you readers might want to interject at this point: what is so bad about a few inconsistencies in some actor’s performances from time to time; why should that be a major problem? Can’t you just cut where there are no continuity mistakes? Reasonable questions, but questions that don’t consider how frequently continuity mistakes would occur, if extensive rehearsals were not done, and if gesture scripts were not required. There is a rule of human behavior that is relevant here. Which is, what you do not take into consideration will never take place. If extensive rehearsals were not done, and gesture scripts were not required, there would be much inconsistency in the majority of the actor’s performances. And those large numbers of inconsistencies would significantly limit, the picture editor’s ability to place the cuts where they would be most effective. And the movie would then be much less entertaining, then it could have been with the proper cuts.

Let us refer to *The Empiricist* as an example. For that movie, extensive rehearsals were held, and

gesture scripts were required. And, yet, in many of the scenes, there were upwards of ten to twenty times where the ideal cut was not made; because, in each such case, making the cut at that location would have produced too jarring of a continuity mistake, for the audience to enjoy the movie. If hundreds of cuts (throughout an entire movie) were not able to be made, even after extensive rehearsals took place and everyone showed up at the initial rehearsal with a gesture script; it is eminently rational, and logical, to presume, that there would have been many more continuity mistakes if just a few rehearsals had occurred and no gesture scripts were done.

A further issue. Each stage of the movie reveals to you even more information, as to how that movie can be optimally done. This doesn't mean, that you get to, in each successful stage, invent a whole new movie (as the status quo often does). It means, that, in each successive stage, you become more clear about how to further refine the movie. Now, relative to the editing stage, you can't know ahead of time (you can't know back during the shooting stage of the movie), where the cuts should go in each scene to have the movie be as refined as is possible. Therefore, as the movie is being edited, the picture editor must have the freedom to place the cuts wherever he feels lead to do so. To have actor performance inconsistency happen often, can significantly limit a movie. And such an outcome would be unfortunate. Now, when the status quo makes a movie, the majority of shots are close-ups and medium close-ups; and such shots, typically, only portray one actor at a time. And, therefore, in status quo productions, the continuity mistake that have been referred to up to now rarely arise.

So, each actor is supposed to arrive at the first day of rehearsal with his script gesture written out and memorized; as well as having his lines memorized. Now, why do the lines need to be memorized by that first day? Because the entire rehearsal time should be available to fully refine the performances. And no performance can begin to be refined, until after an actor thoroughly knows her lines. During the first two week period (remember rehearsals are broken up into three periods, each of which lasts two weeks), everyone's gesture scripts are discussed; and the staging is discussed; and fairly firm decisions are made in regard to how the actors will interact with each other. During the second two week period, those initial decisions are refined; and each scene is videotaped and watched. During the rehearsals that were held for *The Empiricist*, most of the actors concluded the following: watching a videotape of the rehearsals helped them in refining their performances. During the third two week period, all the elements of the performances are finalized. Videotaping is also available on the sets during the filming days, in case the actors want a final review before each scene is finally filmed.

Phosphorus Alights has several goals for the rehearsal period. First, is to have the actors arrive at appropriate performances prior to the starting of the filming period. Second, have no rehearsals be needed on the actual sets; except for the rehearsing that is necessary so the actors can familiarize themselves with the set, (rehearsals occur in raw space, with little to none of the final set dressing items present). Third, have the actors will be so adept in their individual performances, so that once filming commences almost all camera paths can be captured in one take. Warren and Fred don't assume they will only shoot one take for every camera path that is shot in the movie; but they want to have as many camera paths as possible require only one take. All three of these goals allow the

shooting of the movie to be done quite efficiently.

In status quo productions, few if any rehearsals occur. And, when rehearsals do occur, they most often take place on the set just before the scene is shot. And, once the actual filming takes place, many takes are shot for each camera path. This is wasteful, and sub-par, for several reasons. One, it is much cheaper to pay for salaries and rehearsal hall rentals during the rehearsal period, then to pay rehearsal costs while paying the costs of a full production set-up: stage or location rental, equipment rentals, crew salaries, and so forth. Two; and Warren and Fred are emphatic about this, and ask any actor you know if you disbelieve Warren's and Fred's position; all actors will perform superiorly if they fully prepare ahead of time, compared to how they perform if all rehearsals take place just before the final shooting of a scene. **(This is a law of nature: all actions that are appropriate are vastly superior to actions that are inappropriate, regardless of the intentions of the participants.)**

Here are some statistics on how much film is shot when features are made, that will provide additional insights into the rehearsal issue. On the average studio feature production, a million feet of film is shot: that is 184 hours of recorded action, for what will end up, typically, a two hour film (a shooting ratio of 92:1). The average independent film shoots 85,000 feet of film: which is a little less than 16 hours of recorded action, for what ends up, typically, a 100 minute film (a shooting ratio of 9.5:1). Phosphorus Alights shot approximately 47,000 feet of film (a little less than nine hours of footage), and ended up with a two hour and forty minute film (a shooting ratio of 3.5:1). Warren and Fred are convinced, that the major reason their shooting ratio is significantly less than the typical independent film, and much much less than the typical studio film, was because of their rehearsals were lengthy and took place prior to the filming. Here is some additional information. The raw negative (unexposed film, which is called "film stock") cost about 50¢ per foot. Therefore, film stock for the average studio movie is $1,000,000 \times 50\text{¢} = \$500,000.00$; and for the typical independent film is $85,000 \times 50\text{¢} = \$46,750.00$; and, for *The Empiricist*, Phosphorus Alights' film stock costs were \$23,500.00.

In actuality, Phosphorus Alights film stock prices were only \$8,400.00. Because they shot with super 16mm film stock, instead of the 35mm film stock that most independent movies, and all, with very rare exception, studios movies use. And super 16mm film stock, for the same shooting time, costs only 1/3 of 35mm film stock. The prices that were quoted for Phosphorus Alights in the preceding paragraph, were the prices Phosphorus Alights would have paid if they had shot *The Empiricist* using 35mm film stock.

So, extensive rehearsals add to the quality of performance, and also produce a significant savings in film stock costs. Now, in addition to the rehearsal process resulting in considerable savings, the Phosphorus Alights' model results in significant savings in all areas of making a feature movie. In almost every area where a cost comparison is available, Phosphorus Alights spent about one 25th of what the status quo typically spends. Here are two examples:

(A) The logo. Shortly after the company was started, Warren and Fred decided that a logo

would be a valuable asset. They worked with two graphic artists and created the logo you saw on the first page of this web site. The total cost of producing the logo was around \$1,500.00. Prior to working with Warren and Fred, those two graphic artists had produced many logos for other companies. And, according to those two artists, in every one of those previous endeavors the cost was in excess of \$50,000.00, and often over \$100,000.00. Same item (a logo), same artists, but major differences in the approach that was followed to obtain that item.

What was the difference? Warren and Fred repeatedly asked themselves, as the process unfolded, what was the true value of a logo; and went with the inspiration, that came as an answer each time they asked that question. The status quo always pursues an agenda (what the business owner personally prefers). And all people who pursue agendas are inherently insecure; and out of that insecurity are continually indecisive. That indecisiveness produces many unnecessary steps.

(B) In *The Empiricist*, there are two scenes that involve Winston (the lead character), and Chester (the hospital microbiologist). In the second of those two scenes, Winston and Chester view a video tape of an experiment, that Chester (supposedly) conducted for Winston. What appears on the screen is an actual experiment: one that was done, and videotaped through the lens of a microscope, by a marine biologist Warren and Fred contacted.

When Warren and Fred first considered doing this experiment, they searched for companies that do such projects. Eventually, they were referred to a company in London, England; a company that repeatedly does work for major movie studios, and major television production companies. A company that was considered to be the premiere company in the world in this area. That company worked up a proposal for Phosphorus Alights, which came to \$120,000.00. Warren and Fred immediately realized, as soon as they read the proposal, that such a cost was far too excessive for a minor aspect of the movie. So they took it upon themselves to find a knowledgeable individual to conduct the experiment. They found such a person; and the total cost for the experiment, including videotaping it, was less than \$2,000.00.

2. Begin the actual filming. When *The Empiricist* was filmed, the sound stage scenes were filmed first and then the location scenes were filmed. Warren and Fred decided on this order, because they fully expected many problems to show up; especially in the beginning of the shooting period. *(*This is the same issue as was discussed in relationship to misfortunes and insurance: point 10 of the pre-production period.*)* They further assumed, that whatever problems arose, they could be more effectively resolved in the sound stage environment, then in the location environment. (When you are on location, all of your equipment is on a few trucks —only one truck and one bus in the case of *The Empiricist*—; and the amount of equipment is limited to the bare minimum need-

ed, so as to exercise good stewardship and efficiency).

The first day you arrive on the stage, you begin construction of the phase one sets; and then you continue doing the tasks that are described on the production calendar, five days per week (excluding national holidays), every week, until the last shot of the movie is filmed and all the rented equipment is returned. Incidentally, during the filming stage, there are several ways in which the Phosphorus Alights' model differs from how the status quo makes movies:

(i) Warren and Fred do not consider themselves responsible for the cast's and crew's food. They offer free snacks and fruit and beverages on the set, but expect the cast and crew to pay for their own meals. However, they do make sure reasonably priced, nutritious food is available near the set; and further make sure, that a refrigerator and microwave are available at the shooting location, for those people who wish to bring a pack lunch. The basis for their position is good business practice. No effectively run small business, which is exactly what Phosphorus Alights is, pays for its employees meals during regular working hours. Status quo productions pay exorbitant salaries, and then provide free food all day long: a major expense (often over \$1,000.00 per day).

(ii) Work days are scheduled to last eight hours or less; and no more. And are only scheduled Monday through Friday. Warren trained as a physician; and, during that training, had extensive experience with long work hours. He is crystal clear, that once you start working longer than eight hours per day you begin to diminish your capacity to work effectively. He is also clear, that working more than five days per week has the same detrimental effect, as working more than eight hours per day. Warren and Fred have the desire, that everyone, who is involved in the project, will be as enthusiastic about the work day the morning they rise out of bed on the last day of the shoot, as how enthusiastic they were when they first heard about the project.

During the shooting of *The Empiricist*, very few work days extended past eight hours. And the majority of the work days lasted less than eight hours. Throughout the 14 weeks of the filming stage, there were three Saturdays on which some people worked; but none of these Saturday work days extended longer than six hours. Now, during the shooing days on most studio movies, everyone works greater than 12 hour days, and often work up to 20 hours each production day. And shooting is done six days per week, and many times, seven days per week. This approach to work exhausts everyone involved. As an example. Warren and Fred took a production course from a very experienced movie maker; who stated during the course, that he took a four to six week vacation after every movie project, because he was totally exhausted.

(iii) **Absolutely no specialization.** Warren's and Fred's objections to specialization were referred to back in points 1 and 3(a) of the Pre-production phase. Here are a few most

thoughts on that issue.

- (a) On status quo productions, almost everyone specializes into quite narrow job categories: an example being that there are people who only work on draperies. The size of the crews on studio movies number in the hundreds, and are forty or more on most independent movies. On Phosphorus Alights projects, each crew member works on all aspects of the shooting stage: construction and painting, set dressing, lighting, shooting, and striking the sets. And, during the making of *The Empiricist*, there were only eight people on the crew throughout the entire movie. The only time more than eight persons worked as crew, were when two additional people worked on the truck that picked up and dropped off furnishings for the set decor. Non-specialization costs much less money.
- (b) Warren claims, that workers who specialize cannot have a fulfilling experience while working. And he defends that position with the following. When a person specializes, that person focuses on a narrow portion of the overall project; thereby having no way to tell if his actions are facilitating the success of the overall project. Anytime a worker is unaware of how his actions impact the overall project, his actions are bound to limit the overall project.

Why? Because this is what always happens. This is an omnipresent aspect of human beings. Perhaps an analogy would be informative. When a person first drives a car, the car wobbles all over the road; and does so, because that person is holding tightly to the wheel, over correcting each slight movement he notices; not focusing on the road ahead, and not driving in a relaxed manner. So, focus on the whole = the details take care of themselves and the overall outcome is optimized. God is responsible for this phenomenon. He wants all humans to focus on the overall picture of each endeavor they enter. And to have this focus, even if they are, as the saying goes, “working in the mail room”. Whenever a person doesn’t focus on the overall picture, God puts limitations in that person’s life; along with ensuring, that person’s work outputs are way less optimal.

Warren also claims, that all humans who focus on details, instead of focusing on the overall picture, do so deliberately. And they do so, because an accurate noticing of the overall picture would fatally threaten that person’s preferred view of that situation (or of his life in general). Each person has to focus on something in every activity he does. And if the overall picture is not to a person’s liking, then focusing on the details will occur.

- (c) The making of *The Empiricist* validates the value of the overall picture. This movie is a superior movie, compared to how it was visualized when the story was initially conceived. And, given what was learned during the making of *The Empiricist*,

Warren and Fred are convinced their next movie will be superior to this current one. But, this movement toward superiority only takes place, when everyone involved considers all of their individual work choices within the context of the overall project.

(d) Warren and Fred have spoken to, and heard or read interviews of, many status quo moviemakers (people creatively involved in some phase of making a movie); and, without exception, every single one of those people stated, that the release print of his movie was significantly inferior, compared to what that moviemaker assumed the movie would become when he was first exposed to the project. Warren and Fred admit, that the absence of resolution in status quo projects contributes to such movies being inferior. But, they insist, the specialization that is present on all such projects is a major contributor as well.

(e) Each worker, who specializes, experiences work as an increasingly confining experience.

Specializing has no benefits associated with it; and, therefore, will never occur on a Phosphorus Alights project.

(iv) No contingency plans. This position was mentioned back in the discussion on insurance (point 10 of the pre-production phase); but here are some additional thoughts on the issue. In the status quo approach to movie making, there are always plans made for alternative shooting locations. For example, interior sets are held on standby, for those times when the weather makes it impossible to carry out the scheduled exterior shooting. Warren and Fred never obtain insurance (a type of contingency plan), never have contingency plans. Based on their philosophy, they search for the principles that lead to a worthy product; then they follow those principles without compromise, trusting that God runs everything; expecting God to determine if a particular scene is necessary.

During the making of *The Empiricist*, every single day of shooting took place on the exact calendar date that was scheduled during the production scheduling meeting, held on May 20, 2001; that date being many months before the actual production commenced in September, 2001. The schedule was also maintained during the three weeks of location shooting. There was dialogue recording that took place on a day, after the filming was over; because the tape recorder completely malfunctioned that final day. But, in the post-production sound editing process, it was decided to re-record that scene's dialogue in the studio; so, that extra day's work was never used in the movie.

Warren and Fred are open to shooting additional footage, after the production period is over; or, on the occasional Saturday during the production period, if their impulses tell them

to do so. But they do not set up contingency plans.

:—————:

C. The Post-production Phase. All the desired images have been filmed, and all the actors' dialogue has been recorded; and it is now time to review that material, and produce the release print that will be shown in the cinemas. This phase is over when the release print comes into existence.

1. **Edit the picture.** Picture editing, as was described earlier, involves looking at all the images that were filmed; then picking which movie-shots (each one of which is a segment of one of the film-shots that were recorded when the movie was filmed), you want to be in the release print; and then arranging those movie-shots into the sequence, that best tells the story. In other words, editing the picture is about refining the story. Now, the screenwriter writes the story, and the picture editor provides the final refinement of the story. Is it realistic that those two skills stem from significantly different mind-sets? Warren and Fred say not! They claim that both skills stem from the same mind-set (the mind-set of a story teller). And they further claim, that since they are from the same mind-set, the screenwriter is eminently qualified to edit the picture.

It is true, that picture editing involves some technical skills: operating a flatbed, or a moviola, when the editing is done using a film print; and operating a computer editing system, if the editing is done

digitally. But, those technical skills can be learned by anyone who applies himself; just as how most writers learned to use a computer, when they switched from writing by hand, or by typing, and moved to a word processor. Creative skills, authentic ones that is, develop out of talent, which is always given by God. Warren and Fred propose, that anyone who is talented as a screenwriter can learn the technical skills that are involved in editing a motion picture.

In the status quo model, the picture editor is rarely the screenwriter, and rarely has any writing background; typically being a person who was first trained as an assistant editor (a person who handles all the basic mechanical, non-creative, work of the editing process); also, being a person who focuses exclusively on editing pictures (that is her only task in the movie business). And the people who specialize in picture editing defend their specialization; by claiming, that directors and producers and screenwriters become too emotionally involved in the movie to be objective during the picture editing process. Throughout the movie industry there exists the assumption, that the picture editing process is an opportunity to make a completely different movie (tell a completely different story), compared to the story that was told by the script; if the director and producer and picture editor are dissatisfied, when they first review what was filmed. And this last phenomenon, completely changing the movie during the editing process, occurs far more often than the general public may realize.

Warren and Fred are adamant, that each of their release prints tells the story that was generated when the script was written. And are further adamant, that their sole focus, throughout the entire movie-making process, is to enhance the original story as much as they are capable. Their focus is never to produce their agendas. As a result of this focus of theirs, they are never attached to any part of the movie; and, therefore, are never “too emotionally involved in the picture to be objective”; and have no “blindness”, within them, that prohibits them from perceiving what would be an optimal release print. In empiricism, the life philosophy to which both Warren and Fred are committed, you maintain the original goal, in each and every individual project, until that project is complete. You never change a goal mid-way through a project, and that includes making a movie.

By the way, the picture editing process typically takes place in a computer. All the images are imported into the computer, the individual film shots are selected, and then arranged into the final sequence.

A few words here about optimal picture editing. One, always introduce each scene, in a manner that allows the audience to be clear about that scene’s context (the environment in which that scene takes place). Two, recognize that cutting to specific aspects of the scene, at particular times, can significantly stimulate the audience to be involved in the story. Watch for those aspects, and cut to them as they occur. Another way of describing this point: always cut to the aspect of the scene, which most fully communicates the story at that moment. Three, use your cuts to vary what the viewer focuses on. And to assist you in understanding this point, notice how much you change your focus the next time you are interacting with a group. Four, cut as frequently you need to, so as to keep the viewer informed of everything that is happening in the scene. Five, consider the possibility, that the most

interesting aspect of a scene, that is happening at a given moment, may not be the actor who is speaking: it may be the response of another actor to the actor who is speaking; and it may be a non-human item that is part of the set. Six, if a particular film-shot (a particular camera path) shows all the essential action of the scene, all at the same time, feel comfortable remaining with that shot: in other words, feel comfortable having no cuts occur for an extended period of time.

2. Cut the negative. After the picture sequence is finalized, the picture editor creates lists to send to the negative cutter: which are called a “cut lists”. These lists tell the negative cutter where to cut the original negative, (so that all the movie-shots created in the editing process, now exists in the original negative); and further tells the negative cutter, the order in which to splice those segments together (so as to create a final sequence that is made of segments from the original negative, that matches the sequence that was decided on during the editing process).

3. Edit the sound. After the picture editing is finished, the picture editor also creates lists to send to the sound editor, which are called EDL's (edit decision lists); which tell the sound editor, how to match up the dialogue on the production sound tapes, (which were recorded when the movie was filmed), to the picture sequence that was chosen during picture editing. In the movie industry, this matching process is called “conforming the sound to picture”. After the sound is conformed to picture, the sound editor works on the dialogue, to get it to be clear as possible. Plus, she creates all the environmental sounds that will appear in the movie's sound track: sounds that give the movie viewer the impression, that the movie takes place in a real-life situation.

When you film a movie, each time you film the action (with a camera) you record the dialogue (with a tape recorder). So, for film-shot #1, there is an associated sound tape #1; and for film-shot #2, there is an associated sound tape #2; and so forth. Now, as was presented previously, each scene in the final movie is made up of movie-shots, all of which are taken from the different film-shots. As an example, first there is movie-shot #1 (a segment from film-shot #2), then movie-shot #2 (a segment from film-shot #1), then #3 (from film-shot #4) and so forth. In a perfect world, the dialogue that is recorded with a specific film-shot, (say the dialogue from sound tape #2, which was recorded when film-shot #2 was filmed), would be the dialogue the movie viewer would hear whenever film-shot #2 images appeared on the screen. But, as you all know, the world is not perfect. And, often, when doing the sound editing for a movie, the dialogue that is associated with the image on the screen (in this case, dialogue from sound tape #2), is not all that clear. Whereas, those exact lines of dialogue on another sound tape, (say, sound tape #4), are quite clear.

The tools available to sound editors in current times, allow much manipulation that can't be detected by the movie viewers: lengthening words, changing the pitch of the human voice, adding room sounds that make a voice sound quite different than how it sounded on the original sound tape, and so forth. So, in a case, like the one described in the last sentences of the previous paragraph, the sound editor will put dialogue from sound tape #4, in place of the dialogue from sound tape #2; and

then manipulate that sound, until it sounds natural for those images from film-shot #2. Now, if there are environmental sounds on sound tape #2, they are, almost all the time, going to be different from the environmental sounds that exist on sound tape #4; primarily, because, even though both tapes were recorded at the same location, they were recorded a few hours apart. And the environmental sounds of any one location, at two different times, are never the same; (even on the same day). Environmental sounds are very difficult to manipulate, if they are on the same sound tape as the dialogue. So, most of the time that environmental sounds are on dialogue sound tapes, the sound editor's choices become quite limited. Therefore, to facilitate effective sound editing, you want as few environmental sounds as possible on your production sound tapes.

4. Select the release print's colors and density. A well exposed negative, which hopefully was achieved while filming the movie, offers tremendous variation in regard to the prints that are made in the film laboratory (the prints that will be shown in the cinemas); in terms of the colors and the density (clarity) of the objects which appear in those prints. Now, Phosphorus Alights' policy, regarding color, is to have the visual images of its release prints look as life-like as possible. And its policy, in regard to the density of the objects, is to have each object look as clear as it can. The process of selecting the release print's color and density of objects is called "doing an answer print". Warren and Fred discovered, during the answer print process of *The Empiricist*, that this is a quite sophisticated process. If the timing settings are not appropriate you get unnatural colors (which can make both the actors and the environment look different from real life); and, worse, poor timing settings can produce a blurred picture.

5. Blow up the negative to 35mm, and add all the opticals. Phosphorus Alights shoots its movies with super 16mm film stock, and, then for the release print, enlarges that super 16mm negative to a 35mm negative (which is called *blowing up the film*). Most studio movies are shot on 35mm film stock. Those numbers (16 and 35) refers to the width, in millimeters, of each frame of film; they do not refer to the quality of the film stock (super 16mm film stock can record images, almost as excellently as can 35mm film stock; whatever differences that do exist, not being identifiable to the vast majority of movie viewers). Warren and Fred chose to shoot with super 16mm film stock, because it costs significantly less than 35mm film stock; and, also, because (in their opinion) their 35mm release prints, that are produced when they blow-up their original super 16mm negative, look as excellent as the release prints of movies which were originally shot on 35mm film stock.

Here is a brief cost comparison; using the footage figures from the making of *The Empiricist*. The initial cost of the film stock, plus the cost of all the film processing, up through, and including, the first release print that can be shown in a cinema (a 35mm release print), totaled approximately \$58,700.00. If they had shot the movie using 35mm film, that cost would have been \$81,816.00. An even greater disparity between the two formats exists, if you shoot a movie that is going straight to television. There, the super 16mm approach for *The Empiricist* would have cost \$24,404.00; and the 35mm equivalent would have cost \$69,288.00.

After the answer print process is over, a super 16mm IP (“interpositive”) is made. An IP being the transition stage that is created, whenever a duplicate negative is made: original negative → IP → IN (duplicate negative). If you intend to have more than one or two release prints, you always get an IN (duplicate negative) made. Because the original negative, which was made from the processing the original film stock, has a soft emulsion (the chemical layers that record the image; which lay on top of the acetate—which is the structural base for the film stock—). Those soft emulsions degenerate quickly, when the processed negative is run through the printer to make prints. The emulsion of the IN’s are quite tough, and can make over 600 prints before they began to deteriorate.

After the film stock is exposed, it is processed to create the original negative. Which is used in the initial answer print process (determining the colors and densities of the release prints). Then, once the answer print process is over, a super 16mm IP is made, which is then sent to an optical house: a place that makes all the cuts you see in a movie (fades and dissolves and wipes; as well as titles and special effects and sub-titles). At the optical house, the titles are added and the film is blown up to 35mm, using an optical camera. An optical camera has two source lens, and one recording lens. One source lens projects the super 16mm IP, and the other source lens projects any titles or such, that are to be in the release print; and the recording lens captures all those images onto a 35mm negative. That 35mm negative then goes back to the film laboratory, where another answer print process is done; this time called “a check print”. The check print is done to ensure that the 35mm release prints will have optimal images.

6. Compose and record the music of the sound track, and any songs that will be in the movie’s soundtrack. As soon as the picture editing phase is completed, a copy of the movie is sent to the composer, who then composes the music. As soon as she is done with the composing, the score is recorded. During this same time period, you need to compose, and write lyrics for, any songs with lyrics that will appear in the movie. These sound recordings are then taken to the sound editor, to be prepared for the final sound mix. You can also put songs in the movie that already exist (were recorded and sold in music stores before the movie process even started). But, realize, that in this latter case, the time and money involved in obtaining the necessary legal rights (to have those songs appear in your movie), can be quite extensive.

7. The final sound mix and the release prints. Once the final 35mm negative exists, and the sound editing is completed, and all the music for the movie is recorded, you then do the final sound mix. This is done in a large room, whose size is similar to a small theater. You go through the entire movie scene by scene, and determine exactly which sounds will appear at which points in the movie, and how loud the volume will be for all of those sounds: dialogue, environmental sounds, music, and so forth. This final mix takes close to a week or more to finish. After the mix is completed, a printmaster is created: the multi-tracks that were created during the final mix (typically four to six tracks) are reduced to two tracks.

The printmaster exists on a sound tape. And that sound tape is then taken to a transfer house: a place that transfers the information on the sound tape to a strip of acetate, that, to the uninformed eye, looks just like a film print. That acetate strip is called a “optical sound negative” (also called a “sound mag”). That optical sound negative is then taken to the film laboratory, where it is run next to the film negative, so as to create the 35mm release prints (which contain both picture and sound). Once you have sufficient release prints for your cinema release, the film negative and the print master are sent to a telecining house: where the film is transferred to a video; that is your master video, for when you make VHS video tapes, and DVD’s; that master video, also, being what you send to television networks, if your movie is to be shown somewhere on television. At this point you have a release print, which is sent to cinemas so the public can view your movie.

This completes Phosphorus Alights’ model for making a movie. You will note, that there was no discussion regarding the distribution of the movie in this model: getting cinema owners to show your movie to the public. This is because Phosphorus Alights has not yet distributed *The Empiricist*, which is the company’s first movie. After the distribution of *The Empiricist* is completed, the distribution aspects of making movies will be added to this model.

We can add here, that if you intend to self-distribute your movie, you need to create a trailer (called previews by the general public), radio and newspaper ads, and a press kit (which are now, most often, electronic —on a CD—, instead of being printed materials).