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This issue is jammed-packed with useful information on a variety of important subjects. Mostly we concentrate on digital communication, especially new developments—what it all means and how it is dramatically changing the world of television and movies providing exciting new opportunities for producers, writers and directors. ... There is an exceptional piece by producer Larry Turman explaining what producers really do. Then writer Bill Blinn looks at the other side of all this in a highly original essay. Two of our most talented television writers and directors, Allan Burns and Jay Sandrich of *The Mary Tyler Moore Show* fame, discuss comedy writing then and now. Expert Randall Dark goes deep inside the future of high-definition television. There’s much to think about in Bob Finkel’s definition of digital cinema, plus Steve Binder takes on award shows. And finally, everyone who attended the Herman Rush panel on the “Impact of the New Wireless/Mobile World” on October 27 thought it the most interesting Caucus panel of experts in many years. We’ve captured the soul of it here in the *Caucus Journal*. 

FROM THE EDITORS
Roger Gimbel
Fay Kanin
let it be known, we have been busy! Thanks to a very supportive Steering Committee, Membership Committee and Events Committee, the past six months has seen a flurry of activity at The Caucus.

Government affairs continue to be a major forefront of challenges for us. In July, Caucus member Donna Brown and I visited Capitol Hill and sponsored a luncheon panel along with Representative Diane Watson’s office titled “More Media, Fewer Creative and Independent Voices.” Participants on the panel included Jonathan Rintels of The Center for Creative Voices, Robin Bronk of The Creative Coalition, and Michael Bracey of The Future of Music Coalition. Topics ranged from threats to the creative promise of the Internet, broadcast decency in today’s media, expanding the reach of radio with low power transmission, and my topic on the impact of integration on the creative voices.

After the luncheon, Donna and I attended meetings with representatives of Congressman Maurice Hinchey, Representative Louise Slaughter, Johanna Shelton, council for the committee on Commerce and Energy; final stop of the day, the FCC, to catch up with Caucus Spirit Award recipient Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

That July trip was the beginning of an important relationship between Representative Watson’s and Congressman Hinchey’s offices as the two moved forward with the proposal of HR 2359 bill that closely echoes our Caucus mission statement on consolidation. In fact, through the efforts of Steering Committee members Bonny Dore and Gary Grossman, we have been able to suggest language to strengthen the Watson/Hinchey bill.

Here in Los Angeles, the Caucus Events Committee has sponsored two very successful and innovative panels. The first was held mid-summer at HD Vision Studios, where President Randall Paris Dark lectured to a breakfast group of 50 about producing successful HD programs in all genres.
Perhaps though, our most successful event was this fall’s cell phone panel and new members’ mixer held on October 27, at the Century Plaza Hotel. Attended by over 100 participants, including many prospective new members, the panel discussion, created and led by Caucus Steering Committee member Herman Rush, was electrifying. Panel experts included: Don Beck of Toolbox Productions, Frank Chindamo of Fun Little Movies, Scott Ehrlich of Impulse Media, Neel Ketkar of Gemstar-TV Guide International, Inc., Peter Sealey of Los Altos Group, and Eric Smith of MobiTV. Exploring the technology of the new generation cell phones able to receive both audio and video program information was the topic of the evening.

Questions discussed: Is it a phone or a TV? What about guild residuals? Who will be the content providers? Will independent producers be able to own their own products? How and when will we see any money from this new technology?

When asked if anyone had questions, a sea of hands responded. Both the audience and the panel members agreed the seminar could have gone an additional hour to discuss this exciting new topic. We have included highlights of the discussion later in the Journal.

So yes, we have been busy, and we are making an impact! We have the ears of those in Washington as well as the eyes and ears of our Hollywood peers. Many thanks goes to Chuck Fries, Lee Miller, Greg Strangis, Herman Rush, Liz Selzer Lang, Holly Harter, Bonny Dore, Gary Grossman, John Berzner and Penny Rieger for their fine efforts.
The Caucus Foundation, founded in 2000, will have awarded by the end of 2005, close to 50 student completion film grants totaling $300,000. Our grant recipients continue to win Awards of Excellence around the world, and for 2004, we presented David Lazarte Risdon with the Caucus Foundation Outstanding Film Award.

The Foundation recently received $25,000 from the Carole & Robert Daly Foundation. This named fund, in addition to others, and the proceeds from our awards dinner provide the financial base for our grant program.

We have formed an Advisory Council of active educators and executives from the entertainment industry. The council members are:

- **Barbara Boyle**, Chair of the Dept. of Theater, Film & Television, UCLA
- **Leo Chaloukian**, Ascent Media Group
- **Randall Paris Dark**, HD Visions Studio
- **Allen Daviau**, ASC, Cinematographer
- **Ric Halpern**, Panavision
- **Jerry Roskilly**, Fotokem
- **Michael Taylor**, USC Film and Television School

The council will be available to advise and consult with the Board of Directors on the primary focus of the corporation including, but not limited to, the student grant awards process and mentoring and fundraising advisors to the Foundation as per the by-laws of the Caucus.

In December, we will select the outstanding film from grants provided in the winter of 2004 and spring of 2005. We are looking forward to another great year for the Foundation.

---

*Chuck Fries’ combined service to the Caucus as Chairman, Co-Chairman, and Secretary exceeds two decades. In addition to President of the Caucus Foundation, he serves as a member on the Board of the American Film Institute.*
Question: BOB, WHAT IS DIGITAL CINEMA ANYWAY?
Answer: Allow me to simplify: I went to my dentist the other day and he placed a curser in my mouth, pressed a button and on this laptop, there was a picture of the tooth in question. He enlarged it, tightened the picture, pressed another key on his laptop and printed out a picture of my tooth. Then he created a Finkel file and placed the picture in the file. ... NO X-RAY FILM! He created a cinema movie called The Tooth. Digital cinema is the science of digital storing and display. A movie is shot, stored and then delivered to a source (a movie theater) where it is projected by digital projectors. The source receives this material by satellite or even DVDs. This is an over simplification of the technique but okay for now.

Question: IS DIGITAL ACTUALLY BETTER THAN FILM?
Answer: Well, George Lucas and Steven Soderbergh think so. Flightplan, the Jodie Foster movie, and the new Star Wars were both projected digitally in theaters recently. Digital pictures have millions of colors and are immune to scratching, fading, popping, etc. The digital source runs about $200 whereas the filmprint runs about $1,200. A digital movie can be run at any time, and it is conceivable that all digital movies could be run at the same time. ... a premiere in all USA theaters at once. And, by the way, digital projectors cost in the neighborhood of $100,000, a price that needs monetary help form the suppliers, but that is a subject for another time.

Question: HOW DOES DIGITAL CINEMA WORK?
Answer: Remember when you say “digital cinema” that it can refer to TV as well. ... The process is about the same in theory. The digitized image file is transferred onto three optical semiconductors known as micro-mirror devices with three colors. ... The projector lamp is reflected off the mirrors making an image and the mirrors tilt toward the image a thousand times a second and onto the screen. Quite honestly, I do not understand the technicalities of this process.

Question: WHERE CAN ONE SEE A MOVIE DIGITALLY?
Answer: There are about 300 theaters worldwide showing movies in the digital format—Asia, Europe, North America—37 in the USA and 12 in Los Angeles.
**Question: BOB, WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO FILM?**
Answer: It is hard to say. Some people, like Lucas, think that film is dead. He is building a $350 million facility in San Francisco to house production of movies, games, special effects and animation. And, what is going to happen to the huge company, Emery Air Freight, that is dedicated only to shipping those huge cans of films as well as the Unions, film projectionists, editors, and film cameramen? ... I hesitate to think about that.

**Question: IS DIGITAL MORE EXPENSIVE?**
Answer: As far as I know, the only costs involved are the new digital camera projectors, etc. There are combinations now ... such as Technicolor who is packaging the costs of the equipment, the satellite transfer, etc., displaying a great deal of trust in the future of digital.

**Question: MILLIONS HAVE BEEN SPENT ON FILM PRESERVATION. ... WHAT ABOUT PRESERVING DIGITAL?**
Answer: They can digitally transfer all film to a hi-end disc. And, by the way, you can take a videotape and transfer it to a DVD and project it on a progressive machine and it is far superior to the original.

**Question: HOW CLOSE ARE WE TO WORLDWIDE DIGITAL EXHIBITION?**
Answer: We are there now.

**Question: WILL DIGITAL CINEMA BECOME AN ART FORM?**
Answer: I think you can call digital graphics an art form.

**Question: WHAT IS THE DOWNSIDE OF DIGITAL CINEMA?**
Answer: The time it takes to get people to understand it. It took a long time to arouse interest in using computers in the Caucus for Producers, Directors and Writers and it was a long time getting the Producers Guild of America to put up a Web site. The digital revolution is upon us, and, as creators, we must not lag behind.

**Question: PEOPLE KEEP ASKING ABOUT STREAMING VIDEO, WHAT IS IT EXACTLY?**
Answer: Streaming video is a sequence of “moving images” that are sent in compressed form over the Internet and displayed by the viewer as they arrive. Streaming media is streaming video with sound. With streaming video or streaming media, a Web user does not have to wait to download a large file before seeing the video or hearing the sound. Instead, the media is sent in a continuous stream and is played as it arrives. The user needs a player, which is a special program that uncompresses and sends video data to the display and audio data to speakers. A player can be either an integral part of a browser or downloaded from the software maker’s Web site.
Question: IS THERE SUCH A THING AS DIGITAL TELEVISION? EXPLAIN.

Answer: If you have Comcast or Adelphia or a little box that you pay extra for on top of your TV, you have digital television. If you are paying $3.95 for an on-demand movie, you have digital. Your SOURCE is either a dish or a cable to your digital box. And, did you notice how much better the picture is? ... Wait until December 2006 when all transmission will be in HD ... HD digital. My gosh, it was only yesterday when guys like me were using image-orthicon cameras and the radio folk thought we were a little strange.

By the way, try this site and you can make your own movie in 15 minutes ... http://dfilm.com/index.moviemaker.html.

Bob Finkel has mainly been associated with variety shows including the outstanding Andy Williams Show, The Perry Como Show and The Dinah Shore Show. He has won three Emmys and the coveted Peabody Award among many others. His credits as a director encompass McMillan and Wife, The Bob Newhart Show, and Barney Miller.

Getting the Caucus Foundation grant has allowed me to complete my thesis film without compromising my vision for it. Now the final product truly reflects all the hard work the cast and crew put into making this film, and I have The Caucus Foundation to thank for that.

— Jerry Chan
On October 27, 2005, The Caucus organized a panel discussion called A NEW WIRELESS WORLD and ITS IMPACT on the CREATIVE COMMUNITY. Moderated by Caucus member Herman Rush, who not only has an extensive career in film and television, he currently serves as a consultant to several companies engaged in this new digital and wireless world including Smart Video Technologies. Our guest panelists for the evening included:

Donald R. Beck – President/CEO, Tool Box Productions, Beck-Ola Productions and Neolink Wireless Content Inc.
Tool Box Productions and Beck-Ola Productions are full-service advertising agencies serving entertainment clients including UPN, MGM, ABC, Sony, Paramount, and Universal Worldwide. NeoLink Wireless Content is a streaming video content provider on MobiTV and Smart Video platforms.

Frank Chindamo – USC Professor & CEO, Fun Little Movies
FLM is a channel of original, live action, mobile comedy entertainment found around the world on Sprint’s PCS Phones, Microsoft’s new PMC Service Vision SM Multi-Media, and on Smart Phones using Smart Video. FLM’s content is also available on the web at www.funlittlefilms.com.

Scott Ehrlich – Managing Partner, Impulse Media
He is founder and managing partner of Seattle-based Impulse Media LLC, a digital business consulting company as well as co-founder of Red Tie Incorporated, a development company with offices in New York and Seattle.

Neel Ketkar – Director, Mobile Entertainment, Gemstar-TV Guide

Peter Sealey, Ph.D. – CEO & Co-Founder, Los Altos Group, Inc.
As the founder, CEO, and majority stockholder of Los Altos Group, Inc. (LAG), he specializes in business and marketing strategy for media and technology companies.
Eric Smith – Senior Director, MobiTV
He is senior director of Business Development and Programming for MobiTV. He’s responsible for developing and implementing MobiTV’s programming strategy.

(Full bios of each panelist are available on our Web site: www.caucus.org)

MODERATOR HERMAN RUSH:
America is the land of plenty. Its population is over 250 million people. We have many modern conveniences offering us a means by which to receive news, information, education, sports, and entertainment. We have radio. We now have satellite radio, television, cable, home videos, DVD, iPods, and now cellular telephones, PDAs, and other wireless receptors. It is in this new wireless community area that the Caucus and its guests explored and discussed the wireless impact on the creative community. Is it television? Is it the Internet? Is it new? Is it just more of the same? For certain, it’s unique. It’s unusual. It’s mobile. It’s small. It’s interactive. Some say if it quacks like a duck, it must be a duck—therefore, it’s television. Others believe it’s a media and should be treated accordingly. Let’s hear what the above experts thought. Below are a few of their remarks and the questions they put forward:

Is it television? Or is it merely an extension of the same, or are these mobile receptors a new media, a new technology?

“If a technology company that provides the video services to carriers like Sprint and Cingular and the content that they put up via their services is live television ... then ... ”

... It is television. Isn’t it?

“Perhaps the answer lays in the question: How are the consumers going to consume this content? They don’t consume it in the same way that you would consume television at home. Consumers use it as a very much as an alternative, like a snack-type television where they’re into it for a few minutes, wherein they’ve got some time, they sit down and watch regular television.”

So, maybe it’s not television.

“Even though there isn’t much programming available on mobile devices, from anywhere you can watch a popular television program streamed on your wireless device, and this is because cellular technology companies go out and do deals with television networks and people who provide television content to television networks.”

So maybe it is just an extension of television?

“Remember, there is a permanent, systematic long-term decline in theatrical exhibition, box office movies, because of the in-home experience’s advent of large screen TV’s, the new plasma TV’s and now the debut of hi-def TV’s. It is a much different scenario than 25 years ago, when the leading technology at home was a 24-inch color television set. So the way we consume media is going to be different on that hand-held device ... ”
... but it’s going to still be television ... but it will be different.

“One of the nifty things that mobile brings to us is (whereas regular TV has gone from three channels to a hundred channels to now the 500-channel universe) wireless will become increasingly more personal and more niche oriented. The Internet’s evolution of the last five years has certainly helped reveal this aspect. Mobile will make the media experience even more personal. You don’t just have consumers only consuming this content outside of the home when there isn’t another television around. You will also have them consuming it at other places within their home that is more appealing for viewing because of what they’re doing at that moment.”

So, it is television.

“... The cellular space will follow a similar continuum to the way the product development has worked in the past. Product development for digital platforms seems to follow a pattern of re-purpose (take the programming you have where the marginal cost of putting it onto this new distribution platform is relatively low).”

The current model for content on cellular telephone appears to be following the cable model of subscription.

If it is television, there’s one set of rights involved. If it’s not television, it might be another.

“What about the opinion by the unions and the guilds, starting with the networks, as to rights? How do we address that issue? And If it is television, are we actually dealing with the same rights that television deals with?”

Everybody has an issue around this subject of rights.

“For example, SAG is creating agreements for their members who perform in the wireless medium.”

The guilds are getting savvy ...

“For some wireless technology companies, it’s the number one issue that they deal with everyday. ... offering live networks on their channels. MSNBC, CNBC and Discovery for example are available via wireless devices. Some are live, linear feeds right off the satellite ... the same as on the East Coast feeds for these television networks.”

...Mobile video didn’t exist two years ago. Thus, nobody really thought to start carving out ‘mobile’ as part of what they were negotiating when they were doing deals.

“But others, such as ESPN and Fox Sports cannot be offered via their live signals.
because of the rights issues. And this is in part due to a networks’ business with organizations such as the leagues ...”

_Now, all the content providers and the traditional linear networks are starting to look at ways to carve things out._

“... There is a recent trend in the producers of television shows that appear on linear networks coming directly to wireless companies and trying to cut the network out altogether, and saying: We’re the ones that own the rights not the networks, and we’re not going to give them to them. We’ll give them the television rights but we’re not going to give them the mobile rights so that we can do a deal directly with the mobile sector.”

_It’s power that is going to bifurcate._

“Power is going to go to the consumer of media or communications, or to mobile entertainment, or to the content producers, and the middlemen, to some extent, will be obsolete, because the others are going to have so much power to bypass them. Much in the same manner that TiVo bypasses commercials or that conducting long-distance phone calls via one’s laptop while traveling in foreign country supersedes the usage of a long-distance telephone carrier.”

_Looking ahead to the burgeoning market sector of wireless, we must think through on this one and not let the DVD/home video paradigm of taking your creative product and giving it to somebody else ..._

“If it is television, what is the Government’s position? Is there Government regulation? Are the same rules that apply to television now going to apply to mobile? Is it interference? The government doesn’t know now how to treat Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) as to whether it’s a telephone service or not. They don’t yet know how to regulate technology such as this. They don’t yet know how to charge the universal service fee in this model. In short, the technology has outpaced the ability of the old institutions to categorize applications in new formats.”

_At the core, technology continually outpaces our ability to understand it or project it or anticipate the rights issues interlaced with it._

**If it is television, is there a need for any standardization within this new wireless world?**

“There are different technologies being used by different phone carriers. One major obstacle to having any sort of association control anything at this point or drive anything at this point is there are multiple potential industry standards, whether they’re defined by the industry standard groups or become de facto-driven by major technology corporations or carriers ...”

... _this will need to play out a little bit more._

“In the cellular sector that carries content, there are about 60 or more different handsets. Mobile service providers have to create an individual port for each handset type. So as we start to see the carriers and the handset manufacturers bring out phones that are video enabled—it’s going to get better. But,
if there was an industry standard that was out there, mobile service providers would love for it to be there because they’d be further along. The real barrier ... is that ... if you pickup any particular cellular phone, it may or may not play back video.”

If it does playback video it’s one of nine different flavors.

“... First ... the user experience has to get better. ... Some phones that we run on, it’s like a slide show ... (well), it’s probably worse than a slide show. Other phones that we run on, it’s a pretty good user experience and it’s watchable. With the cellular networks that are coming out, the new phones that are video enabled phones—the user experience is getting better.”

Yes, size matters. Size matters in terms of file size. Size matters in terms of the size of the screen. Size matters in terms of the amount of time that you have to fit into this medium.

“While we think about this, we look at the train wreck that the studios are about to have between Blue Ray and HDTV regarding the technology of high definition television. Here it comes again, 1976 all over again (the war between Beta and VHS). This train wreck will slow the adoption of HDTV. It will slow and reduce the size of the market because the industry at large can’t sit down and decide on a common standard.”

That’s why we can build a business on the Internet ... everybody started with a PC. . . We could address 90 percent of the market with one set of code.

“This whole value added services model is such a key thing for them. And I don’t think they’ve solved it. A value-added service to a telephone company in a wire line ... is call waiting. That’s a value-added service. I mean think about it. That really is. They made billions and billions of dollars off of call waiting. So, what’s the next thing that’s going to be that value-added service? And are they going to bring it or are they going to go outside and get it?”

Could the offering of certain content via cellular be the value-added service?

Will advertising become part of this model? Will it be a separate advertising model? And if so, is it going to happen soon or is it going to happen later?

“... A 30-second spot, a minute spot, that’s not the right thing for the mobile sector. If someone’s only watching for eight minutes, they don’t want to spend, you know, an eighth of their time watching an ad. With the exception of a live feed, for example, if you are watching MSNBC on your cell, you’ll see the same length ad as you would on television—because it’s the live signal: it’s whatever’s on the television is on your wireless device.”

Like television, advertising has to be a part of this.

“During one mobile program, three seconds of advertising is allowed for every video that’s longer than 60 seconds and at the end of the segment there is an 800 number to call. For another company, to get paid for
their services, (they) provide deconstructed, video programming; after which, (they) close with a little five-minute short spiel that says: ‘if you want to buy my entire series, go to this Web site ...’”

_In short, no one knows when big advertising will come and how._

“But advertisers always find eyeballs, right? And people who sell eyeballs always find a way to sell those eyeballs to advertisers. Part of the problem is, again, what have we done so far? We’ve slapped 30-second ads onto broadband TV and broadband video. We’ve slapped 30-second ads onto mobile video.”

_And guess what? Neither of them work, right?_

“The Internet started with a business model that was: ‘Hey, let’s slap banner ads onto web pages, right?’ A paradigm that’s roughly similar to either buying a billboard or buying an ad in a magazine.”

_Hey, guess what, turns out that it’s not much of a business._

“Four or five years ago, BMW spent almost 50 million dollars to produce a series of five-minute clips for their Web site. And they had John Frankenheimer, John Woo, and Guy Ritchie directing. And people thought BMW was crazy to spend that kind of money. It was one of the most successful campaigns in the history of advertising and it was done on a new medium. . .the web.”

_And at some point, somebody is going to produce some kind of advertising campaign for mobile television._

“... During _Desperate Housewives_ this past year, one of the housewives was demonstrating at an auto show. In the scene she was demonstrating a Buick LaCrosse and she gave every sales point on that Buick LaCrosse automobile ... Really, at its core, it was a three-minute commercial. In the advent of TiVo, they found a way to get a commercial into the programming.”

_One day, we’ll find the same paradigm in the mobile sector. No one knows how it’ll happen, but the money’s going to get in there._

“... One of the inherent advantages that the platform has is that it has basically an Internet backbone, an Internet backed channel, to be able to track what users do in real time and to be able to target, similar to the keyword search targeting, to be able to do that targeting.”

_When advertising is germane to each of us, we like it._

“Every handset will have a one-to-one relationship with the carrier so the advertisers literally can get down to each individual person. That’s a key difference than other technologies that are out there.”

_So, think about that. It’s not an aggregate of advertising like Nielsen. It is how many people absolutely in that universe watched._

“When you get a GPS on a wireless consumer, you know not only who the person is, where the person is. And if you, the advertiser via the wireless service, know it’s a college kid and it’s 7:00 on a Saturday night, you might throw a coupon for (a
popular local pizza chain) at the person and say, you know: Come to your (favorite pizza chain) with this code number and get four dollars off of a pizza.”

*This concept is known as location-based services, where basically the advertisers, the marketers, the wireless carriers know where YOU are with your phone.*

“... How do we monetize as independent producers the content that we produce? So, as an example, we’re producing golf tips, gaming tips, and the ability within 100 feet of a casino to gamble with a proprietary software available on either one of our channels, ‘Vegas Sports’ or ‘Vegas Scoreline.’”

*If we want the economics to be affordable ... Advertising has to become part of wireless experience.*

“We don’t want a big wireless bill each month as a consumer. If wireless viewing providers start adding more money to the service, it is going to reach a threshold where people won’t subscribe. ... The way to kind of lower some of those economics is to allow people to advertise ... ”

... *Let the advertisers support programming on behalf of the consumer.*

“Wireless service providers wish they had ads on every one of their channels. They don’t. And that is actually bothersome ... because they think it creates a disjointed viewer experience because some channels have ads and some don’t. There are wireless service providers out there who are actively trying to get all of their content providers to do something in the space, ‘just something. It doesn’t have to be, you know, put a, you know, McDonalds commercial on there.’ Just do something so that the viewers get trained to know that ads will be on here.”

*So, we may as well get people used to it now.*

Since the majority of those in the room attending this panel are involved in content, the belief is that content is king. Will content be the guiding force that’s going to create the increase in a number of cell phones out there, increase the number of consumers that will subscribe to programming on that cell phone, whether that will impact on the current subscription rates that are $10 or $12, or $19? And will cellular content ultimately threaten the content on television?

And as the cellular sector grows, the service providers are deathly afraid of becoming obsolete because cellular is easily commoditized. Could this be the same for television? The margins go out of it, and it’s a business with high overhead, right? Could it be that simple? If they can’t sell you services—content services, always at the top of the list. They can’t sell you services, they just spent trillions of dollars on worthless infrastructure, right, because you’re switching costs from SBC DSL to Comcast broadband to Sprint EBDL, right, or some satellite delivered thing we haven’t thought of yet, is zero.

*Tune in later this year ... The Caucus will address this very question in more detail with a follow-up panel about television and the advent of cellular programming.*
We have all had the experience of hearing one of the local or national newsreaders on an ABC station address an issue that touches on the Disney empire and close the news item by mentioning that the station broadcasting this information is a part of the very same Disney corporate monolith. All of this, of course, is to acknowledge the possibility of something akin to a home-team bias.

It’s only fair that I open this offering with a personal version of the Disney disclaimer. The topic of what follows is the effect of current technology on the story-telling process that is, for some of us still, a key element to our livelihood. I simply must state up front that I am admittedly an analog person in a digital world.

Though by no means a Luddite, I confess they would probably invite me to their Christmas party, and that I would probably attend, unless it was a no-host bar. With that said, I am not the Unabomber, not seeking to limit computers use, knowing that planes would tumble from the sky, iPods would be merely numchucks with aspirations, and I couldn’t TiVo Jerry Springer at my leisure. Even as I flash back to my eight track, I know the fault, as the man pointed out, lies in us and not in the giant strides made in the world of CGI and its assorted hydra-headed cousins.

There is something in our psyche that turns us into 6-year-olds on Christmas morning when a new piece of man’s ingenuity to man is placed before us. To the best of my recollection, this has been true every time a new Edison cranked out an earthshaking breakthrough. (For Hemingway, the earth moved. For technologists, apparently, it shakes.)

Shortly after The Jazz Singer tweaked our hearing, Hollywood created a veritable avalanche of talking pictures, which soon escalated into all-talking, all-singing presentations, and shortly thereafter the audiences let Hollywood know that all-talking and all-singing was becoming all-boring, too. The steed upon which we ride into the future turned out to be bolted to a merry-go-round of mediocrity.

Someone, an odd person no doubt, then recalled that there was a time when audiences had seemed to respond to characters interacting in the framework of a cleverly crafted story. It’s an offbeat concept, but the studios’ risk-takers always decided to try it. They brought in writers and directors who had some storytelling expertise and wedded these talented souls to the new world of sound and dialog and for reasons no one can clearly comprehend, the audiences were taken with this new development. The movie industry grew fat and happy—Mickey and
Judy, Bogie and Betty, and Lassie and Kong—all was right with the world.

Yes, there was something called television on the horizon, but it was a fad, a bug waiting to be squashed under the booted heel of Hollywood’s better thinking. Clearly, television was no threat because for one thing, it was in black and white and movies were in color and, more to the point, the damned screen was so small. To point out the shortcomings of the small screen, Hollywood opted to make its screens even bigger than they already were. There was the Superscope, VistaVision and the movie screen on steroids Cinerama. The deathblow would surely be dealt by the best thing of all: 3-D!

“\textbf{The saddest thing \ldots is the time that gets wasted riding on the merry-go-round.}”

There were flaming arrows flying into the lens causing red- and blue-lensed audiences to shriek and duck. There were daggers hurled, guns exploded, bosoms thrust aggressively, though never hurled or exploded, if my research is correct. Technology had saved the day.

Unfortunately, they lost the week, the month and the year.

Then someone, an odd person one presumes, wondered aloud if it might make sense to explore the notion of using interesting characters that would interact within the framework of a cleverly crafted story. While admitting it was at best a Hail Mary sort of strategy, some agreed to give it a try, and for reasons no one can be expected to comprehend, the audiences did return and even stayed to see some of their favorites again and again.

Television had its own spiking fevers. Many can recall the innovation of the zoom lens, which allowed some directors to hammer together television episodes that allowed us to recall what it was like to be a three-year old or a swing. Stereophonic sound also came into the living room, just in case we wanted to experience Wimbledon as it might have sounded to Ray Charles. In short, the television marvels were no less vulnerable to technology addiction than their movie mirrors had been in the past.

Maybe it’s genetic, this tendency to throw out the old every time a new cookie comes off the assembly line. To our credit, here is also a clear history of our eventually regaining our balance from the initial overreaction, but it creates great gray areas of pabulum programming that tends to lower the bar till it rests on the curbstone.

The saddest thing about this tilt we bring to the table is the time that gets wasted riding on the merry-go-round. It has been proved time and time again that the art of storytelling and technology’s advances can work hand in hand and in ways that bring up to new peaks, which we can envision new
horizons. Go see the technical mastery of *Sin City* and marvel at its loyalty to the source of the story as, at the same time, it honors the mystery of the story itself—no contradiction and no quality compromised. It’s a double-ring ceremony.

It’s not a unique result; this is successful melding. We saw it work in *Apollo 13*, *Forrest Gump*, the *Star Wars* offerings, *Harry Potter* as well as a host of others. If one end of that teeter-totter is out of balance it simply won’t work, unless you are content to offer a sideshow of sensation or a casserole of Cool Whip. We can do better than that; we are better than that.

Why did *Lost* strike such chords with audiences and critics alike? Was it the setting, characters, or mysterious effects? Try all of the above. The creators had the faith in themselves and, more importantly, in their audience, to utilize every color in the palate that helped them along the way. They didn’t jump on a bandwagon. Neither did they turn their backs on the elements that worked in *The Globe* and every *Punch and Judy* show. They told a compelling story and kept their skills interwoven within the fabric of the show they were doing.

It has always seemed to me that when we do what we do well, we are doing the following: We are telling the truth in an interesting way. Might be serious, might be comedic, but we’re telling the truth in an interesting way. Not enough to just tell the truth, that’s for Koppel. Not enough to just be interesting, that’s for the Raiders’ cheerleaders. When we take all the tools at our disposal and integrate our imagination with all the wonders coming out of Lucasville and Gatestown, we will then have the chance to justify our skills and validate our effort.

Hit “enter.”

---

*Mr. Blinn has been active as a Writer and/or Producer for the better part of four decades. He has received multiple Emmys, WGA Awards, and Golden Globes.*
The universe is going digital, widescreen and high resolution, and the “traditional” aspect 4x3 TVs just don’t seem the same anymore. Let’s be honest, 36 inches of low resolution just doesn’t cut it. I always thought a square box shouldn’t represent the outside world, but it was the norm. One day I saw a “traditional” 16x9 HDTV. Sure, the resolution was amazing and the detail was uncanny, but it was the shape that caught my eye. It was much like the way I actually see the world. It filled my vision vertically and horizontally. What a concept! As a storyteller, why would I want to force my vision into a frame that has no reference to our world? Raise your hand if you want to shoot black and white and set up your shots in such a way that you need to cram the content into a confining area. ... I thought not. If you have an option to work with a technology that expands your creative process, why would you even consider something else?

Doesn’t it make perfect sense? Movies are showcased in their proper aspect ratio, and sports that are played in rectangle arenas are presented in rectangular form—and size! Oh yes, size does matter. Bigger is not only better, it’s brighter, sharper and honestly, you won’t go blind by sitting three picture heights away from the screen. The image will fill your vision and the willing suspension of disbelief will jump start your emotions. Your cathartic response will be far beyond what you have had in the past with inferior display systems.

The constant cliché is that the difference between HDTV and “traditional” NTSC is as dramatic as the difference between black-and-white and color TV. Another is that watching HDTV is like looking through a glass window. I’ve even heard people say, “I wish I could see the world as clearly as these images.” The truth is, technology is a moving target and this target has moved on. Finger to toothbrush, horse and buggy to automobile, typewriter to computer and that ancient 4x3 aspect display device to HDTV.

The naysayers tell us that consumers don’t want to pay more for an improved picture. Please shut up and check out the latest HDTV sales figures released by the Consumer Electronics Association. Historically, humankind has constantly demanded, fought and strived for improvements and upgrades. The computer industry preys on this human weakness. Remember, this device is beyond a television. This consumer device will be your television, your
computer, your VCR, your PDA, DVD, DVR and your new best friend all rolled into one.

In the true sense, high definition is not even television. Referring to HD as television is like saying 35 mm is television. Yes, we watch content that was captured on 35 mm daily in our living rooms. Most movies and dramas are currently shot using film, but they are then transferred to a different format for electronic distribution via television. Just a few years ago, almost all sitcoms were shot using film. Today, the opposite is true. Most sitcoms are shot using HD. This is changing rapidly.

Film is an incredible art form that has been around for over a century, but I believe film’s days are numbered as well. My next paper will be called “The Death of Film.”

Yes, high definition will be used for television but it is so much more than that. It’s an evolution in technology that is not only impacting our homes, but also movie theaters, retail stores, museums, medicine, military and computers.

Why will 4x3 die? The main reason is that televisions worldwide are being slowly replaced with the 16x9 display devices. If you transfer a 4x3 standard def image to 16x9, you have three options. Option 1: blow the image up (zoom in) to fill the screen, which crops the frame and worsens the image; Option 2: side bar panels, now that’s attractive; and finally, my favorite, make everything fat and short by stretching the picture. Actors will really love that option. Each of these options completely takes the viewer out of the willing suspension of disbelief and breaks the visual flow of the story.

We now have a television system that affords and demands excellent visuals—a technology that can actually heighten inferior images. It’s called high definition for a reason.

As a businessman with an ego, I believe that my programs will stand the test of time creatively. However, it is imperative for my financial future that everything I create today will be shown for years to come. Why would I want to limit my pocket book with a format that will no longer be used in the future? Stock footage libraries are already seeing a significant decrease in 4x3 sales. I predict that eventually those libraries will be virtually worthless.

The creative community strives for the absolute best looking pictures from the image capture process all the way through to the final display. They will be the true crusaders and we will all benefit from their artistic vision. With that said, a great story is still a great story no matter how the images look, no matter how they are displayed, no matter

“... a great story is still a great story no matter how the images look ...”
what the aspect ratio is. Some of you still watch *I Love Lucy* and enjoy it, but I bet you are over the age of 50. 4x3 will die a slow death but a death nonetheless.

An undisputed pioneer in the high definition industry, Randall P. Dark is the creative and marketing force behind HD Vision Studios, Inc. His 19 years of work exclusively in the medium have distinguished him as both an artistic and technological visionary. As a writer, director, and producer, Dark is able to offer an artist’s point-of-view while demonstrating the technological advantages of high definition. Dark and his companies have been involved in over 2,000 HD projects including feature films, documentaries, commercials, music videos, corporate presentations, product launches, and live events. In addition to his experience in high definition, Randall is a theatrical director/producer, published playwright, and has recently completed writing the children’s book *The Tale of Sasquatch.*

I was wonderfully surprised and delighted to receive a grant from The Caucus Foundation. Getting the grant made me feel supported as a documentary filmmaker and encouraged me to keep doing the work I love to do. I am truly honored to be a recipient, and I can’t thank you enough!

— Lila Place
THE GOLDEN YEARS — OR WERE THEY?

Conversation between Allan Burns, Jay Sandrich, Roger Gimbel & Fay Kanin

Allan Burns created, wrote and produced The Mary Tyler Moore Show, Rhoda and Lou Grant. He is the recipient of six Emmy Awards, two Peabody Awards, and two of the Writers Guild of America’s most prestigious honors, The Valentine Davies Award and shared the Laurel Award for Television Writing Achievement with James L. Brooks.

Jay Sandrich directed The Mary Tyler Moore Show from 1970 to 1977. He also directed The Cosby Show, The Golden Girls pilot and Soap for several years. His work includes three feature films and a variety music special with Lily Tomlin. He has won four Emmy Awards for Outstanding Directing in a Comedy Series, three DGA Awards for Outstanding Directorial Achievement in a Comedy Series, and one for Musical/Variety (The Lily Tomlin Show).

Fay: What we are curious about is how writing for comedy has changed. What’s different about it now?

Jay: You mean how the whole production has changed.

Allan: When Jay and I were doing The Mary Tyler Moore Show, there was really a desire to do good shows. The networks cared if they had a quality show. Grant Tinker’s whole concept was it was like a grocery store where there was something for everyone. The ones they cared about were the shows that had some intellectual basis and were witty.

Jay: I have one quick Grant Tinker story. I know it’s true because I was there. At one point, Brandon Tartikoff asked Grant to replace Cheers because it was doing very badly in the ratings. And Grant said, “Do you have a better show?” Brandon replied, “No”, and Grant said, “Then why should
we replace it? Leave it on. Eventually the audience will find it.”

**Allan:** And they did.

**Jay:** Another difference is that very few shows have one director for a series. They bring in different directors, which basically fragments the authority on stage because the producers are there every week. So the actors don’t really pay that much attention because they know the producer is going to come down and change it.

**Fay:** The big emphasis was for the show to get numbers, wasn’t it?

**Jay:** I think everybody cared about that, but we never talked about numbers. We talked about doing a good show.

**Allan:** The reason that I pulled away from doing series television was that I found that the networks were so intrusive, much more intrusive than they used to be. Grant’s attitude was, both at MTM and later at NBC, “I’m going to hire the best people I know and listen to their ideas. If I like them, let them do it.” And then the show was on for twelve years. They pull shows so quickly now. It’s like the weekend box office in movies. If a movie doesn’t do well on the opening weekend, it’s dead. And the same thing applies to television these days. Nobody will leave a show anymore in hopes for the best. I won’t say nobody because occasionally there is a show that does, like *Everybody Loves Raymond.* And they weren’t even too sure of that. But they let Phil Rosenthal have his creative vision and Les Moonves did support it.

**Jay:** Well, it’s a different audience they’re aiming for these days. It used to be they wanted a large audience, now they want a killer audience of younger people.

**Roger:** It’s happening in every field and in the whole society. Kids are running the show.

**Allan:** I think cable has a lot to do with the coarsening of discourse, the level of sophistication, of taste. And network television is now trying to pander to the same audience.

**Fay:** In your era, they didn’t do series from cartoons, did they? Now half the shows are knock-offs of cartoons.

**Jay:** I must say, there’s nothing wrong with that. If young people like cartoons, why not? Some of them are very clever. As long as there are also shows somewhere for adults—about human emotions. One of the things about *The Mary Tyler Moore Show* was that we were always finding moments that maybe didn’t have a laugh but had a feeling of emotion. So when the show was over, you knew what that show was about. Today you turn the set off and ten minutes later you say, “What was that show about?”

**Allan:** A lot of laughs but very little content.

**Jay:** I want to go back to one other thing that Allan said. I did a series about five years ago, a pilot for a series. It was done for 20th Century Fox, NBC Productions and NBC. The poor writer would get notes from three
different sources and a lot of times they were in conflict.

Roger: And what about the advertising?

Jay: Well, that was in the early days. I worked for Sheldon Leonard and Danny Thomas when the advertising companies owned the shows.

Allan: We would generally get notes from one person, a network executive who was the liaison to the show. If you go on a comedy stage today, a multiple-camera show, and you go to a rehearsal, you’re likely to see fifteen or twenty people in suits standing on the stage. How can anybody not feel intimidated by that? The actors are never going to give their best performance with that.

Jay: Grant would not permit that. He had enough confidence in what he was doing and he was content to walk away from it. When we were in rehearsal, there would be one person there from the network and she would sit in the audience and maybe she’d just have a couple of notes she had brought along. Not to say that it never happened. When we were getting The Mary Tyler Moore Show off the ground, they really didn’t like the concept. Unbeknownst to Jim Brooks and me, they said to Grant, “These guys are going to kill you. Get rid of them.”

Allan: But Grant never told us that and just stayed with us. The reason they hated the early scripts was because there were not jokes that they could say. They were looking for how many laughs per page.

Jay: They were there but they were character laughs.

Fay: And another thing-branding within the show, trying to find how to do the advertising within the body of the show. Gene Reynolds has done a wonderful article in which he says, “we used to worry about the storyline and the content and the characters, now we’re supposed to worry about how you put Coca-Cola in there.”

Jay: I was asked to come in and consult on a show a few years ago, and there were 12 or 13 people in the writer’s room, all trying to work out a story, everybody talking over everybody else. They spent the first two hours talking about what they saw last night. Very often the ideas that were coming up were variations on stuff that they had seen that worked. And the whole frame of reference was other television shows.

“That’s when I quit. I can’t sit in a room with 13 or 14 people pitching at the same time …”
Allan: Not life. That’s when I quit. I can’t sit in a room with 13 or 14 people pitching at the same time, trying to work out a story.

Jay: And another problem seems to be that everything is sexual. Not that I’m against sex. But those are easy laughs. And it’s a challenge to find different ways of doing things—stories and jokes. Today they do the same thing over and over again. The young audience seems to like it. “I’ve seen that before so it’s got to be funny.”

Roger: What do you think the difference is in this so-called young audience?

Jay: Well, their attention span is obviously shorter. Sometimes we used to do five, six, seven, eight, nine-minute scenes of two people talking. Today, they’re just little short scenes and a couple of jokes. I think computers, the Internet, MTV and things like that have had a strong influence.

Roger: Or there’s action. Action is a big word now. Sin City and Sahara are the two big-screen movies of last summer and they are action movies. Just ‘bang, bang.’

Jay: Well, there’s a place for everything. What is a comedy show that adults can really hang on to today on television? Obviously, one was Everybody Loves Raymond. Dick Van Dyke has a show on Channel 30 called, Diagnosis Murder, a re-run. And, the kids still love The Cosby Show.

Fay: But comedy has always had a tough time. When you look at how many comedies have won Academy Awards there are very few because there’s a prevailing thought that comedy is easy to do. It’s really the hardest to write, the hardest to direct, the hardest to produce. It takes years of experience to run a comedy show. There has to be an art to the stories. You have to know how to cast-casting is critical.

Allan: And there’s such a proliferation of producers on a show. People who are not really producing but want that title.

Jay: And what about the types of comedy that are done in front of an audience?

Fay: Was Everybody Loves Raymond in front of an audience?

Allan: Yes. But there’s a bit of a move away from audience shows. Back to one-camera. Arrested Development is a one-camera show. They’re doing more of those now.

Jay: But here’s the problem. When you’re doing a one-camera show, you get a script and if you’re lucky, maybe you have a half-day to read and rewrite it. Then you go to work and if a scene doesn’t play you don’t have time to fix it. You just do it. Whereas in an audience show, you have three days of rehearsal. You work on scenes and the writers come and see it and sometimes there are massive rewrites.

Allan: On one-camera shows, you shoot what’s in the script.

Jay: The thing is, networks are fallible.

Allan: And that’s gotten worse. Young executives without any experience, never having done it, are giving you—
Fay: —suggestions.

Jay: Not suggestions where they say you ought to go in this direction, but in whole new directions. And these are from people who have never done it telling people who have been doing it for years that they are doing it wrong.

Allan: Basically, they’ve been hired to supervise.

Jay: And, by God, they’re going to do it! A guy that doesn’t know diddly. I remember one time we did a show called Soap for ABC and Marcy Carsey was the comedy executive. We did a run-through and Marcy had one note. She said, “I’m not sure about this particular scene” and that was the whole note. It wasn’t, “do this and do that.” I still to this day remember that.

Roger: It’s not the networks today—it’s the cable companies, isn’t it?

Jay: Places like HBO, that’s where you want to do comedies. There’s much less interference. I remember when we started our career there were titans of the business. When you’re young and you have something to say and there’s fire in the belly to say it, people are going to listen to you. As you get older, new people come in and take over—that’s just the way it is. Doesn’t do any good to be critical, that’s the way it is and that’s life. But it was for us a wonderful time to work. The people in television comedy aren’t having the same joy. But for us, it was a great product we’re all proud of. I think we all felt that we were doing something that had some meaning. Obviously it must have because it’s still being shown.

The Caucus is truly a rare and wonderful organization. Without its support, I would not be able to finish my film, and because of the mentoring program I’ve been able to establish incredible contacts in the industry.

— Sandra Chwialkowska
WE ARE NOT THE ENEMY
(The Truth About Producers)
by Larry Turman

Maligned, misunderstood and often mysteriously credited, movie producers rarely get their props. Finally, one speaks out.

With the sweet smell of my success still in the air, I thought I would give myself a break and get out of the trenches. Having just produced the 1967 film The Graduate, I decided to executive-produce my next film, which meant trying the entrepreneur route—setting up financing for a film and choosing the creative elements, including a producer who would supervise the shoot. I was a relaxed, happy camper at a dinner hosted by my friend and fellow producer David Wolper in the summer of 1968, bragging about how I had a picture that I was about to start shooting, Pretty Poison, with a fine script by Lorenzo Semple Jr. (The Parallax View) and a superb cast (Anthony Perkins and Tuesday Weld). I boasted that I wasn’t even going to visit the set. I had hired a producer to do the job.

But before I had even started on my dessert, I was hit by a flurry of phone calls. My producer and the director tracked me down to tell me that their crew was in mutiny and they couldn’t start the film. I was on a plane the next morning to put out the fire as well as to rub sticks to start new ones. First, I cajoled the assistant director to stay on board, and then I axed the production manager and hired a new one. I did a lot of fanny patting and got everyone on track emotionally, and, soon, the movie was off and running. It wasn’t long before the neophyte director fell behind schedule. Each night I would have to go over his shot list with him for the next day’s work to ensure he could “make his day.” After we finished filming, I had to spend hours in the editing room and at the sound mix. Merely executive-producer? I never worked so hard in my life.

Nobody cares what goes into a film, only what comes out. Happily, the critics, including Pauline Kael, loved Pretty Poison. The director went on to bigger and better things (for a while). My young producer learned the importance of crisis management, and I learned you couldn’t always tell from the producer credits who did what on a film. Today, many films credit anywhere from 4 to 14 producers, some who are “baggage,” because there are so many categories of producer: executive producers, co-producers, associate producers, line producers and assistant producers. Line producers are physical production specialists. They are the
guys on the ground, overseeing every day of the shoot. Executive producers get that credit for anything from arranging the money, being manager of the star or director, or being the studio executive overseeing the film. The associate producer title is a catchall, designating anyone the producer deems worthy. The real deal is the producer. He or she runs the show. It’s the producer, and only the producer, who is called onstage to accept the Academy Award for Best Picture.

Even so, hardly anyone knows what a producer’s job is. You can see a director’s work, you can hear a writer’s work, and you can readily assess an actor’s skill. But let me tell you, the producer just happens to be the cause and reason that all the others are working on the movie. What you see at your local theater nearly always began its life as just an idea in a producer’s head. Sure, writers give birth to ideas and stories, some directors too, but without our recognition and steadfast push, most films would not see the light of day. It is the producer who starts the ball rolling, and keeps it rolling. Do I sound self-serving and prejudiced? Well, I plead guilty. That takes nothing away from the talented, creative others I’ve had to convince, implore, and seduce to climb aboard my project. Even film crews often don’t fully understand or appreciate that the producer has busted his or her butt for several (or many) bloody, sweaty, and tearful years prior to the start of filming. I’ve been on set and heard them mutter about me, “look at the slicker just standing around, and he gets the big bucks.”

Oh, sure, I’m hot stuff at the restaurants where I get the best tables, and at parties, where everybody wants to talk about my business, not theirs. But I only get a paycheck when/if I make a movie—and that’s not every year. My friends get a paycheck each and every month. I’m more like an oil wildcatter who sinks a lot of dry holes and once in a while, hopefully, hits a gusher, as I did with The Graduate.

Maybe a few stories will help show some of the things a producer actually does:

Getting started: What’s the big idea?
Charles Webb wrote The Graduate, but his novel had only sold several thousand hardcover copies and was lying fallow when I spotted it and took an option for $1,000 of my own money, which was a lot for me in 1963. I then chose Mike Nichols to direct, before he became Mike Nichols. (He had directed one Broadway play, Barefoot in the Park, but had not yet done a film. I had already produced four films, the last being Gore Vidal’s The Best Man.) Together, we developed the script and cast Dustin Hoffman and Anne Bancroft, and then, together, became rich and famous. Of course, he a little more than I. (A few years
later, a big *New York Times* story about me was headlined “But They Still Say ‘Larry Who?’”)

**The pitch: Hope springs eternal**

Every producer pitches a story to the studio his own way. I’ve seen some practically jump on the executive’s desk and act out every role. I myself use a low-key, straightforward approach: Here’s my project, here’s why I like it, here’s what I think its potential is, and I hope you share my enthusiasm (and they usually don’t). I always expect a no and am rarely disappointed, but all it takes is one yes and then I’m in the game. So we producers live on hope, and it does spring eternal. After all, a project is only dead if the producer quits working on it. I hate to admit it, but I quit on *Amadeus* after my enthusiasm from seeing how the play in London was thoroughly dampened by categorical turndowns from every single studio. However, the dedicated, tasteful Saul Zaentz didn’t walk away from that project, even though he had to cobble together the financing, and he produced a great Oscar-winning film.

**Developing the script: A slow road**

How does a producer develop a script with a writer or director? Very carefully. Nothing is more important than the script. I work on the simple premise that I’m an audience of one for the writer. I always ask who is doing what to whom and, very important, why. I took this approach with novelist Bill Goldman, yes, the one and only future Oscar winner, when I arranged to meet him long before he ever wrote a screenplay, in the early 1960s. I was a big fan of his novels, and we became fast friends. He offered to write on spec what became the movie *Harper*. In my infinite wisdom, I turned him down, but in turn offered to have him write the screenplay for *The Graduate*. He turned me down. Bill then wanted to write an original script about the last of the outlaws, *The Sundance Kid* and *Butch Cassidy*. We worked together on it for two years, and although I got him to reverse the title, to *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid*, and got Paul Newman interested (okay, in fairness, the script did that), I didn’t even get to produce the movie. Bill’s agent (whom I had set him up with) got muscled by his biggest client, who wanted to produce the picture. So I was out. Whoever said life or producing was fair?

**Crisis management: If I had a dime for every headache**

I was on a soundstage in England producing *I Could Go on Singing* (1963), starring Judy Garland and Dirk Bogarde, longtime pals who then were pissing ice water at each other due to Judy’s mercurial mood swings.
So I was ready for another gripe about Dirk when she came up to me, but instead she started bitching that director Ronald Neame was exhausting her by demanding too many takes. Trying to soothe her and to just get through the shoot, I took Neame aside and encouraged him to ease off. The very next scene, after only one take, Neame yelled, “Cut! That’s it. Perfect. Let’s move on to the next.” I let out a sigh of relief, until Judy rushed up and said, “So that’s the game the son-of-a-b*** is going to play.” Sometimes the producer can’t win.

**Each film has its own unique problems**

On *The Graduate*, my brilliant director Mike Nichols fell in love with a church as a location for our story’s climax, but the church refused to let us film there. The Graduate was racy, sexually provocative; this was 1967. So I told Mike, “No go. We have to find another church.” He replied, “But, Larry, that’s the only one I want.” S***! I maneuvered a meeting with the church elders in which I told them our film was dealing with the very issues (purpose, morality, etc.) that the church itself should be dealing with. Chutzpah, yes, but it’s the truth. They relented, and their church is the glorious centerpiece of our climax.

**Minding the budget: The bucks got to stop somewhere**

Producing is largely about balancing your artistic desires against the financial means you have to achieve them. In the middle of filming *The Young Doctors* in 1961, starring two-time Oscar-winner Fredric March and a young Dick Clark, we began slipping over budget. Our director was from the Hollywood studio system and was used to taking orders, so my partner at the time and I sat him down and told him, “Remember that nighttime ice skating sequence with two hundred extras? Well, it’s now a daytime scene with 25 extras.” The old pro agreed, putting the camera up high and pointing it downward to create a tight shot that made it look like we had zillions of extras on location, and, presto, by the next week we were on schedule and budget again.

Hopefully, that gives you a sense of just some of what a producer does on a film, and yet, still, we are thought to be irritating, money-obsessed, artistically devoid trolls. Serving as I do on the board of the producers branch of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, and having formed a board of 40 producer mentors for the Peter Stark Producing Program at the University of Southern California, which I’ve chaired for 14 years, I talk a lot to my kind. They all echo the same Rodney Dangerfield complaint, “We don’t get no respect.” Frankly, it’s damn unfair. The best producers have the taste and creativity of an artist, the mind-set of an entertainer, the people skills of a politician, the business acumen of a CEO, the insight of a psychotherapist, the ebullience of a cheerleader, the tenacity of a pit bull, the charm of a snake-oil seller, the delegating ability of a five-star general, the malleability of a chameleon, and the dedication of a monk. It’s not happenstance that Zaentz produces quality classics that also have commercial appeal, that Jerry Bruckheimer has one blockbuster after
another, that Brian Grazer can eclectically go from producing *A Beautiful Mind* to *The Cat in the Hat*, that Scott Rudin could mortgage his house to tie up a story he loves, or that younger newcomers like Laura Bickford (*Traffic*) and Michael London (*Sideways*) produce such gems.

I had the good fortune to be around in the old days, and I have to admit they were better. Every studio had dozens of producers under contract, each getting a hefty paycheck, and, to boot, a story department that would send around a memo saying the studio just bought such-and-such Pulitzer-winning book or play, and to please register interest if you’d like to produce it. Ah, where are the snows of yesteryear? Today, a producer has to full-time hustle, beg, borrow, and/or steal to nail the hot script or book that is the cheese to bait the trap to catch the money mouse (read: star, director, studio).

The old-time producers were lords of the universe, whereas today they’re high-priced peons. I’m not talking about the top elite, who still has the perks of studio-paid plush offices on or off the lot, plus plenty of staff, ample expense accounts, and even discretionary money to unilaterally buy a script or a book. Too many producers are working out of their homes, suffering the daily frustration, the indignity of not having their phone calls returned in a timely fashion, if at all. Today’s fat cats, like Kathy Kennedy, Neal Moritz, Gale Anne Hurd, Joel Silver, Lauren Shuler Donner, and Doug Wick, don’t have the same power and control that David Selznick, Hal Wallis, and Darryl Zanuck had. As legend has it, two-time Oscar-winning director Joseph Mankiewicz once said, “I’ve been tilling the fields a long time and I know who is the massa,” regarding renowned producer-turned-studio chief Zanuck, who had re-cut his *Cleopatra*. Furthermore, Selznick, when asked why he didn’t direct since he controlled every other aspect of a production, said, “I’ve got more important things to do.”

That was then, this is now. Hollywood has embraced the French Cahiers du cinema theory that each film has an author, and that author is always, and only, the director (unless a critic’s darling-like writer Charlie Kaufman is involved). The studios think the director is the only one who can have a “vision” for a film. And the ripple effect? When was the last time you saw a producer mentioned in a film review? Robert Dowling, publisher of *The Hollywood Reporter*, got it right when he said, “Producing is the only job where you hire the person [the director] from whom you take orders.”

If producing is so tough, why do we do it? I asked a dozen top producers, whom I interviewed for my book (*So You Want to Be a Producer*) if they liked producing. To a person, they replied, “I don’t like it, I love it.” Many years ago, a young reporter named Curtis Hanson asked me about the joys and sorrows of the job. (Yep, before he was the Oscar-winning writer-director of *L.A. Confidential.*) I replied, “Nothing could be more rewarding or stimulating. Each day has new challenges, new struggles, new frustrations, and new satisfactions. Each day I figure I’ll walk into the office and get hit with a right to the heart and a left to the kidney, but I love it.” I feel the same way today. Nothing beats sitting in a crowded
movie theater showing one of my films, hearing the audience laugh and hold its collective breath, seeing tears flow, and, perhaps, hearing some applause. That’s just the icing. The cake, for me, is my personal expression: the idea behind each film I do, my conscious or sometimes unconscious signature with which I express my values. I like to think-I do think-that I can affect the world, or at least a few people in it.

Sure, seeing my name when the credits roll is nice, but knowing how I help shape a film is more important, like with American History X, which I was executive producer. Because he was so eager to play the part, Edward Norton volunteered to test for the lead role of the tattooed skinhead. Here was a guy who had already received an Oscar nomination for his first film. I was elated, and his test knocked my socks off, but not those of our director, Tony Kaye, whom I had also championed, and who was king in the world of commercials but helming his first film. He wanted to find a non-actor, an authentic street person. All studios are director fornicators; thus, to my dismay but not surprise, New Line agreed. After five weeks of testing dozens of hopefuls, Tony screened his top choices for us. None of them had the right stuff, so New Line and my producer partners and I put our foot down, and Edward was in our film, which he rightly earned his second Oscar nomination. Two weeks into shooting, Tony sidled up to me and whispered, “Edward is the best piece of luck I ever had.” His luck was having smart producers.

Lawrence Turman has produced more than 40 films for the big screen and television, and was voted into the Producers Guild of America Hall of Fame. His producer credits range from The Graduate to American History X. He has spent the past 14 years directing a two-year master’s program at USC whose graduates include the creators of such films as Silence of the Lambs, Napoleon Dynamite, Dodgeball, and television shows including Six Feet Under and Smallville. He has guest-lectured at FEMIS in Paris, the Triangle Conference in Rome, Equinoxe in Bordeaux, the Polytechnic in Singapore, a Ford Foundation-sponsored workshop in Vietnam, the Producers on Producing Conference in Stockholm, AFI, UCLA, and NYU. He has been a juror at the Flanders Film Festival and the Ivy Festival at Brown University. In his recently published book “So You Want To Be a Producer,” he answers the question: What on earth does a producer do?

Reprinted with permission from PREMIERE magazine. ©2005 by Hachette Filipacchi Media U.S., Inc.
The proliferation of award shows continues. To name a few: People’s Choice Awards, Billboard Music Awards, MTV Movie Awards, Teen Choice Awards, American Music Awards, Golden Globe Awards, AFI Awards, CMA Awards, and Soul Train Music Awards.

In any one given year there are, at last count, at least 11 film award shows not including the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts & Sciences’ Academy Awards, 16 music award shows, not including the Recording Academy’s Grammy Awards, one theater award show, the American Theatre Wing’s Tony Awards, and 11 television award shows, not including the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences’ Emmy Awards. Those are only the shows that are broadcast on the networks, cable and specialty channels! You may ask why so many. Well from a network’s point of view they’re relatively inexpensive to produce like reality shows. Secondly, they bring in viewers by the truckloads. Viewers who love to watch their favorite stars, and live vicariously with them for a few hours. They possibly even dream that one day they could be on the red carpet themselves. Attending an award show comfortably at home is the ultimate fantasy for those who read gossip magazines and watch “Access Hollywood” or “Entertainment Tonight.” Now, start multiplying just how many awards are given out on each show, and you’ll find that the numbers are staggering. This year alone, the Academy of Television presented 171 Emmys. WOW! That’s a lot of excellence. But let’s take a closer look.

Mission Statement of The Academy of Television Arts & Sciences: The mission of the Academy is to promote creativity, diversity, innovation and excellence through recognition, education and leadership in the advancement of the telecommunications arts and sciences.

Let me state a “disclaimer” first and get it over with. Who is to say what “creativity” is? To me it’s always been a purely subjective answer in the eyes of the beholder. I’m always amused when I read or hear a so called “expert” say something like he or she has no talent and should choose some other line of work, or telling someone they’re a genius. All art including television is vulnerable to critique, but to date, I have yet to meet a living God walking on our planet (especially in our business) who can make such arrogant and definitive statements. What all of us have in common is that we all want to be acknowledged for our work, appreciated for our effort and yes, even loved.
How many of you have either won, been nominated or wished you’d won an Emmy? No doubt a lot of you. If you were one of the lucky ones who did win an Emmy, have you thought how much it really meant to your career? Let’s go one step further. As a winner, deep down in your heart did you feel you deserved to win? Was it a fair and equal playing field?

Unfortunately, I feel that winning an Emmy in today’s environment of corporate mentality has made television’s most prestigious award lose most of its real meaning and value. The Emmy has lost its way with its senseless categories in regards to who competes against who, and has now unfortunately become, in Andy Warhol’s words, “fifteen minutes of fame” for the victors and little more. I bet you can hardly tell me who won an Emmy even in the 2005 award ceremony? More importantly, did they really deserve to win under the original criteria of the Academy’s mission statement? Remember innovation, diversity and creativity.

As a producer/director of numerous variety television specials, one of my personal pet peeves for years has been when the category for Outstanding Variety Show is announced. The nominees usually include the award shows themselves, and most of the time they’re the ones that actually win the Emmy! To the best of my knowledge, the sole purpose of an award show is to honor its movies or shows and to honor its stars. I pose this question to you: aren’t there any primetime variety shows being produced specifically for television that are worthy of being nominated other than the Oscars, the Tony’s and the late-night talk shows? Maybe the Academy voting members need to be reminded what the Emmy Award symbolizes. Maybe before we vote next time, we should all re-read our mission statement.

My take on the Emmy telecast, having served two consecutive terms on the Board of Governors of the Academy representing the Director Peer Group, and serving one term on the Executive Committee, is that the primetime Emmy broadcast has very little to do with the advancement of the telecommunications arts and sciences, but rather a lot to do with negotiating license fees with the networks. The new game seems to be how big are the rating numbers in order for the Academy to justify increasing the license fee for the broadcast from the networks. That means “playing ball” with the networks for their friendly commercial “suggestions” on how to make the program more “viewer-friendly” rather than honoring the integrity of the award itself. The push for higher ratings most of the time leads to sacrificing...
“creativity and excellence ...” for giving the public what the networks “think” they want even if it’s a program or actor that just happens to be the flavor of the week. The “new” criteria for the Emmy telecast seems to be about making sure the winners don’t exceed 20 or 30 seconds when giving their acceptance speeches and about getting the show off the air on time.

Were you aware that in 2005 alone, The Academy of Television Arts & Sciences handed out 72 Emmy statues in primetime and 99 the night before at the Creative Arts Awards, not even mentioning that an Emmy statue is “given” to the elected President of the Academy when he or she leaves office? The International Academy awarded 14 Emmys and The National Academy of Arts and Sciences (a separate organization than ATAS, but I won’t go into that) distributed 65 Business & Financial Emmys, 264 Daytime Emmys, 150 News Emmys, and, get this, 1,409 Sports Emmys!

What real value is there if every year 2,073 Emmys are awarded by all the television Academy’s with the knowledge that all the “winners” received the exact same Emmy statue? If you were a purest, and painted one masterpiece, the value of your painting could potentially be enormous. If you started to duplicate the exact painting over and over again, the value of your one painting would start to obviously diminish in value and depreciate. This is my analogy to being awarded an Emmy in today’s environment of excess. Instead of selectively handing out an Emmy for just the few who actually do qualify and live up to the Academy’s mission statement, the Academy has chosen to hand out Emmy Awards by the hundreds to anyone who happens to have a hit program being broadcast in any specific year and therefore keeps diminishing their value to each recipient.

I have argued on the floor of the Board of Governors monthly meetings that there are Governors who do not believe that the Academy should be, in their words, “an elitist organization,” and I ask “why not?” Who wants to belong to a group that anyone can join and be a member? For that matter, who wants to win an Emmy that’s handed out like candy by the hundreds indiscriminately?

I have observed and participated in endless discussions of addressing the question “who is our master?” The people who have the power to hire us and pay our salaries, or the untainted, and un-politicized artists who, when voting their choice of who qualifies to win the Emmy, award excellence to the highest of standards no matter what the consequences might be.

Personally, I have never supported, nor will I, catering to the corporate networks insatiable appetite for higher ratings and bigger profits for themselves at any cost to the creative community and the mass audience at large. The Emmy should not be all about higher ratings and popularity, but only about excellence and creativity, and as in the Academy’s own words “in the advancement of telecommunications arts and sciences.” That way, they wouldn’t have to hand out so many Emmys by just revisiting its original standards and ideals. Instead, they could devote more time to making sure there were fairer categories,
which in turn would result in giving the public more “entertainment” on the primetime broadcast. How refreshing that would be instead of just announcing, “the nominees are” and “the winner is. ...” I want my Emmy to mean something more than just a statue to put on my mantelplace or stored in a box in my garage.

Steve Binder’s long and distinguished career includes multiple Emmy and ACE Awards in both television and film. His highly acclaimed production of Pee Wee’s Playhouse earned a record 16 Emmy nominations in one season.

I have made several short films in my young life, but never did I have the opportunity to finish them on a 35 mm print. That is, until receiving the grant from The Caucus Foundation. This might seem like a prestige factor, the opportunity to be a part of history and embrace a dying art form. But the romantic in me prefers to call it something else—realizing a dream. Thanks for helping it come true.

—Adam Schlachter
he so-called “digital revolution” traces its roots to 1983 when NHK, a co-venture by the government and electronics companies in Japan, developed an analog, high-definition television (HDTV) system and proposed a global standard. The Media Lab at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) played a large role in convincing a United States Congressional oversight committee to reject that proposal. They called it “obsolete technology” and suggested a need for developing a digital television (DTV) standard.

That led to a considerable debate between broadcasters, technology vendors and the creative community that produces content for television. The Caucus and its members were deeply involved in that debate. The FCC finally established a relatively flexible set of technical standards for DTV in 1996, and called for a gradual transition.

There is now talk in Congress about pulling the plug on analog transmission at the end of 2009, coupled with providing several billion dollars in subsidies to off-set the cost of consumers purchasing set top boxes that will enable them to receive DTV signals. That may or may not happen, but one thing is certain, the government isn’t likely to tell tens of millions of U.S. families that their television sets are obsolete. While DTV has been evolving at a leisurely pace, advances in film production and digital postproduction technologies have shifted into high gear. This convergence is enabling filmmakers to create compelling production values that are even more nuanced when aired in HD format. Consider Ridley and Tony Scott’s episodic series *Numb3rs*.

“The producers initially believed that we could save money by shooting in 24P digital HD format by eliminating film and processing costs,” says cinematographer Ron Garcia, ASC. “I’ve shot HD, and knew there were hidden costs. It takes more time to control light in many situations because HD doesn’t come close to the latitude of film.”

*Numb3rs* is the first television program to use a hybrid system recently introduced by Kodak. The Kodak Vision2 HD System includes a scan-only film and an HD image processor used to emulate the imaging characteristics of all the various other Kodak negatives.

“When I shoot a scene, I make a notation on the camera report indicating what negative I want to emulate,” Garcia explains. “I can pick a faster or slower film that records more or less tones and colors. I can also tell the timer at The Post Group to emulate the
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*CINEMATOGRAPHERS’ PERSPECTIVES ON THE ART OF VISUAL STORYTELLING*

by Bob Fisher

“*Revolution ... a sudden and radical change.*”

—Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary
effects of ‘pushing’ or ‘pulling’ the film a stop or two.”

The timer pushes buttons on the processor box, which manipulates the picture data to conform to Garcia’s instructions. The final product is an HD digital file.

Garcia describes a scene that he filmed in a penthouse office during one episode. The characters were standing in front of a window. One was a black male who was standing next to a Caucasian woman with red hair. “There was a two-and-a-half stop difference between the skin tones on their faces, and about an eight-stop difference between the interior and scene outside the window,” he says. “The film recorded the scene the way we saw it with our eyes.” Numb3rs is framed in 16:9 format and recorded on three-perf 35 mm film, which trims negative and lab costs by 25 percent. That is a common practice today. Approximately half of the 35 mm film shows are produced in three-perf format.

Brian Reynolds is shooting The Closer, a TNT series with three-perf 35 mm film, and composing it in 16:9 format. He typically covers scenes with two handheld cameras in kind of a cinema vérité style designed to create a subliminal sense of presence. “We can get three or four people in shots at the same time, and keep them in the environment where the story is happening with the wider frame,” Reynolds says. “The latitude of today’s films combined with the sensitivity of the Spirit DataCine used in post, gives us the freedom to shoot in just about any environment,” he says.

What about the claim that HD cameras require less lighting to record images? Reynolds says that’s a myth, which started as a sales tactic. “Producers I’ve worked with are savvy enough to understand that cinematographers use lighting and color to tell stories the same way writers use words,” he says. “We help create a sense of place and time and visually punctuate moods with light and darkness.”

Roy Wagner, ASC, who is shooting the hit Fox series House, offers similar observations. The show is filmed in three-perf 35 mm format on sets at Fox Studios. “We designed an organic look that serves both the characters and the written words,” he says. “Fluorescent lights that we built into sets are our primary sources of light. I put metal grates on the lights for pinpoint control of the beams. That’s important because the eye automatically goes to the brightest part of the frame.”

The cinematographer also uses handheld
movie lights and reflectors to put light on faces, create shadows, and add other painterly touches to the images.

“This approach to lighting gives directors freedom to shoot in any direction,” Wagner says. “It also saves time, which results in shorter days for the crew and cast.” He says that advances in telecines go hand in hand with new film technology.

“I was using the complete dynamic range of the film last season, but the images didn’t feel quite right to me until we switched to a 2K Spirit DataCine that is capable of pulling more details off the negative,” Wagner says. “The difference is astonishing.” He notes that it isn’t necessarily something that audiences consciously notice.

“I believe they sense and feel it on a subliminal level,” Wagner adds.

During the summer hiatus, sets were redesigned. For instance, a hallway leading from an office to the elevator was made longer. Wagner explains that allows them to shoot longer walking and talking shots from different perspectives with two cameras. He explains that’s another advantage of three-perf 35 mm film. It increases the run time before he needs to stop to change magazines.

The Super 16 film format is also becoming an enticing option for producing television movies and series. It has the same latitude as 35 mm film and the resolution is proving to be more than adequate when displayed on HD resolution screens.

James Chressanthis, ASC is currently lensing the hit episodic series Ghost Whisperer in three-perf 35 mm format with HD post. During the past several years, he shot the television movies Four Minutes, 3: The Dale Earnhardt Story and The Reagans in Super 16 format. The first two of those films aired in HD format on the ESPN cable network. The Reagans, though posted in HD, aired on the Showtime cable network in standard definition.

Chressanthis filmed the Emmy winning miniseries Life With Judy Garland: Me and My Shadows with a blend of 35 mm and Super 16 film depending upon the scene. It aired on ABC Television in standard definition format. He notes that The Reagans is future-proofed because postproduction was done in HD format, while the Judy Garland bio-pic was posted in standard definition leaving its future value as an HD program in question.

Chressanthis also observes that in addition to cost-savings, the compact and lightweight Super 16 cameras provide aesthetic advantages in many situations. Four Minutes recounts the life and times of Roger Bannister, an English physician who was the first human being to run a mile race in less than four minutes.

After Four Minutes aired in October, a review in a Hollywood trade daily said, “…it evokes a sometimes breathtaking, realistic vibe … as a former trackman, I can tell you that the way Bannister is paced by his training and race cohorts is exactly right.”

That was no coincidence. Chressanthis was a long distance runner when he was a student. He estimates that some 30 percent of Four Minutes consists of scenes where Bannister and other characters are running in training and competitive races. The cinematographer used a new, four-inch high Ikonoskop camera from Sweden to literally
put the audience in the middle of the pack. The camera has a fixed 9.5 mm lens, and it can record six to 36 frames per second for high-speed and slow-motion shots.

Sometimes Chressanthis mounted the camera on a Pogo system, which enabled him to shoot from any angle while running with the actors. Other times the camera was on a monopod mounted on a chase vehicle where it was used to film the runners’ legs for a low angle. He covered running scenes with up to five cameras with lenses ranging from ultra-wide 6 mm to ultra-long 640 mm, sometimes shooting in slow-motion at 150 frames per second.

“You can try to create those slow-motion effects in postproduction with digital cinematography,” he says, “but it just doesn’t have that same, tactile feeling.”

Chressanthis chose from a menu of emulsions the same way that an artist selects different paints for his palette. The earliest scenes take place during the mid-1940s, when London was in ruins because of bombings during the war. Chressanthis chose to record those scenes on a lower contrast 500-speed Kodak Vision2 film, which he felt rendered an appropriate look for those darker times. As the story progressed, he switched to two normal contrast Kodak Vision2 emulsions.

“We have a tremendous palette of films to choose from today, which allows us to shoot anyplace at any time and create the looks we want,” he says.

Snow Wonders aired on CBS-TV in late November. The movie intercuts scenes from four cities on a snowy Christmas day. It was filmed in New Orleans. Kees Van Oostrum, ASC, the cinematographer, suggested shooting in Super 16 format with Zeiss Ultra-Speed lenses, which were designed for 35 mm cameras.

“We wanted the flexibility of working with Super 16 cameras,” Van Oostrum explains. “The combination of 35 mm lenses, the new films, and advanced telecine technology satisfied everyone. They knew we could create compelling and believable images.”

Van Oostrum explored a new frontier when he helped to establish locations in the four cities by using a visual effects technique usually reserved for the cinema. He filmed scenes with the actors in front of blue background screens. That footage was composited during postproduction with background plates filmed at locations in the different cities.

“It is absolutely transparent to the audience,” he says.

Donald M. Morgan, ASC recently collaborated with Edward James Olmos during the production of Walkout, an HBO movie that was filmed in East Los Angeles. The film is based on an event that occurred in Los Angeles in 1968, when some 10,000 Mexican-American students staged a peaceful walkout to protest conditions at their schools.

“Eddie (Olmos) was determined to shoot this film in Los Angeles where it actually happened,” Morgan says. “They decided to shoot in Super 16 mainly because of the budget, but Eddie also wanted that feeling of reality. We did quite a bit of handheld camerawork to augment the energy that the audience feels during action scenes.”

Morgan adds, “The script called for a 35-day schedule. We did it in 24 days.”
For the final word, we spoke with Bruce Pearson, a senior colorist at LaserPacific in Los Angeles. Pearson began his career at a film lab where he became a color timer working on features. He joined LaserPacific in 1989, and has subsequently compiled an impressive list of credits timing episodic series and television movies, including *Four Minutes* and the series, *7th Heaven, One Tree Hill* and *Everwood*.

“The progress that has been made in both film and digital telecine technologies is absolutely amazing,” Pearson says. “The new films allow cinematographers to paint with colors, contrast and other details never seen before on television. Today’s digital telecine technology allows us to transfer the subtlest nuances recorded on film to video in both standard and high-definition formats. We have tremendous flexibility. It’s my job to ensure that the intentions of the filmmakers make it to the television screen.”
Our mission is to protect and actively promote the artistic rights of producers, writers and directors. We actively oppose any interference with these creative rights whether they originate from government, studios, networks, or special interest pressure groups.

We are opposed to the growing concentration of ownership of development and television production in fewer and fewer hands. When a small number of mega-corporations control the vast majority of the process, diversity of voice is threatened, and our creative rights and our ability to compete as entrepreneurs are gravely endangered.

We are aware of the powerful impact of television and we will strive to elevate program quality and encourage responsible programming for the public.

Our continuing task is to increase communication among Caucus members about creative and business issues in the television industry and communicate our concerns to those outside our organization.

From time to time we will lend our support to other groups and causes that support our mission.
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