

BLUEPRINT
FOR
A NEW HOLLYWOOD

by

MORTON HEILIG

BLUEPRINT FOR A NEW HOLLYWOOD

by

Morton Heilig

PROBLEM

Hollywood's film industry is dying. All of the major studios are down to a fraction of their potential. MGM and Fox are virtually ghost towns - 75% of Hollywood's production personnel are out of work. The disease has been diagnosed as "runaway productionitis". The cure proposed - a 20% federal tax deduction for films produced in the United States. No doubt a tax deduction will relieve a few symptoms, but ultimately it will perform a disservice if it obscures the painful fact that the sickness that ails Hollywood is much more profound than runaway production (itself a symptom, not a cause). In truth, the illness has plagued the film industry from its inception, but the virtual absence of any real competition for the first 50 years of its development has enabled the film industry to survive - even flourish - despite its series-faults. Today, however, sharp competition for people's leisure time - television, bowling, billiards, travel, boating, magazines etc., plus a supply of quality foreign films produced at a fraction of Hollywood's costs, have for the first time subjected Hollywood's film industry to the stress of real competition and the chronically weak structure has collapsed.

The basic problem is that notwithstanding its penchant for flatteringly referring to itself as "The Film Industry", Hollywood isn't an "industry" and never has been one in the modern sense of the term.

A true "industry" is an area of activity that defines a direct or indirect human need - chemicals, food, transportation, clothing - and then tries to organize resources - human, technical, and financial in the most productive and efficient manner to satisfy these needs. It has continuity in management - it keeps a tight rein on costs - it generally strives for a reasonable 10-15% profit on investment (plowing much of it back into its own expansion) and tries, in the most enlightened cases, to upgrade its human and technical resources.

Since Hollywood's so called "film industry" has never done any of these things, it doesn't qualify as an industry. Perhaps as a collection of feudal fiefdoms dedicated to the care and feeding of inflated egos, or a carnival of get rich quick operators, but as an industry "no". Real industries are hurting in the current recession (business is down at General Motors, IBM and Dupont) but they are not on the verge of total collapse as is film production.

What is needed, then, is not one shot panacea (tax refund) or a short sighted "make work" program that will temporarily alleviate conditions in Hollywood, but a drastic, thoroughgoing reorganization of the basic film production process so that it will at last become a permanently vital, efficient, producing "industry" in the modern sense of the term.

What follows, then, is my "Blueprint for a New Filmmaking Industry in Hollywood". Obviously, many concerned and experienced people will make valuable additions and amendments to this blueprint, but at least this is an attempt to get beyond the "handwringing and problem pointing" with a plan for concrete, positive action.

NEED

No industry deserves to exist unless it performs a service that people need. The film industry doesn't exist to gratify the ego of producers, the narcissism of the stars, the coffers of the bankers, nor even to provide jobs for Hollywood technicians.

It exists to delight the senses, enlighten the mind and uplift the souls of its viewers.

If it does this, the average man will plunk his money down for fair value received just as he continues to buy a good loaf of bread. This simple fact is the foundation of the whole film making pyramid.

Since competing leisure activities have dramatically narrowed the box office base of the pyramid (from 92,000,000 weekly box office tickets in 1940 to 18,000,000 in 1971) it is of little wonder that empires are crumbling.

The real solution to Hollywood's problem is not in grabbing a larger share of the existing (18,000,000 ticket) pie - thereby merely shifting the unemployment to New York, Paris or Rome, but in making the pie bigger. If the intellectual, emotional and spiritual needs of the American people were fulfilled, enlarging the pie would be virtually impossible. But the fact is that intellectually Americans are woefully ignorant of how to cope with the complex problems of life in a technological society (nuclear warfare, automation, physical and psychological pollution, racial strife, population explosion etc.) - emotionally their life is arid and lacking in joy, and spiritually, Americans are afflicted with an agonizing sense of alienation from their fellow men, their society, their planet and their universe. Thus, the need is great, and one of the most powerful means of filling this need is intelligent, inspired, committed films! - i. e., the kind that a true Hollywood film industry can and should produce.

TO ENLARGE THE MARKET OUTLET FOR FILMMAKING TALENT....

Hollywood should:

1. Produce Quality Films that are not merely action packed - but have significant emotional, intellectual and spiritual value.
- 2.

Quality films not only for general audiences, but for special audiences as well - for children - old people - minorities - women - men - golfers - scientists - engineers - travelers - doctors - architects - car buffs - flying buffs etc. The tremendous success in publishing special interest magazines, while general interest magazines such as Colliers and Saturday Evening Post have folded, demonstrates the validity of this approach.

2. Diversify and broaden the distribution of film product. In conjunction with making better pictures for "general" and "special" audiences, the industry should develop entirely new techniques of getting film product to the people - when, where and how they need it most.

It should:

- a) Develop and place into tens of thousands of locations a visual equivalent of the jukebox. Individual coin operated movie viewers that would provide a 90 second film experience for 10 or 25 cents. These machines could bring film to the public in such locations as airports, shopping centers, arcades, bowling alleys, boardwalks, etc. where a theater would be unfeasible.
- b) Develop the visual equivalent of Muzak - so that silent visuals (cloud patterns, waterfalls, flowers, undersea life) could become an accepted architectural device in lobbies, banks, restaurants, elevators, stores, homes, etc.
- c) Promote audio visual playback systems for commuter trains, long distance buses, back of automobiles (the great success of inflight motion pictures is an excellent illustration of how a market that existed since passenger flying began was finally satisfied by an imaginative entrepreneur outside the major film companies).
- d) Develop a revolutionary method for providing a 2 hour color wall sized film to the public for \$1.00. Cassette systems now in development - Sony's Video Tape, CBS'-EVR, RCA's Selectavision - though all representing an enormous stride in expanding the market for film fare - have 2 basic limitations - (1) cost (\$20 for 2 hours of colored film) (2) The visuals must be seen on existing TV sets. The 1-1/2 square feet of the average TV screen is far less than the public, exposed to advanced wide screen theaters, will be willing to settle for in the 70's. What is needed then is a radically different system that provides two hours of wall sized color programming for for \$1.00. When this comes along it will have the same revolutionary effect on the film industry that the L. P. had on the recording industry and the

paperback on publishing.

- e) Extend the use of film in education at every level. Notwithstanding popular conception, this market has barely been scratched. Complicated equipment, shoddy unimaginative films, high print costs, have kept films waiting in the wings. With easy to operate, reliable equipment, inexpensive prints, and above all, imaginative quality productions, the film medium will move to the center of the stage. Educational films which recreate historical periods or reveal the workings of the atom, the cell, and the milky way, will require the model making, set building, animation resources that only large studios can provide.
- f) Extend the use of film in the realm of medicine, psychological testing and psychotherapy. The ability of audio visual techniques to hypnotize, distract from pain, cure psychomatic phobias, and probe the nature of perception and the brain, has barely been tapped.
- g) Convert the Neighborhood Theater into a Social Center. The major reason for the catastrophic drop in weekly theater attendance from 92,000,000 to 18,000,000 is free TV fare at home. But major secondary reasons are: rising theater prices (from 50¢ to \$3.00), difficult parking, and the vanishing servant. The one great advantage that theatergoing has over home TV viewing is that it is a "social experience". In their unerring drive towards self destruction, however, theater owners have virtually ignored this great strength and made theatergoing a lonely, outrageously expensive experience. A young married couple in addition to spending \$6.00 for 2 tickets, has to spend \$2.00 for parking, \$4.00 for a baby sitter, \$1.00 for intermission refreshments and \$4.00 for a post (or pre-cinema snack). Total outlay - \$17.00. If theater owners really want to get viewers away from the tube, they should offer mini-bus transportation from key points in the community to their theater, inexpensive self service buffets, multiple screening rooms that can simultaneously cater to the different age groups and tastes of the family - a supervised nursery, reasonably priced candy, popcorn and snacks (10¢ not 50¢), and charge \$1.00 a head (50¢ for children). This way, the price for an evening at the movies for 2 would be \$4.20 (tickets \$2.00. Intermission candy 20¢, snack \$2.00) - low enough for a family to go twice a week instead of once a month. To stress the theater's social advantages, films should be personally introduced by a master of ceremonies with interesting points and background about its Director, shooting problems etc. At the film's end, instead of throwing everyone out on the street,

the MC should moderate a half hour discussion (closed circuit television and shotgun mikes projecting the speaker's face and voice on to a central screen) so that the audience can evaluate the film and exchange ideas. A cafe-dance hall should be adjacent to the theater auditorium for further discussion, eating, dancing, seeing and being seen and general socializing. With this approach, theater owners will fill their empty halls, and weekly attendance might have a chance of rising from its paltry 18,000,000 to 40, or 50,000,000. Hollywood alone cannot dictate these changes, but it could set up several prototype theaters in key cities to demonstrate its point.

3. Diversify beyond film. A true program of diversification can and should reach beyond the film product itself. GM and IBM, though identified with one product (cars and computers), produce a tremendous variety of products.. This gives them the flexibility to flow into new markets when others shrink. The one outstanding example of the advantage of diversification in Hollywood is the Disney organization. The Disney talent pool of artists, designers, writers, composers and directors work on albums, records, dolls, books, World's Fair exhibits, theme parks (Disneyland and Disney World) pageants, parades, as well as films for TV and theaters. As a result, even in a shrinking film market, the Disney organization is thriving while all other studios are in a state of collapse. Every other Major Studio could and should use its valuable creative people in the same way.

These steps will broaden the base of the entire industry and thus revitalize the whole superstructure.

REDUCE COSTS AND INCREASE EARNINGS

If Hollywood wants to survive it must bring its costs into line with the costs of foreign production. For years Europeans have been making quality feature films with excellent production value for \$200,000-\$400,000. There is no reason why American features of comparable value have to cost \$2,000,000. Granted, American prices for everything (equipment - laboratories, etc.) are higher, but if real screen value is received for every dollar spent, a comparable American film need only cost \$5-600,000.

Start Paying Realistic Wages

Realistic wages will not only cut costs but bring badly needed realistic values back to the film world. No industry in the world can survive unless it keeps its costs in line with its earnings and its competition. The maximum pay for anyone involved in a film

should be \$500.00 a week - the minimum \$200.00. The idea of an actress receiving \$100,000 a week (\$1,000,000 for 10 weeks work) is sheer insanity. The idea of an electrician or a driver, or an assistant cameraman receiving \$1,000 a week, as they often do, is also insanity.

Like so many leeches, everybody in the dying Hollywood was (and is) out to get as much out of each individual film regardless of whether the film or the industry as a whole can sustain the astronomical costs. In true suicidal fashion they have opted to earn \$1,000 a week for 4 weeks a year (annual income \$4,000) rather than earn \$300 a week for 50 weeks a year (annual income \$15,000).

The Secret of a Sensible Wage Scale is Security and Continuity.

If the industry rebuilds itself on solid ground, creative personnel will finally be rid of the kind of "feast or famine" insecurity that drives them to "get as much out of each picture as they can". A realistic, sensible pay scale will accomplish several things:-

1. Though still way above foreign wages it will at least put American film production in the same ballpark with foreign production.
2. It will make the economic reward of each individual proportional to his true contribution to the film. Thus cameramen, editors, and composers will earn as much as lead actors.
3. It will bring wages into a realistic alignment with the experience levels and pay scales of other American industries - i. e., automobile, chemical, steel, etc.. This will go a long way to stop the influx of mediocrity into the film field - people who have no taste or talent for it; but who flood in simply for the "easypickings" and who by their mere physical presence block the opportunities of truly talented and interested individuals.

A. Directors and Producers should lead the way in requesting reasonable pay scales. If the Unions are to reduce their pay demands to reasonable and competitive levels, the example must start at the top. (Why shouldn't an electrician ask for \$25,000 a year if the producer makes \$100,000 or a star \$2,000,000?) Top studio heads and top directors should earn no more than \$25,000 a year. That is plenty for any man to live on if he has the slightest love for film or is concerned for the cultural well being of the nation. (Van Gogh and Rembrandt earned much less) If his earnings are more, he should curtail his life style and volunteer the pay cut. If not, he doesn't belong in the film business. Let him become a banker or a real estate broker.

B. Crew pay should be realistic - with profit sharing. Writers, cameramen, editors, lead actors, and musicians should make no more than \$400.00 a

week. Chief electricians, grips, assistant cameramen and assistant editors - \$300.00 a week. Nobody on a film should earn less than \$200.00 a week. To "compensate" for what appears to be low wage scales and to increase incentive, every crew member should have a liberal profit sharing plan whereby 50% of the film's profits are divided amongst the entire crew and cast - proportional to their salaries. Thus, the profits of a film that cost \$350,000 which earns back \$700,000 would be shared in the following manner:

Total profits	\$350,000
Profit to Financial Backers on investment	\$175,000
50 % profit divided amongst entire crew and cast in proportion to total income.	<u>\$175,000</u>

In addition to the efficiency of the production, by far the biggest factor in crew and cast bonus will be the final quality of the film. If the film is very good, it can "take-off" and earn many millions of dollars, which will represent very large bonuses to all the people involved. Everybody should be willing to work hard for and gamble on a good picture.

C. Get Rid of Agents and Lawyers.

The film business should rid itself of its greatest leeches - agents and 99% of its lawyers. They make great "deals" and beautiful contracts but contribute nothing to screen value. If actors' fees are set at a top of \$400.00 a week there's nothing for the agent to bargain about, and any agreement worth making can be summed up in two pages. An industry wide computerized retrieval service can put the photos, tapes and film clips of the industry's entire talent pool at a director's disposal in a far more efficient and objective way than an agent could ever do. Good actors constantly are quoted as saying "I would have done the part for nothing - but if the studio is stupid enough to pay me a million bucks for it, who am I to say no". The culprit is the agent who has no creative fulfillment other than 10% of the highest sum he can connive. The star system is dead. Bad films with stars bomb. Good films with unknown actors make a fortune.

Actually, well known "stars" often detract from the reality of the film. If a "star" won't work for \$400.00 a week, get a good hungry actor who will. If every producer did this, actors would become realistic humans

again, instead of spoiled demigods who change scripts and challenge directors - who actually believe their contribution to a film is equal to their bloated paychecks. As for the lawyers - Ingmar Bergman made a film recently. His contract with ABC pictures was 110 pages. The script was 60 pages! Solution - keep one young lawyer at \$350.00 a week or have one part-time when needed and keep the contracts simple. Put the rest of the money into the films.

D. Enact Drastic Reforms in Distribution and Exhibition.

The well known stealing and double and triple billing by Exhibitors and Distributors is another major cause of Hollywood's collapse. No producing company in the automobile, chemicals or food industries could survive if their earnings were based on a percentage of retail sales and this figure was tampered with right down the line. The current system is nothing short of insane. The filmmaker - producer takes all of the risks and does all the hard, exhausting, backbreaking work. Starting with an idea, he contends with the maddening variables of weather, artistic temperament, travel, disease, physical danger and faulty equipment. After a year of exhausting and monkish dedication in a cutting room, the film is completed. The distributor, for his part, sits down in a comfortable screening room for two hours (often at a festival) and sees not a vague idea, but the concrete reality of the film itself. Hence, his risk is not one-hundredth that of the producer. If he likes, it he majestically decides to buy and bids. If his bid is accepted he holds a few screenings - has a few cocktail parties for the stars and the press - designs an ad - and sends prints out to theaters across the country. For this he obtains 30-40% of the gross after he has deducted all his costs for prints and advertising!! The theater exhibitors also get 30-40% of gross after they, too, have deducted all operating expenses. That leaves only about 20% of the net to the poor filmmaker - producer who took all the risk and did 90% of the work! He not only doesn't deduct any costs, but he usually doesn't even see half of his measly share because the exhibitors and distributors rarely give him a fair count. The obvious solution is to eliminate distributors altogether. The producer of each film could market his film directly to exhibitors at monthly regional film fairs. The producers should also set up a committee to devise a fool-proof method of accounting for money received at the box office. One of the major reasons that Italian producers who make one good film survive to make another, is not only that the government gives a tax refund to quality films, but since the government is directly involved, it keeps a very careful

check on every lira taken in at the box office, with the receipts of every theater published weekly for all interested parties to examine. No national box office check (backed by law) is made in the U. S., but Hollywood should either back legislation or create its own industry wide watch dog committee as quickly as possible. The film industry should take its cue from the automobile industry. The auto manufacturers can not own dealerships (just as the consent decree separated the studios from their theater chains) and yet there are no "distributors" in the automobile business. Manufacturers run their own national advertising campaigns. The income of a car that sells for \$4,000 is usually divided in the following manner - 80% or \$3,200.00 goes back to the manufacturers and 20% goes to (\$800.00) the local dealer who out of this pays for his salesman's commission, space rental, insurance, advertising, and general overhead. His costs are not deducted and there is no hanky panky. The Ford Motor Co. gets its fair share of the final gross and plows it back into production. Thus the producer of a film, who takes far more risk than any auto maker ever does, should get the same 80% (at least 70%) of every box office dollar with no deductions for theater operation. The producer will provide prints and all nationwide advertising. The theater owner can and will make money by running his theater efficiently (automatic projection booths) and by expanding into auxilliary services - coffee shops, restaurants, dancing, books, records, discussions, etc., the revenue of which he will retain 100% (as the auto dealer retains 100% of his service income). Thus a film that costs \$1,500,000 to make - \$800,000 for production - \$600,000 for prints and advertising (word of mouth is the best) and grosses world wide \$3,000,000 will still, at 70% of gross, return \$2,100,000 to the producer, or a profit of \$600,000.

This is a profit of 40% on investment. A superb return in any business but not, unfortunately in the film business where money men expect a profit of 300 to 1,000%. Actually, when the film business matures into a serious industry and outgrows its childish carnival days it should be very happy with 5-10% profit on investment as is every other serious enterprise in the U.S. If this were the case, many worthwhile but financially limited projects would be financed.

This brings us to the subject of financing. No major industry has to run to the bank for money to finance every single project as the film studios do today. As a result, bankers have achieved a position of power in the film industry that their background and conservative taste ill equips them to fulfill. They pass on scripts, directors, stars,

cameramen, etc. Not only does this lead to artistically mediocre films but to politically safe ones that won't offend the most established of the establishment - the bankers. This situation threatens the very "raison d'etre" of the film industry. Throughout history, art has always been a vehicle of social protest, a criticism of the "status quo" - a testing of the new and better ways of the future. Films are no exception. If they are to be "relevant", if they are to uncover and reveal the sham, the injustices, the failings of American life and, if they are to be a rallying point of new and constructive ideas, they must be free. When they are, they not only serve their audience and in the long run the country, but the financial stability of the producers who made them. When Costa Gavras gave us "Z", a devastating look at the fascist takeover in Greece, the public responded with their dollars. When Robert Altman gave us "M. A. S. H.," a parody on the idiocies of war in the Far East, the public responded en masse.

Unfortunately, films are very expensive to make. A talented, perceptive artist working alone can write a book, paint a painting, sculpt a sculpture, but he cannot make a feature film unless he is a millionaire - which is rare. Thus he must turn to outside sources for funds. The conventional sources of large sums of money - the bankers - are by their very nature conservative defenders of the "status quo" - in short the last people in the country who want to rock the boat with provocative, critical (i. e. relevant) films.

As a result, America has produced only one or two films of the stature of "Z" in the last 20 years. "Dr. Strangelove" is an example, and that was a fluke that somehow got by, most likely because it was produced in England with the American backers kept pretty much in the dark by Stanley Kubick. The Artist and Banker are very strange bedfellows. The only way out of this dilemma is for producers to finance efficiently made films out of their own earnings, going to the banks only when involved in a general expansion program. If Hollywood's filmmakers don't find a way of doing this soon Hollywood's disease will be terminal. If they do, we may at last see some honest films about the debacle of Vietnam, (there have been umpteen articles and books about it but not one film except John Wayne's flagwaving "Green Berets") civil rights, pollution, government credibility gaps, consumer fraud, etc. that will reawaken the public's interest in the American product.

Strangely enough, U.S. filmmakers have a great advantage over European filmmakers for the U.S. already has all the problems that Europe will only inherit in 10 or 20 years. The social, racial and technological revolution is here now. This is rough on society, but from an artistic and cinematic point of view, it represents as great an opportunity for American filmmakers as the Russian Revolution offered Eisenstien and World War II offered the Italian Neo-Realists. If only we had the guts and the intelligence to seize the opportunity and make true films about our "revolution" we would not only save Hollywood, but perhaps the U.S. as well.

This brings me to the matter of CONTENT. People are rapidly abandoning their habits of psychic masturbation (killing of time) in favor of pursuits that contribute more directly to their personal growth and development. Good documentary styled films on:

1. The Great Ideas - Evolution, relativity, etc.
2. The Great Men - Galileo, Galen, etc.
3. The Great Inventions - The Steam Engine, the Helicopter
4. The Great Eras - Greece, Rome, etc.
5. The Great Places, etc.
6. The Great Species - insects, birds, etc.

would find receptive audiences on home TV, in the school, and in the community theater. (The current huge success of the insect documentary "The Helistrom Chronicles" and of "Blue Water - White Death" illustrates the public's interest in exciting subjects with high educational content). Imagine, if over the years Hollywood had made 500 cowboy films less and had made 500 films on the Story of Mankind instead. What a valuable library that would be! Films of this nature that will once again require the facilities of the major studios - their great stages, costumes, front projection techniques, model builders and animators. How else could one recreate ancient Greece - explore the mind of DaVinci or visit the atom?

Relevant films about today, and educational films that take their audiences through space and time, are the great tasks that await Hollywood's idle film craftsmen. Even with the commendable growth of location shooting, Hollywood can and should remain a center of pre-production research and post production editing, recording and printing, because not only does it have the climate and the healthy way of life to regenerate filmmakers' energies, but it also has an unparalleled array of talented personnel for the pre and post phases of production.

DEVELOP PRODUCTIVE RESOURCES

A mature industry concerned with its long range vitality protects and nourishes its resources. (The farmer fertilizes his land, the lumberman plants new trees). The two major resources of the film industry are PEOPLE and TECHNOLOGY. Of the two, people are by far the greater resource because they are the sole source of the essential commodity marketed - "ideas and feelings" and, they are also the source of the technology.

Hollywood Must Revolutionize Its Methods of Developing Its People Resources.

Nothing illustrates Hollywood's suicidal drive towards self destruction better than its tradition of frustrating, emasculating and devouring its best creative minds. The causes are many - the egomania of the studio head who couldn't tolerate any pretenders - the myth fostered in a society based on capital - that the money man has the God given right to tell the director how to make his picture. (he's paying for it, isn't he?) The myth,

reinforced in a democratic society, that art, like politics, is a democratic process - that 5 heads are better than 1, that the producer, the writer, the actor, the cameraman, the editor, the composer, all have equal say with the director on how a picture should be made. Whatever the reason, the Hollywood establishment, vis a vis the creative filmmaker, must do a complete about face, for unless it does, Hollywood will never be able to compete with the European product. It must admit, not only in thought, but in deed, that the director-filmmaker is the prime creative force behind every good film. This is so because, like the arts of painting, poetry, music, film is a precisely controllable form that attempts to communicate the vision, passions and perceptions of "one mind" to another. Each mind has its own unique structure, and the artistic mind carries its particular uniqueness to great heights of internal harmony and organization. When several unique, yet different minds collaborate, notwithstanding their best intentions, there is a muddying, a confusion, of the very things that make a work of art art, i. e., its subtlety, precision and internal harmony. Every great film ever made has been the creation of one mind - Welles' "Citizen Kane", Eisenstein's "Potemkin", Dryer's "Passion of Joan of Arc", Griffiths' "Intolerance", Chaplain's "City Lights", Fellini's "8-1/2", Bergman's "Virgin Spring", Kurosawa's "Seven Samurai", Costa Gavras' "Z". "One mind" does not mean that one man must write the screenplay (although in many cases he did), design the sets, operate the camera, compose the music. It does, however, mean that one man should do as much as he can himself and where he must draw upon the skills, training, and energy of others, he should have the uncontested right to control the output of these craftsmen as extensions of his own personality and vision.

One man's control of the film making process will be further enhanced by the miniaturization and automation of film making equipment. It used to take three men to handle a camera - now it takes one. Sound recorders used to weigh 200 lbs. - now they weigh 10. As the equipment becomes smaller and easier to operate the physical basis for the illusion of group creativity will erode.

Hollywood must acknowledge once and for all that the spectator and the director are the true stars of the film industry. Actually, the greater star of the two is the spectator. Technically, aesthetically, and in content, the only trustworthy link that the whole complex film making process has with the "single mind" of the spectator is the "single mind" of the director. He, and only he, can enter into the skin of the spectator and experience the film with him. Thus, studio administrations should not tell a director what he will make next, but ask him what he wants to make next. Like the best research laboratories - the film company's function is to provide the optimum environment and the best technical and financial means for the film artist to create the link that will unite him with the spectator.

Film production in Europe is organized around the director. He is the center of the

more or less permanent creative families that give birth to that elephantine baby, the film. The director works with his writer, his cameraman, his actor, his editor, his composer, to give form to his vision. Every great cameraman, editor, actor and producer has recognized and accepted the leadership of the director. Only immature producers, cameramen, editors, and actors, who are frustrated directors and who lack either the talent or guts to assume the responsibility of direction, challenge and refute the leadership of the director.

It should be said once and for all - art is not democratic! If anything, it is an elitist act of expression by an outstandingly sensitive and intelligent individual. In production it is a benevolent dictatorship. (If the director is secure and intelligent he will draw upon the ideas, talent and experience of his crew to strengthen his expression). Thus, production funds should be made directly available to the filmmaker - director. He should be liberated once and for all from the yoke of executive producers, associate producers, sons-in-law and producer's wives. All of their functions should be combined into the role of one production manager who is not above the director but subject to his instructions. The director should choose a subject of interest to himself - research it himself - write it (or collaborate) - cast it - direct it, direct the camera and direct the editing; in short, control every aspect of the film from A to Z. For the essence of a film is like a precious oil - if one tries to pass it along through too many hands - it is lost.

Since the talented, well trained filmmaker is the prime source of quality films, it is no wonder that the Hollywood product has been consistently so mediocre. She consistently frustrated and destroyed the goose that lays the golden egg. To begin with, film schools - with a few exceptions, were non-existent. Craft unions were (and still are) virtually closed and studio jobs difficult to get unless you "knew someone". Internships that could smooth the transition from student to professional filmmaker were non-existent. If by some miracle one managed to get a job in a studio he could never move laterally through the field to learn all the aspects of filmmaking, and if he were a member of the New York cameraman's or editor's union, he couldn't work in Los Angeles without a standby and vice versa. If one finally managed to become director he was considered a glorified traffic cop who had no say on story, casting or location. His hands were slapped if he dared to touch the camera, much less operate it. He had to battle for a right of first cut and sit helplessly while his work was mutilated by the front office. This blueprint for salvation then calls for no less than entire restructuring of the film industry around the prime seed of its vitality - the creative filmmaker-director. The industry must find these men - young in life - train them well - encourage them at every turn and provide them with optimal working conditions!

Above all, the money man and the money interests must be subservient to them in

income, status and real power. There is no reason why the complete Director should not also be the Producer of his own films -(many of todays best directors have wasted years of energy fighting their way up to this position.) In truth, the purpose of money is to serve the artist. (In his time it seemed that Michelangelo was working for the Pope. We know now that culturally and historically the Pope was merely providing release for the titanic visions of Michelangelo.) These ideas lead us to recommend that Hollywood take the following steps to develop and release the creative energies of its creative filmmakers.

- a) Lobby for the introduction of filmmaking classes into the public schools right down to kindergarten level. Children are taught singing, dancing, painting, sculpture - why not filmmaking? The industry should supply pilot schools with 8mm cameras and inexpensive video cameras, film and video tape. (Note - it should be clear at this point that by "filmmaking" I mean the organization of dynamic, sensory elements into a communicative and meaningful whole, that is concrete and reproducible. Thus, from a filmmaker's standpoint there is no basic distinction between using photographic film or video-tape as the recording and reproducing material).
- b) Every major and minor film company should pledge 5% of its post tax profits to a central fund that supports Film Colleges around the country (or as a variant of this each major company can adopt a particular film college for support. (G. E. and Westinghouse do this for electrical engineers - why not Warner Brothers for filmmakers). The course should be a thorough-5 years as it is for architects - and it should be taught by part-time teachers who are active professionals in the industry. An effort should be made to keep the number of graduates roughly proportional to the industry's needs. Those who do not qualify as director-filmmaker can find employment in the supportive crafts. Part of the funds should go towards providing outstanding high school filmmakers with college scholarships. This is a common practice for outstanding football and basketball players - why not filmmakers? The colleges should organize a yearly college-wide film competition.
- c) Develop a meaningful program for smoothing the filmmakers' painful transition from University cinema graduate to full professional. As things stand now, many fine talents are lost because there is no "way", no "path" for the conscientious, talented filmmaker to follow that offers him any guarantee of establishing himself in the profession. He steps off the graduation podium and falls into a black abyss where perhaps, if he is lucky, a contact, or a rich uncle, will sustain him until he finds his way. The Union books are closed, the established companies want only "experienced" help, and nobody "has money to gamble" on an untried talent.

Taking its cue from the medical profession, wherein the difficult transition from graduate doctor to self sustaining professional is eased by a two year internship, the film industry should create film internships that would consist a) of assigning directors, cameramen, editors, etc. to experienced filmmakers as assistants; b) of moving future filmmakers from one discipline to another to broaden their experience; c) of helping them make relatively inexpensive (\$15,000) short films - (10 minutes) and then moving along to longer more expensive projects. The American Film Institute has initiated valuable programs in this direction but they are hindered by lack of funds, and Hollywood's indifference.

- d) Transform the Cameraman's Union and Editor's Union into voluntary Guilds similar to the Writers and Directors Guild. At present it is virtually impossible for even highly experienced and talented cameramen and editors to gain access to these unions. By freezing membership and maintaining high initiation fees, these two unions have contributed to the collapse of Hollywood by cutting off the creative energies that emanate from new talents in these fields - many of whom could later evolve into excellent directors. (Robert Wise came from editing - George Stevens from camera). Motion picture photography and editing are creative acts, comparable to writing and composing. They are not mechanical trades like plumbing, where long established answers exist for endlessly repetitive problems. Without realizing it, cameramen and editors demean their own profession by considering themselves craftsmen akin to plumbers rather than highly skilled professionals akin to doctors or architects. In addition, no group of professionals has the right to rope off a profession, particularly a creative one, and say no one will be allowed to enter until every last one on the inside - even the hopelessly mediocre and incompetent, are earning a good living. If doctors, engineers, or architects closed their profession until every aged or incompetent was working, medicine, engineering and architecture would have remained at a standstill.
- e) Look in the right place for the promising directors. Until the new film training has had time to bear fruit, the most promising young film masters are to be found not amongst theater directors, (strong on drama, actors and dialogue, but weak on action and camera choreography) or the directors of advertising commercials, (strong on visual form but, of necessity, weak in thematic conviction and commitment to principle) nor to directors of television serials, (pressure of time and assembly line operation creates "animated radio" but prevents the development of true filmic style and originality) but among the very experienced, but little known directors of quality documentaries for television, the government or

industry. These directors, who are obligated to sustain their audiences interest for 20 or 30 minutes, often without dramatic plot or experienced actors, have learned to lean heavily on the basic elements of cinema - (ideas, camera choreography, atmospheric sound and music) - to move their audience. These are the basic elements of the directors' craft. European producers have consistently drawn upon the ranks of documentary filmmakers for their new directors. (Resnais, Antonioni, and LeLouche) - reasoning that a man who can move an audience without plot or professional actors (in 10 or 20 documentaries) could certainly do so with them. But Hollywood would rather trust a hack who has made one mediocre feature than a sensitive director of 10 superb documentaries.

Thus, one of the first steps of a studio in the new Hollywood should be to carefully search the ranks of successful documentary filmmakers on both coasts and choose the 10 best. Then take money that would normally be spent on one feature film - \$2,500,000. Divide it into 10 sums of \$250,000 and give each of the 10 directors \$250,000 to make a personal film with no strings attached. If only one of the 10 clicks, the studio will make its investment back. More than likely 5 of the 10 will be good. If 5 major studios do this in one year at least 25 new film talents will have been launched on their feature film careers.

Hollywood Must Begin From Scratch to Develop Its Technological Resources

Machines and technical systems are the other great resource of the film industry. This has been so from the very beginning. The very birth of cinema as a means of communication depended on the invention of the motion picture camera, film, and the motion picture projector. Until then no other art form required a machine for its existence. In painting, sculpture, music, poetry, very simple tools have sufficed. But only with the aid of machines in the modern sense of the term could man capture, record and recreate sound and visual motion. Realizing this great reliance on technology, it would seem only logical for the great captains of the film industry to invest considerable care and capital into research and development of their technical base - only natural that they would pamper their engineers as much as their stars - that for every five dollars spent on improving software, at least one dollar would be spent on hardware. Unbelievably and sadly, such has not been the case. Nowhere on the lots of MGM - Fox - Paramount - are there research and development departments in the modern sense. Not only is there not even a faint suggestion of the likes of G.M.'s "Technical Center" or IBM's "Yorktown Heights Laboratory"-anywhere in the entire film industry - but, fantastic as it seems, as they slip over the brink into bankruptcy, today's industry leaders are still blissfully unaware of how the lack of technical Research and Development contributed to their demise. One truly wonders how the film industry could have existed on the same planet, in the same

country, to say nothing of the same city as one of the world's most advanced R-D complexes and not be aware of this lack. As a result of this total vacuum, every major advancement in film technology has come from lone inventors working outside the industry and in spite of the industry rather than because of it. When they offered their wares they were generally rebuffed for an average of 10 years. Lee DeForest invented a way of recording sound on motion picture film in 1918. A desperate Warner Brothers, facing bankruptcy, reaching for a straw, finally condescended to try it out in the "Jazz Singer" in 1927. The public stormed the theaters - Warner Brothers was saved and sound movies were born. Two musicians, working in their home bath tub, invented color. Fred Waller, with the support of the Air Force, developed peripheral vision film techniques and only after 15 years of constant rebuff by the industry did showman Mike Todd bring out Cinerama. Easy money, an assured market, lack of real competition, but most of all lack of intelligent leadership have lulled Hollywood into its technical somnolence. Today, 70 years after the invention of cinema, the structure of the local movie theaters and the experience one has in them is fundamentally unchanged. People still sit on seats on a horizontal floor and watch 2 dimensional images flit across a small rectangular screen. The only advances have been sound and color (music was always there - provided by the maestro in the pit). Compare this minuscule change to the changes that have taken place in aviation in the same 70 years. While the art of physical transportation has progressed from the Wright Brothers 50 MPH to Apollo's 25,000 MPH (a multiple of 500), psychological transportation hasn't amplified its power by more than a factor of 10.

Had Hollywood actively pursued the research and development of better means of recording, distributing and replaying visual information, it would have invented and owned television rather than leaving it to (aural) radio people. And when television did come along instead of embracing its technology, Hollywood characteristically put its head in the ground - hoping it would go away like a bad dream. In fact, three of the greatest recent technical developments in recording and distributing sensory information have all been nurtured outside of the Hollywood film industry - Electronic Television, Automatic 8mm cameras and Cassettes.

Electronic television, though potentially a giant step forward in the filmmakers technical arsenal, represents, at this date, mainly an improvement in distribution (60 million homes can simultaneously see a film from one print) and a large step backward in aesthetic form. A small screen with relatively poor definition and varying color quality - viewed in a living room with infinite distractions (commercials, station breaks, telephones and door bells, etc.) - does not compare with the visual quality and concentration of good theatrical viewing.

Automatic 8mm cameras - built mostly by the Japanese for gadget hating women are far superior to any camera Hollywood has developed. They offer daylight cartridge loading, automatic exposure, power zoom, and soon to come, automatic focus.

Cassettes represent a major advance in distribution (allowing the viewer to see what he wants - when he wants) but no particular advance in recording techniques or the final viewing experience.

To rectify Hollywood's dismal performance in the realm of R & D, every medium or large size company in the field should devote (as does the chemical, and the electronics industry) at least 15 or 20% of the annual budget to the research and development of its technology. New developments should be annually standardized through the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, and the industry should plan on making a qualitative changeover in the entire cinematic system (cameras, moviolas, projectors) every 10 years.

Recording

Contrary to the art of flying and spaceflight (where every man on the street has ideas about future forms) the art of communication is so blind that not only the man on the street, but the industry's "leaders" haven't got the foggiest notion of what films will or should be like - 10 - 20 - 50 - or 100 years from now. If, however, one studies the past evolution of cinema (from still photography through motion - sound - color - stereo sound and wide screen) and one then extrapolates this line into the future, it is easy to see the basic direction that Hollywood's Research and Development program should take. It should aim at providing the filmmaker with the smallest, lightest, most automatic, economical means of recording his total spontaneous or created experiences. By total experience, I mean total - not 10% of one-eye and the one-ear sound of today's cinema (which represents only 15% of the total sensory input of man's nervous system) but 95% of man's sensory input with true 3 dimensional imagery, total peripheral vision (i. e., 185° horizontally and 155° vertically) - binaural sound, aromas, taste, touch, temperature, and inner kinesthetic body awareness. A film made in this form will give a viewer the total illusion of having been physically transported to another reality. Instead of seeing conventional scenes of the alps taken by a skier, the viewer will feel that he is physically skiing the slopes himself - with trees passing him on both sides and the wind whistling past his body - the snow flying in his hair and the fresh smell of pine in the air. Research along these lines will ultimately lead to a complete recording robot - linked directly through servo mechanisms to the director. (These servo techniques are already well developed in man amplifiers developed by the Army) This robot will see, hear, smell, touch and record what the filmmaker wants it to. Naturally, there will be many small steps on the way to this final goal but the direction of today's research should be determined by its final point.

Editing

The second line of research should develop a highly automated computer and video - assisted means for the director to arrange (amplify or compress) the wealth of information recorded by the sensory robot. This part of the film making process - commonly known as "Editing" is by far the most backward because no one, even outside of the industry, has had the economic incentive to develop sophisticated editing machines. (The home movie

fan buys a camera and a projector, but doesn't have the patience to edit. And, as usual, nobody inside the industry cares).

As a result, a film which can be shot in 6 weeks - and viewed in 2 hours - often takes 8 - 10 months to edit. This lengthy time is a large factor in the film's cost (interest on loan - loss of timeliness of subject etc.) Sophisticated, computer assisted editing equipment built around the human capability of creative filmmakers could reduce this 8 months of editing to 1 month. If this were done, the cost of the average film would be reduced by 20%.

Playback

Once it is possible to record, and edit a "total reality" film, means must obviously be developed to play it back to an audience. Playback devices will fall into 3 categories: 1) individual 2) small group & 3) large group, depending on the size of the audience. (This is analogous to motor transportation where there are individual - motorcycles, small group - passenger sedans, and large group - busses.) Individual simulators will be used primarily in the home or in the school by the individual student. The small group simulators will be primarily for family, classroom or work groups. Large group simulation systems will be for large social aggregates - in theaters, conventions, auditoriums, fairs, religious temples (a theater is a playback machine that people sit in for psychological transportation just as a DC-8 is a flying machine people sit in for physical transportation). Whatever the scale of the playback machines, they will be literally wrapped around and tailored to the sensory perception of the audience - feeding it totally (just as the recording robot was totally tailored to the director). They will provide environmental experiences indistinguishable from natural life experiences except that they will be more condensed and structured. Surprisingly, "total reality" cinema can be created with the technology that exists today - nothing "blue sky" needs to be discovered. The only thing lacking again is the vision of the financial leaders of the industry. For \$2,000,000 a total recording robot could be built. For \$1,000,000 an advanced automatic editor. For another \$2,000,000 a total reality theater, and for \$1,000,000 a 2 hour demonstration film. Total cost \$6,000,000. This is equal to what Hollywood spends on 2 features (that may or may not return their investment in today's market). An investment in this direction would totally revolutionize the film industry. It would enormously magnify the communicative power and excitement of films and thus bring millions of people back to films as their major source of entertainment and enlightenment.

If no one company or group of companies has the resources or daring to invest \$6,000,000 for this kind of qualitative leap, then a lobby should be mounted to get the money from the Federal government as a grant in education technology. (For \$6,000,000 is only 1/3 the price of one pursuit bomber, several of which can be lost every week - without a murmur from the taxpayers). Since Russian advances are often the best spur to Congressional action, it might be effective to point out that Russia has a large, well financed Film Research and Development Institute on the outskirts of Moscow working in the direction of total environmental systems.

If the medical industry can get the government to finance medical research, and the aviation industry can get it to fund aviation research with hundreds of millions of dollars, then the film industry should be able to get a paltry \$6,000,000 so that America can regain the leadership in the one art form it literally invented.

Technical Development is what the United States does exceedingly well. A technical leap of this kind into the future will do more to win domestic and foreign audiences back to American films than any other single step - including the tax rebate. And this in turn will make Hollywood once again a world leader in motion picture production.

NEW PRODUCTION METHOD

Assuming now that Hollywood actively develops both its human and technical resources, how should it weld them together into an efficient and creative production system to feed its newly expanded markets?

First of all, it must stop doing what it has been doing with almost reflex torpor for the past 20 years, i.e.:

1. Read the galleys of the latest novels.
2. Buy an option on a novel about a totally irrelevant subject like tribal feuding in ancient Turkey.
3. If the book clicks, pay \$250,000 for the film rights.
4. Hire a "screen writer" to write a screenplay - \$25,000.
5. Get one or two stars interested in the "property" - \$1,000,000.
6. Hire a director - who though not too artistic has the reputation for not getting behind schedule - \$100,000.
7. Cast the picture for him - (often over his objections).
8. Build sets (who wants to work in Turkey)...\$500,000.
9. Shoot the picture with a 60 man crew. \$500,000.
10. Give it all to an editor with 3 assistants for 10 months...\$90,000.
11. Let a composer with a 50 piece orchestra pour musical goo over it to give it "feeling". \$100,000.
12. Total cost - \$3,500,000.
13. Make a deal with a Distributor you really can't trust (\$20,000 in lawyers' fees)
14. Have him ballyhoo the picture as the "Best American picture of the last ten years."
15. Watch the picture (according to the books) gross \$5,000,000 worldwide. (Though in reality it grossed \$6,000,000). Get \$1,500,000 back and - go broke.

No, Hollywood must take an entirely different approach. It must break once and for all its idiotic dependency on the latest novel or stage play. No other major U.S. industry depends on outside sources for its key ideas. (Does IBM sit back and wait for a freelance engineer to design its new computer?)

For a fraction of what it costs to buy "bestsellers" and "stage hits" and adapt them, Hollywood should develop original screen material suited from its very inception to the
20.

special strengths and capabilities of the film medium. This is common procedure in the European film capitals of Paris and Rome. Generally, French and Italian film producers are sufficiently sophisticated in matters of culture to understand that each medium has its own unique form and that it must approach a theme from its own unique angle. Thus a work of art, in one medium based on a work of art from another medium, is doomed from the very start - the strengths of one form never fully emerging in the other. This is why films based on stageplays or books are overly talky, their "action" artificial contrivances pasted on to make the film seem "cinematic".

In the new Hollywood, Step I should be for the money man to meet with the filmmaker to discuss ideas of interest to the filmmaker and of value to the public. (It should be clear from the start that the filmmaker is not "working for" the money man, but that the two are associated in a symbiotic relationship - one providing capital and studio resources - the other providing creative talent).

Aside from providing money, the most important function of a producer is to assess not only the public's likes but its needs - and to suggest topics and themes to the director that will have relevance and meaning to a particular audience when the film is released.

(That Hollywood "producers" have failed miserably in this function is attested to by the fact practically no good films have been made on any of the following themes. . . . pollution, ecological balance, overpopulation, Vietnam, the military-industrial complex, the Hippie communes, automation, paranoia of the Left, paranoia of the Right, Women's Lib, toxic food, unemployment, planned obsolescence etc. These are areas that the public must understand if the U. S. is to survive as a society.)

The director will very likely bring to these discussions a theme that he is vitally interested in or, he will be stimulated by a particular suggestion of the producer. The financial producer must totally respect the workings of the filmmaker's psyche. If there is no genuine interest - if a theme does not fuse totally with the ego of the filmmaker and become truly "his", the film, which will inevitably demand tremendous drive and hundreds of hours of dedicated care, will never pan out. When the "right" theme is agreed upon the filmmaker should be given a salary plus expenses to research the area and write a script (if he is capable of developing plot, character and dialogue) or to work with a compatible "writer" if he needs assistance in these areas.

For example, let us assume the director wants to do a story about the hazardous work and technological unemployment of the Appalachian coal miners in the vein of "Grapes of Wrath". The research resources of the studio should be placed at the disposal of the director and his writer. They should read dozens of books, articles, on the area and its people and see all the films and documentaries that deal with it.

Next, they should travel through the Appalachian area, making notes, sketches, taking photos, interviewing people on tape, gathering impressions, incidents. The studio should arrange for them to get jobs as coal miners, (unknown to their fellow workers) and they should begin to feel what it is like to be inside the skin of an Appalachian coal miner.

Gradually, a point of struggle will emerge, an incident about a group or a man that expresses certain essential truths of the plight of men performing difficult work and facing obsolescence by machines. The director and writer will pursue this theme with further interviews and travel until they feel "creatively" pregnant. Then they should be prepared to go to the quiet isolation of a mountain cabin - no phones - no family squabbling - to "design" their film - complete with story board sketches, sound and music indications, and dialogue. I say "design" because we should get away from the idea of "writing" films - or worshipping the little black words marching in line across the white paper. If one "writes" a film, one will create a completely different film than if he "draws" one because, as any writer knows, words have a force and direction all their own. Thumbnail sketches with verbal notes are much closer to the essence of visual cinema than words alone.

The total studio investment for a complete film design made in this manner would be \$31,000 (as opposed to \$275,000).

Director - \$500 per week x 24 weeks =	\$12,000
Writer - \$500 per week x 24 weeks =	\$12,000
Travel and Living Expenses	<u>7,000</u>
Total	\$31,000

The need for filmmakers to present a detailed written script in order to get money for their film is one of the major obstacles to the creation of truly visual films. Good filmmakers are visual creatures who think in terms of visual music. It is almost always an awkward step backward for them to turn their fluid visions into words on paper. The very thing that makes a film cinematically valid - its visual rhythm - is impossible to communicate in words. This is so much so, that if an idea or scene can be expressed adequately in words its visual integrity is immediately suspect. Could anyone write Leonardo's "Last Supper" or Beethoven's "Fifth Symphony"? Why do we persist in "writing" films? Undoubtedly because Hollywood still carries the weight of its preelectronic print heritage. The producer still wants a "script" - 300 pages of neatly bound paper that he can hold in his hand - then he feels secure, notwithstanding the fact that many great reading scripts have been filmic disasters and many films made without scripts have been huge successes ("Que Viva Mexico", "Woodstock").... No - the new Hollywood should go with the visually inspired brain of a good filmmaker rather than a "property" filmed by a traffic cop.

Once the film's design plan is completed it should be budgeted and, if the financial requirements are reasonable, the project should be funded. The financial producer should have absolutely no decision making powers over the content or aesthetic form of the film! (Once he has decided to fly somewhere, does he tell the pilot how to fly? Once he has

decided to have surgery, does he tell the surgeon how to operate? Then why, in heaven's name, once the decision has been made to make a film does the financial producer presume that he has the taste, the judgment and the knowledge to tell the director, who is highly skilled and is deeply immersed in his subject, how to make the film?) The director should pick his cast and make his film. All organizational and financial details should be put in the hands of a capable and efficient production manager.

A film in the new Hollywood must be made with maximum economy. This means using the light, portable equipment (Arriflexes, Nagras, Lowell lights etc.) that Europeans have been using in feature production for 15 years. It also means absolutely no feather-bedding and the complete freedom of anybody on the production team to help any other craftsman or artist perform any task the director wants him to, particularly if it will help the quality and economy of the film. This means that, if practical, everybody should be able to help set up lights, unload trucks, drive vehicles, push dollies, play bit parts, etc. This is the way the great films of Italian neo-realism were made ("Rome-Open City", "Bicycle Thief," etc.) and this is the way the great American films will have to be made if American production is to be reborn. Working this way, all a good director needs to make a feature is one good personal assistant, one production organizer, one cameraman (who also operates the camera), one assistant cameraman, one sound mixer, one sound assistant and four combination grip-electrician-prop men-drivers. Total 11 people. They can make an excellent modern-location type feature. The typical 40 or 50 man Hollywood armies not only are completely unnecessary, they are millstones around the neck of the director. They create the confusion of make-work and often become grouchy and insolent because they have nothing to do most of the time. All the maddening union rules about overtime, double time, golden time, penalty time should be dropped completely as they are antithetical to a free creative atmosphere and they establish the false impression that instead of a creative "team" there are 2 camps - "labor" and "management" who are natural enemies. Lead actors should be talented unknowns whose age and physical appearance make them suited to the role without makeup and shoulder pads. They, in turn, should be supported by real life people who are generally extraordinarily believable when acting themselves. In most cases, makeup, costumes, and sets are "out" unless dealing with a fictional time and place. Making a film this way will reduce its costs at least 30%.

Once the film is completed the director, who should be a trained editor, should with one or two assistants, edit his film with no interference from anyone.

Friends and the producer can be invited to view the film providing the director wants their reactions and guidance.

If the director decides music is appropriate, he should communicate to his composer as best as possible the theme and atmosphere of the music he wants. One day, properly trained directors plying music synthesizers will be able to create their own music (Chaplin and Fellini have always written their own musical themes). The best film music has no

valid musical structure apart from the film and is created on instruments that provoke the fewest conventional associations.

Once scored, the filmmaker, abetted by computers and repeatable "rock and roll" recording systems, should mix his own sound track. Working in close contact with the film laboratory, the director should bring his film to completion with the precision of color and density he desires. (The only valid limitation imposed by the studio being the film's length{anywhere between 90 minutes to 4 hours for theatrical or TV release). (Films for the specialized cassette market will have no time limitations (anywhere from 1 minute to 21 hours, seven-3hour sittings). Average cost of a realistic modern film made in this way would be about \$350,000 as opposed to the current average of \$2,500,000. This dramatic price reduction will automatically make American production very competitive. Not only will American film production come home, but we very likely would see European and Oriental filmmakers coming here to make their films in the new creative atmosphere.

If the large studio produces films in this manner, if it becomes a true "home" for the individual filmmaker, providing him with the conditions that optimize his creativity, the major motion picture studio will have justified its continued existence. The studios can provide the funds, the equipment, the sets, the models, the sound and editing facilities, while the individual filmmaker provides the vision and passion that breathes life into the whole. Once the new Hollywood has achieved this correct balance between the organization and the individual, it will be able to move rapidly into the sophisticated and powerful communication forms of the future.

Communication in the Communications Industry.

Another major factor contributing to the decline of Hollywood is the curious lack of communication between and within every sector of the so-called industry. Rooted in the America's tradition of individualism (one man against the world) and abetted by the terrible insecurity of "dog eat dog" competitiveness, nobody in Hollywood really talks to anybody! Not only don't the money men talk to the artists, or the artists talk to the technologists (a frightening fact when one understands the interdependency of money, art and technology in filmmaking) but stranger still, members of each of these areas rarely communicate with one another. Contrary to the life in the cinema cafes of Paris or the cinema restaurants of Rome (where directors, actors, cameramen and editors are constantly debating the merits of the latest film, technique or director), the film artists of Hollywood work in a terrible isolation. Unless an artist is stimulated by the heated concern of his peers, he can rarely reach the height of his powers. True, the Directors' Guild has its annual meeting, or once a year the Academy Awards gush forth, but these are feeble substitutes for a daily immersion in the passionate film discussion. Even if the major studios take steps to break this isolation internally, they will never fill the communication needs of Hollywood's entire film making community. Thus, I propose that the Hollywood motion

picture industry, in collaboration with the city of Los Angeles, the State of California (and possibly the Federal government) establish a Hollywood Film Center.

This center should be a center of film making excitement. It should be a place where filmmakers can show their wares - see new films - argue - exchange ideas - make deals etc. A place where many of the ideas proposed in this Blueprint can be given direction and practical impetus. In particular, the Hollywood Film Center should offer the following facilities and activities.

1. A large screening room - where films should be on exhibition 365 days a year - a la the Cinematique in Paris, where all of France's New Wave Directors learned their Cinematic ABCs. The theater should show new works, classics, and hold retrospectives with the directors, writers, producers, actors, cameramen, editors, musicians present to answer questions about their work and their careers. Admission should be free or a nominal 50 cents.
2. Several small projection rooms for small informal screenings and discussions.
3. An economical self service buffet decorated with cinema motifs - a good place to continue discussions.
4. A permanent exhibition of old motion picture equipment and revolving exhibits of new and future equipment.
5. Rapid access files of every filmmaker, actor, cameraman, editor, soundman, grip, and electrician in Hollywood, with resumes of their experience, phone number, address and updated availability. This file to be accessible to anyone free of charge.
6. The Center should build up files and catalogues of information of particular interest to Filmmakers -
 - Locations around the world
 - Sources of Costumes
 - Sources of Props
 - Sources of Equipment
 - Seasonal Weather Maps, etc.
7. The Center should have a full time budget expert who for a nominal fee can help any independent filmmaker make a realistic budget, taking into account things like liability insurance, optical fees, etc., that young filmmakers rarely think of.
8. It should have a script story board library.
9. On its staff it should have a full time member who specializes in the problems of financing - who acts as a contact point between filmmakers who want to make films and investors, and angels, who want to invest in them.
10. The film Center should take an active hand in proposing film curriculums for colleges, high schools and elementary schools.

11. It should hold seminars in all fields of motion picture research-technical-aesthetic, and content.
12. If funds allow, it should house an industry wide Research and Development Center for advanced film technology and advanced aesthetic techniques. Also, a studio where the latest techniques can be tested and demonstrated.
13. Its directorship should, via lobbies and government representatives, apply for legislation and administrative aid favorable and stimulating to the film industry. Why should the Pentagon and weapons industry get billions from the federal government and the film industry, which is an industry dedicated to life and joy, get nothing? Now that America's priorities are hopefully being rearranged, the filmmakers of America should at last step forward and be heard from! If any other industry in the United States had 70 or 80% of its people unemployed, Congress would be holding midnight sessions and voting large funds. (Even when considered strictly in terms of national "strength", as the world shrinks away from the horror of a nuclear confrontation and the struggle shifts to the "hearts and minds of men", great films and advanced cinematic techniques are far more effective than a sky full of rockets.)
14. Once a year the Hollywood Film Center should stage a serious world wide film festival - where a qualified and prestigious jury gives prizes to the best feature films, documentaries, shorts, cartoons, educational films, industrials, commercials, childrens' films etc. The winners to be screened on nationwide T. V. There should be a separate division in all categories for American and Foreign pictures. The foreign films should be truly foreign. They should be shown in competition regardless of whether they are to be commercially exhibited in the U. S. or not. When last has a film made in India, Egypt, or China been shown in the United States or competed for the Academy Awards? And why should distributors alone decide which foreign films are seen by America's filmmakers, critics, and film buffs?

The Center should be a beehive of excitement, a junction for the cross flow of ideas - a place where film is appreciated for what it is - the most powerful communicative form ever devised by man, (rather than simply a quick way to make a buck). Above all, the center will help end the crippling isolation of Hollywood's filmmakers and inspire them to make Hollywood once again one of greatest film making centers in the world.

To sum up briefly - if Hollywood is again to become a great center of film production - this Blueprint calls for it to:

1. BROADEN THE MARKET FOR ITS PRODUCTION TALENT.
 - a. Make quality films relevant to the true interest and needs of the public. Films on the great issues of our time as well as the great ideas, great men, great inventions, countries, eras and peoples.
 - b. Make specialized films for specialized audiences of all ages, occupations and concern.
 - c. Develop advanced coin operated audio visual "jukeboxes" and place in thousands of locations too small for theaters.
 - d. Develop the visual equivalent of Muzak for the architectural decor of homes, restaurants, lobbies etc.
 - e. Promote film playback systems for commuter trains, busses, and back seat of cars.
 - f. Develop a truly inexpensive filmic equivalent of the paper back book wherein a 2 hour color film can be purchased for \$1.00.
 - g. Extend the use of film in medicine, psychological testing and psychotherapy.
 - h. Extend the use of film in education at every level.
 - i. Convert (by example) the Neighborhood Theater into a true Social Center - admission \$1.00 for adults, 50¢ for children, with cafe, buffet, dancing and nursery.
 - j. Diversify beyond film and use creative film craftsmen to create experience environments, theme parks, pageants, shows, fairs, illustrated books, records etc. a la the Disney organization.

2. REDUCE COSTS AND INCREASE EARNINGS.
 - a. Pay realistic wages, comparable to other U. S. Industries - top \$500 a week - low \$200 - and give all crew members a percentage of the film's profits proportional to their salaries.
 - b. Get rid of all agents and most lawyers.
 - c. Eliminate distributors, or, if impossible, drastically reduce their role and take.
 - d. Institute rigid industry wide accounting controls for distribution and exhibition.
 - e. Have the makers of the film obtain 70% of the film's box office gross.
 - f. Take production decisions away from bankers and the corporate lawyers of the conglomerates.

3. DEVELOP ITS' CREATIVE PEOPLE.

- a. Build production around the individual filmmaker and give him his head.
- b. Lobby for and support courses in filmmaking from kindergarten to graduate school.
- c. Pledge 5% of post tax profits to film education and film scholarships.
- d. Develop meaningful apprenticeship programs to smooth the transition from film school graduate to professional.
- e. Transform the Cameraman's and Editor's Unions into voluntary non restrictive guilds.
- f. Find the country's best documentary and short filmmakers and finance low budget (\$250,000) features of their choosing.

4. DEVELOP ITS' TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

- a. Devote 15% to 20% of its annual budget towards the Research and Development of advanced film technology.
- b. Develop in one step (or in stages) a total sense recording robot - capable of recording 3-D, total peripheral vision, color, stereosound, aromas, temperature, tactile and kinesthetic sensations) and of being precisely guided by the Director.
- c. Develop highly automated computer and video assisted editing consoles.
- d. Develop "total reality" playback simulators for individuals, small and large groups.
- e. Lobby for Federal support of Motion Picture Research and Development.

5. MAKE FILMS A NEW WAY

- a. Start with the Filmmaker - not "the property".
- b. Pay for the development of original film designs - created especially for the film medium (break away from dependence on the latest "bestseller" or "stage" hit.)
- c. Make films that illuminate important issues and serve the true intellectual, emotional, and spiritual needs of the people.
- d. Let the Filmmaker make his film his way, with cast and crew and all other components decided by him alone.
- e. Get away from "stars" - use talented unknowns for leads and "real" people for supporting roles.
- f. Wherever possible, use lightweight portable equipment.

- g. Allow every member of the cast and crew to help in every task if the director deems it helpful.
 - h. Let the director edit and assemble the final cut of the film without outside interference.
6. CREATE A HOLLYWOOD FILM CENTER
- as a catalytic focal point for the stimulation, exchange, exhibition and evaluation of new film ideas. with screening rooms, buffet, equipment exhibits, debates, seminars, lectures, information and talent files, production and financial counseling, legislative lobbyists and annual film festival.

This, then, is my Blueprint for a New Hollywood. There is no presumption that this blueprint is more than a beginning, a focal point for discussion - or at best, a starting point for action. I'm sure there are many, many other excellent ideas that should be included. If the reader would care to take the time to communicate them to me, I will do my best to summarize these ideas in an addendum to this edition.

Let's create a new, exciting, creative Hollywood! It's up to us!

MORTON HEILIG
Pacific Palisades,
California 90272