Voices and noises:

Collaborative authorship in Stanley Kubrick's films

Manca Perko

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of East Anglia

School of Art, Media and American Studies

January 2019

Abstract

This thesis sets out to challenge the mythology surrounding Kubrick's filmmaking practice. The still dominant auteur approach in Kubrick studies identifies the director's filmmaking practice as autonomous, with little creative input from his crew members. Following the recent shift in research that focuses on the collaborative nature of Kubrick's working practice, I argue for a different perspective on creative practice in film production. The working process in Kubrick's crews is shown to exhibit strong collaborative features and to encourage individual creative input. This thesis is based on the examination of historical evidence acquired from the Stanley Kubrick Archive in London and an extensive collection of mediated and personally conducted interviews with Kubrick's collaborators. The historical discourse analysis employed in this thesis is rooted in New Film History methodologies and, with its findings, leads to an alternative perspective on film history. The challenge to the accepted view (or myth) of Kubrick is achieved with the use of discourse sources from production and from the archive, presented in the form of stories from pre-production to the promotion stage of film production. The outcomes of the research reveal other ways in which Kubrick collaborated and these alternative perspectives are then used to build an argument around collaboration in Kubrick's films. With its focus on challenging Kubrick mythology by revealing the unheard voices in the production process, thereby challenging the common perception of them as 'noise', this thesis questions the applicability of authorship theory to the study of filmmaking practice. As such, it represents an important original contribution to the field of Kubrick studies.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I am in great gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Keith M. Johnston, who has been guiding me through this research, always assisting me and pushing the limits of my academic capability further than I thought possible. Without his supervision, I would not have arrived at this stage.

My special thanks goes to my mother, Lidija, who has been my rock. Without your endless emotional support, your willingness to engage in long academic discussions on the phone and always believing in me, I would not have achieved this goal. This thesis is for you.

A great thank you also goes to my father, Valentin, whose professional knowledge was always available to me. Thanks, Dad, for all your long, late-night efforts to explain the technical stuff to me. It worked.

Thank you to my friend, Jennifer, who has sat through numerous coffees debating my research, listening to me complain and always picking me up. Without your help and friendship, I would have been lost so many times.

Thank you to my partner, Daniel, who supported me through the studies, patiently using earphones for the whole three years.

Introduction

Stanley Kubrick and his oeuvre have attracted much attention since the beginning of his career and continue to be widely discussed among film buffs, academics and industry professionals today. Kubrick was a private person who rarely communicated with the media and this undoubtedly assisted in the formation of the mythology around him that is still so embedded today that it has become representative of Kubrick's persona. These myths involve both Kubrick the filmmaker and Kubrick the person.

'Mr. Kubrick is such a loner in the film business, not only following the beat of a different drummer but more likely constructing his own drum' (Clines, 1987: 34), 'a master controller, taking great care in every single aspect of the filmmaking process', 'an obsessive perfectionist' who was 'absolutely driven to achieve his goals no matter how long it took' (Edwards, 2013). Central to this mythology is the notion of Kubrick as self-sufficient in the productions of his films:

> A writer, producer, editor and photographer as well as a director, Kubrick maintained a degree of control over his films probably unsurpassed in cinematic history – his perfectionism often leading him to work at a (by Hollywood standards) excruciatingly methodical pace in order to achieve precisely the effects he wanted. Of course, Kubrick had numerous helpers, assistants and sub-contractors, for nobody can make a film single-handedly. But, for most of his career (and despite what Arthur C. Clarke may have thought about his own role in *2001: A Space Odyssey* (UK/US 1968)), Kubrick had, and desired, no real collaborators.
>
> (Freedman, 2008: 134)

Kubrick's reclusive nature and rare communication with the media only contributed to the mythology that has developed around him. But a mythology is a set of stories, or constructed narratives that are based on a false belief and biased

representations. Paul Edwards believes that the misconceptions about Kubrick that arise from the myths actually demonstrate 'a thirst for knowledge' (2013).

This study was inspired by my thirst for knowledge about Kubrick and resulted in my intention to challenge the existing myths around him. I became convinced that the myths were complicated by a statement that contradicts the popular myth of Kubrick as a non-collaborator. Kelvin Pike, the camera operator on *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* (1964), *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) and *The Shining* (1980), makes this revealing statement about Kubrick's working practice:

> He was open to ideas, very open to ideas and there were
> things on the screen which are somebody else's idea. But
> he would acknowledge the fact that if somebody had a
> better idea than he, it would be used.
>
> (quoted in *Staircases to Nowhere: Making Stanley
> Kubrick's 'The Shining'*, 2013)

The documentary that this quotation was taken from was produced in 2013; yet the image of Kubrick as a collaborator has still not been the topic of sustained academic or popular debate. Instead, the majority of research has tended to focus on analysing Kubrick's films or/and documenting his career and personal life. This trend means that making an original contribution in Kubrick studies has been difficult. However, a new perspective has been proposed, which is to turn away from the study of his films to what Jason Sperb refers to as, 'a wholly untried approach', 'a more properly historical account of the production and distribution of Kubrick's body of work' (2013: 43). Taking up this invitation, I consider this study to be an important alternative view of Kubrick's filmmaking practice, focusing on aspects of collaboration and developing an argument around collaboration and collaborative authorship in Kubrick's films. The introduction of the thesis will first refer to recent research about Kubrick's production practice, and the shifting focus from the image of Kubrick as the sole authority in his films to the theme of collaboration. As a foundation to challenging the suitability of the auteur theory approach, I will discuss the development of approaches to

authorship. I will then give an overview of the vast literature pertaining to Kubrick and his oeuvre, focusing on how the authorship debate is applied, and specifically on the new approaches being applied in authorship studies. Lastly, I will address the methodology relevant to my research and introduce the chapter structure of the thesis.

Norman Kagan (2000) has gathered together various existing theories on Kubrick and his work, most of which are applied to interpretations of his supposed intentions in delivering a narrative product. Some focus on Kubrick's working techniques, specifically his technical abilities. Portraying him as an innovator, these studies analyse such innovative techniques as the famous Steadicam use in *The Shining*, technical solutions to challenging scenes, such as the use of special 0.7 mm NASA lenses in *Barry Lyndon* (1975), and his pioneering use of a viewfinder and sound equipment (new Nagra sound recorders used in *A Clockwork Orange*, 1971). Stanley Kauffmann even claims that these technical challenges and the solutions to specific problems were Kubrick's primary concern in his filmmaking practice (1987). It is these technical solutions that are discussed in the industry studies that explore the events in Kubrick's life and identify people he came across, who, in various ways, influenced his filmmaking process. For example, Michel Ciment's *Kubrick* (1983) and Gene D. Phillips' *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews* (2001) include interviews with Kubrick's co-workers and, in this way, reveal the collaborative relationships that were formed in his productions.

While these works richly contribute to knowledge about Kubrick's filmmaking process from theoretical and partially personal and career perspectives, it is only recently that research focusing on the stories of Kubrick's co-workers has started to emerge. Such studies include Filippo Ulivieri (*Stanley Kubrick and me: Thirty years at his side*, 2016), which presents the story of Emilio D'Alessandro, Kubrick's assistant and chauffeur of 30 years; new approaches of reviewing the existing archival material and its application in research about Kubrick's productions are gathered in *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives* (Ljujić, Krämer and Daniels, 2015); a more explicit focus on collaborative relationships can be found in Catriona McAvoy's research of the production of *The Shining* (2015); Simone Odino analyses the Stanley Kubrick-Arthur C. Clarke collaborative

relationship in the development phase of *2001: A Space Odyssey* (2017); and the latest documentary *Filmworker* (2017), portrays the life story of another of Kubrick's long-time assistants, Leon Vitali. What they all have in common is that they tell the stories that have not been heard or have been ignored until now; but, more importantly, they challenge the myth of the 'a tyrannical boss for his cast and crew' (Ulivieri, 2017: 222), portraying instead, the director as a collaborator. These works represent a new departure in Kubrick studies, moving away from the popular view of Kubrick as the mastermind behind his films and shifting the focus to the collaborative aspect of his filmmaking. This does not, however, mean that they all question Kubrick's reputation as auteur or challenge the application of auteur theory in studying the notorious filmmaker. Some of them do, however, address the possibility of abandoning the application of auteur theory. Peter Krämer, commenting on the new perspective on auteurism in Kubrick studies, stated: 'If I had any say, people would no longer use the term auteur anymore, because people have crazy ideas about what that term means. They shift so much in the context and historically so much' (quoted at *Internationales Kubrick symposium*, 2018).

By focusing on Kubrick's creative practice, i.e. his filmmaking process from a different perspective, my research relates to Krämer's view and addresses Sperb's call for an untried, historical approach to Kubrick studies. Kubrick's reputation as an auteur director is reflected in the widespread image of him as the main creative force who gave his crew members little to no opportunity to make their voices heard. This results in ascribing authorship and creative autonomy solely to him and, consequently, disregards the influence of the individual creative inputs of his collaborators on Kubrick's creative practice. Observing his filmmaking process strictly from the perspective of auteur theory ignores the collaborative component and yet it is this element, I argue, that is essential to understanding Kubrick's production process. It is this collaboration that enabled his productions to run successfully. The creative input of his crew members can be identified by analysing the stories about Kubrick's productions, as testified by his external and internal co-workers and by the director himself.

Works I have cited above have opened up this discourse, but there is still much room for discussion. My study expands the range of the sources of these stories and applies new techniques in interpreting them. Information on Kubrick's working practice is widely accessible in the form of published interviews and testimonies in works that discuss Kubrick's life and work. However, the opening of the Stanley Kubrick Archive in London in 2007 opened up the opportunities for research stories through a new collection of primary sources. The information that can be obtained from the assemblage of documentation on his productions extends the up-to-date knowledge on his creative practice and creates room for fresh analysis. By intentionally moving away from the image of Kubrick the auteur and presenting him in a new light as Kubrick the collaborator, my study in effect recognises the idea of authorship as a historical discourse. My method of discourse analysis, which is based on analysing research material for repeated patterns or traces of historical discourses that might reveal information about what underpins certain ideas, can be applied to perceptions about collaborative authorship and creative autonomy in studies of other auteur directors in the film industry.

As well as the use of the archive, my research considers three film industry studies as examples of the analysis of collaboration in film production: John T. Caldwell's *Production culture: Industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television* (2008); Lorraine Rowlands' research on New Zealand's film production workers' experiences in the film industry (2009); and Miranda J. Banks' *The writers a history of American screenwriters and their guild* (2015). All three studies are based on information obtained from individuals working in the industry. Caldwell categorises film workers into 'above the line' and 'below the line' sectors, differentiating between them according to the individual's work position and hierarchy status in the film crew (2008: 38). The workers' status is classified into 'stories' derived from the workers' personal experiences of the structure of the production culture and how it functions in practice. For my study, I borrow Caldwell's term 'stories' (2008) to gather the testimonies of Kubrick's co-workers and organise them into thematic clusters.

Similarly to Caldwell (2008), Rowlands analyses the experiences of film production workers (2009). She categorises and analyses film workers' experiences, their attitude towards the industry and addresses the connection between the mythicised portrayal of the film industry versus the realities of the industry. Her work assisted me in identifying the elements of emotional engagement among Kubrick's co-workers and the effect that has had on their creative autonomy. Banks' research presents the voices of individual screenwriters as confirmation of the alternative history she began to uncover from comparing existing screen stories about the writers and the personal stories of their careers as told by the screenwriters themselves (2015). Her historical analysis of memoirs and archival documents offers clues in the construction of the methodology of my research.

The latter two research studies also address the main limitation of existing studies on group creativity: the primary focus is still on the individual rather than on the collective. Andrew B. Hargadon and Beth A. Bechky try to resolve this by shift from a focus on the individual to collective moments of creativity, exploring instead the process of social interaction through actions of 'help-seeking, help giving, reflective reframing, and reinforcing' (2006: 484). They apply the method of historical research by including past experiences of the case studies, a process that Trevor Ponech claims results in a presentation of the impact of the 'causal relation of individual consciousness' on cultural phenomena (1999). Therefore, if one is to analyse the collective creativity and collaborative process in which collective creativity occurs, the individual creative input has to first be identified. As it is valid for a director to have a distinguishing style, so can his/her co-workers' imprint be expressed and regarded as their 'voice', displayed through various preparative (planning) contributions, ideas as solutions to challenges, filmmaking techniques and audio-visual elements whether or not they are detectable in the final product. These are expressions of the workers' creativity and are reflected in 'behaviours, performances, ideas, things and other kinds of outputs' (Taylor in Sternberg, 1988: 104). Identifying these provides support for the idea that '[I]n a collaborative medium, we should expect to find not only authored components but also varying degrees of joint authorship in the finished work' (Sellors, 2007: 270). In this way, the themes of individual authorship and

authorship occurring in collaboration, should not be studied separately, but considered at the same time.

Kubrick's reputation as an auteur director is reflected in the consequential ascription of authorship and creative autonomy solely to him. The crew's statements sometimes praise a creative environment that allows for collaboration and expression of individual creativity but are sometimes also controversial in describing the nature of collaborative relationships in his crew. Although it is impossible to find a completely objective point of view on the working atmosphere in Kubrick's productions, the accounts that arise from individuals form a collection of perceptions regarding authorship, attribution of creative inputs and recognition of their impact. Immersion in these accounts provides a more nuanced understanding of these concepts and challenges Kubrick's reputation as an auteur and a non-collaborator. The next sections will elaborate on these representations of Kubrick by looking at the meaning and development of the expression 'auteur', exploring how it has been applied to Kubrick and how the ascription of authorship has changed throughout history.

Authorship

'Authorship is a historical phenomenon' Virginia Wright Wexman writes (2003: 9), pointing out that the concept of the author and theories of authorship have been subjected to various critical stances and theoretical approaches, resulting in many contexts and variations of the notion of authorship. I will first describe traditional approaches to studying authorship, then attend to the variations of these approaches and, finally, focus on the modern, collaborative/multiple authorship approach, which will serve as the basis for my analysis of authorship perspectives as applied to Kubrick's filmmaking process.

Classic auteur theory

Jean Mitry defines film as a product of combined effort, but also adds that '[T]o say that a film is produced by teamwork, implying thereby that the *auteur* is the team, is absurd. It is to mistake one thing for another. A Cathedral is the product of a combined effort, but it is not a combined *work of art*. It has only one creator:

the man who conceived it, who imagined and planned it – the architect' (2000: 5). Although Mitry does consider the collective factor in filmmaking, his stance represents the basic principles of classic auteur theory.

Auteur theory can be traced back to the French New Wave movement undertaken by a group of critics who voiced their disapproval of the 'Tradition of Quality',[1] and most famously to François Truffaut, a film theorist and academic, and one of the writers in the French film theory and criticism magazine, *Cahiers du Cinéma* (Grant, 2008: 2). In one of his essays, 'A certain tendency in French cinema', Truffaut introduces an alternative to the, at the time, prevailing image of the directors – 'that they are auteurs who often write their dialogue and some of them themselves invent the stories they direct' (Truffaut, 1954 in Grant, 2008: 16). By introducing the term 'auteur', Truffaut initiated an approach to the evaluation of films as art by seeing the director as a true auteur, a 'man of the cinema', an approach also referred to as 'la politique des auteurs' (Wright Wexman, 2003: 3). Focusing on the aesthetics of films (mise-en-scene) rather than privileging the importance of the scriptwriters, the 'politics of the auteur' lifted the directors on to the pedestal of 'inspired creative geniuses', thereby drawing a comparison with Romanticism, which is why Edward Buscombe refers to the politics of the auteur as 'Romantic auteurism' (1973 in Grant, 2008: 76). This ascription is also due to André Bazin's elaboration of the auteur as a director whose 'personal stamp' can be detected in his opus of work (Bazin, 1957 in Grant, 2008: 25). The critical movement was followed by British journal *Movie*, which began publication in 1962. Its writers Ian Cameron, Charles Barr, Robin Wood and V.F. Perkins (whose work I discuss more thoroughly in connection with collaborative authorship later in the introduction) analysed Hollywood cinema by employing auteurism, demonstrating it in textual analyses of the works of directors like Alfred Hitchcock and Howard Hawks (Grant, 2008: 2). In the US, film critic Andrew Sarris also challenged the trend toward film criticism employing the same technique that was being applied to literature and journalism. He translated 'la politique des auteurs' into 'auteur theory', explaining in his article 'Notes on the

---

[1] 'Tradition of Quality' refers to French films of 1950s which stressed the literary elements of the cinema, consequentially presenting the directors as 'metteurs en scène' – 'essentially literary men' as executors of the literature adaptations without any personal stamp on the film (Truffaut, 1954 in Grant, 2008: 13).

auteur theory' in the *Movie* magazine: 'Some critics have advised me that the auteur theory only applied to a small number of artists who make personal films, not the run-of-the-mill Hollywood director who takes whatever assignment is available' (Sarris, 1962 in Grant, 2008: 41), or as Richard Brody describes it, 'those whose work is deemed artistically ambitious' (2012). Sarris recognises a film director as an auteur according to the exhibition of three characteristics: technical competency, a 'distinguishable personality' of the director and 'elan of the soul' or interior meaning (1962 in Grant, 2008: 43), which comes close to the expression 'mise-en-scene'. Sarris was strongly criticised by *The New Yorker* film critic Pauline Kael in 'Circles and squares' (1963 in Grant, 2008). She argued that Sarris had proposed a theory of criticism that discriminated between 'good' and 'bad' films, due to his call for viewing the director's oeuvre as a criterion for evaluation of the quality of his work in question (Kael, 1963 in Grant, 2008). She also dismissed his premise of the 'distinguishable personality' and 'interior meaning', claiming that he oversimplified what Bazin et al. had proposed in 'la politique des auteurs' (1963 in Grant, 2008: 47). Edward Buscombe agreed with her, writing that 'it is Sarris who pushes to extremes arguments which in *Cahiers* were often only implicit' (1973 in Grant, 2008: 79). It is, in fact, Bazin who already warned against the dangers of labelling a film as 'automatically good as it has been made by an auteur', calling for specific care to discern the products of the artist apart from 'the man behind the style' (1957 in Grant, 2008: 26). In this way, the romanticised image of the creating person, with special characteristics that enable him to create, as with Friedrich Nietzsche's 'genius' (Nietzsche et al., 2003: 43), could be avoided. Bazin and Kael's critiques were among the first to address the dangers of the emerging 'cult of personality' (Kael, 1963 in Grant, 2008: 51), or what later in the eighties and nineties led to the use of 'the author' figure as 'a commercial performance of the business of being an auteur' (Corrigan, 1991: 104).

Criticism of auteur theory was soon followed by emerging variations of authorship theories that moved away from the romanticised version of the genius director and looked instead to structuralism and post-structuralism. This was famously initiated by Roland Barthes who disregarded the authorial voice of the writer/director as the author in his controversial declaration of 'the death of the

author' (1968 in Grant, 2008: 97). Barthes questioned the concept of authorship, claiming that any idea, sentence, image or action one has in mind when creating is only a mixture of their cultural, social experiences and past knowledge, which means there is no real author. It follows that pre-existing knowledge and experiences form a 'tissue of quotations', which is nothing but a blend of multiple writings from many cultures (Barthes, 1968 in Grant, 2008: 99). Therefore, there is no author of the text, but, as Bathes stresses, 'The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination' (1968 in Grant, 2008: 100). Barthes' idea of the text being the carrier of meaning and the reader as an active participant in the creative process of meaning-making was developed further by Michel Foucault in his essay, 'Who is an author?' (1969 in Marsh et al., 1992). Foucault coined the term 'author function' (1969 in Marsh et al., 1992) as regulating how a text is experienced (reading between the lines) and includes the discourses that surround the reading of the text, 'a named discourse stemming from the reception of a text but disconnected from authorial intention' (Sellors, 2010: 27). Thus both Barthes and Foucault step away from the idea of the author of a text as the central entity and determiner of meaning, paving the way for many theoretical approaches to follow. For example, the inclusion of the reader in the interpretation of the creative work, as proposed by the semiotic approach and formalism, endorsed the concept of intertextuality, eventually forming a structuralist and post-structuralist form of auteurism, which in essence focused more on how films signify the meaning. The new approaches brought auteur theory under scrutiny, not by dismissing it entirely, but rather, including other critical theories into the interpretation, thus opening the door to variations of authorship theory.

Variations/contexts of authorship

Structuralist and post-structuralist auteurism (auteur structuralism) emerged from Claude Lévi-Strauss's structural studies of myths and semiotics (1955), introduced by Ferdinand De Saussure in 1916, by stressing reading between the lines as the action of recognising different codes in the text (Chandler, 2007). Stuart Hall later adopted semiotic theory, arguing that the reader's interpretation

of the codes establishes a representation system of these codes, drawing a parallel between concepts and signs employed in the text in theory recognised as formalism (1997). To exemplify this theory in film, both Stuart Hall (1997) and Christian Metz (1991) elaborate on how the elements of cinematography, lighting, editing, mise-en-scene, sound and art design form a representation system of codes, which are interpreted by the audience, critics and academics, thereby engaging in the process of reconstruction analysis of narration in films. Lévi-Strauss's 'The structural study of the myth' illustrated the structuralist approach to reading myths, presenting a formula for identifying the 'specific properties' of the myth which 'are only to be found above the ordinary linguistic level; that is, they exhibit more complex features beside those which are to be found in any kind of linguistic expression' (1955: 431). Lévi-Strauss exemplified his thematic reconstruction of the Oedipus myth, exhibiting how the structures could be detected and that they should be analysed as a structure: 'The true constituent units of a myth are not the isolated relations but bundles of such relations and it is only as bundles that these relations can be put to use and combined so as to produce a meaning' (1955: 431). This draws on Foucault's author function as the discourses and dialectical systems[2] (1969 in Marsh et al., 1992) that operate in mythic thought.

Application of auteur structuralism based on Lévi-Strauss's study of myths and film codes can be observed in the work of writers Peter Wollen, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, Jim Kitses, Allan Lovell and Ben Brewster, described by Charles W. Eckert as 'the English Cine-Structuralists' (1973 in Grant, 2008: 101). Wollen's *Signs and meaning in the cinema*, first published in 1962, in which the chapter 'The auteur theory' analyses the directors Howard Hawks and John Ford, is according to Eckert (1973 in Grant, 2008), the most familiar with Lévi-Strauss's technique of analysis. Wollen agrees that auteur theory is useful in recognising the director as not merely 'a metteur en scène' and is 'an operation of decipherment' or 'decryptment' which should also be applied in order to reveal authors 'where none had been seen before' (1972: 104). However, Wollen also recognises that the problem with auteur theory is that many aspects of a film are consequently dismissed as 'indecipherable' because they are considered as the 'noise' of other

---

[2] More detail on dialectics can be found in Noël Burch's *Theory of film practice* (1981).

contributors (besides the director) in the film production (1972: 102). This phenomenon of noise was later taken up by V.F. Perkins in his chapter 'Direction and authorship' (1972 in Grant, 2008). His analysis considers certain aspects of the production process, stressing that 'Knowledge of the film industry's mechanics and structure helps us to understand many things' (1972 in Grant, 2008: 67), thus representing noise not as a distraction but as an indicator that film production is 'a collaborative enterprise' (1972 in Grant, 2008: 70). The inclusion of the collaborative element in studying film authorship, however, gained in popularity in the late eighties and nineties. I will discuss this in detail later in the collaborative authorship section.

At the same time, the study of authorship that includes the reader and heavily relies on the text also has its flaws. Jack Stillinger identifies the main issue with classic and structuralist auteur theories as being their reliance on theories rooted not in film but in literature:

> Critics have established canons for the individual directors,
> have made much of cross-references and allusions,
> thematic continuities, recurrences of character, symbol,
> technique in the works, and in effect have granted directors
> the same kind of pervasive authority as literary critics have
> regularly assigned to the poets and novelists of English and
> American (and other) literature.
>
> (1991: 178)

John Caughie believes that the main problem of auteur structuralism is that it is reductive: it reduces the text to the structure without including authorial intent (1981). Furthermore, the approach of (de)constructing cinematic elements does not elaborate on the definition of the 'artistic ambition' that defines the author, as outlined by auteur theory. As with Caughie, Philip Cowan identifies that the exact problem with structuralist and post-structuralist approaches to studying authorship is their dismissal of the director's intention: 'In its most mild form I would suggest that it takes the filmmakers themselves as unreliable witnesses in terms of

understanding the films they produce' (2016: 40). Modern approaches to studying authorship, therefore, again turned to the inclusion of the director's intention.

Modern approaches to authorship

Two trends in modern approaches can be observed. First, by turning the focus back to the author's intention, modern approaches attempt to revive auteurism. Second, the 'multiple-authored collaborative systems of production' (Staiger in Gerstner and Staiger, 2003: 27) has led to multiple/collaborative/collective authorship theories.

Paisley Livingston argues that an authorial component is present only in an intentional action (in Allen and Smith, 1999). The author is, in this case, anybody who intentionally expresses or communicates in the process of film production. C. Paul Sellors attempts to expand on Livingston's definition by explaining the action as the authored feature of an individual who expresses themselves and is 'morally and semantically' responsible for his action of expressing (2007). For Sellors, a cinematic author is an active individual who 'intentionally token(s) a cinematic utterance', by which 'the token' is referred to as any intended action that allows the process of the manifestation of their perspective on the utterance (2007). It follows that every individual who 'tokens' his vision is already authorly involved in the process of film production; he is the activist in forming a group that strives for a common goal and which results in what Sellors (2007) and Livingston (in Allen and Smith, 1999) refer to as 'utterance'. Sellors further claims that what makes the individual responsible for his expressing also demonstrates that there exists a certain control criterion over their work (2010), which relates to Wollen's idea of the 'directorial factor' (1972: 104) carrying the most weight, although not being 'conscious' of how the auteur executes it (1972: 113). Trevor Ponech focuses on this factor of sufficient control and defines the author as 'an agent' who is responsible for executing the 'A-plan', which is 'a global, synthetic blueprint or recipe regarding the finished movie's content, structure, properties, and effects, along with some of the means to achieving these ends' (1999). Although he disputes the idea of autonomy as a defining condition of authorship, Ponech's definition thus clearly includes a reference to autonomy as power, when he defines it as 'a personal, psychological feature that you could

experience yourself as having an experience that would strike you as being qualitatively different from those instances in which you've felt compelled, coerced, externally directed, or at a loss for self-control' (1999). Sellors opposes Ponech's idea of control, claiming it is applicable in combination with making an utterance to single authorship theory, but becomes a problem when discussing the collective production of works (2010).

Collaborative authorship

One cannot argue with Sellors's claim that no single author theory accounts for the collaborative nature of production (2010). Berys Gaut goes even further by claiming that 'all traditional films made by more than one person in the key production roles are multiply authored' (2010: 98).

The debate on multiple/collaborative authorship originated from historical discussions about authorship that always focused on the individual element: 'By building theories of film authorship on theories of literature and literary authorship, film theorists and critics have questionably characterised film authorship as an act of individual expression, despite the collective nature of production' (Sellors, 2010: 111). The multiple/collective/collaborative authorship theories that have emerged as a response, focus on the idea of group intentionalism: C. Paul Sellors' collective intentionality (2007), John R. Searle's 'we-intentions' (in Cohen et al., 1990), Paisley Livingston's creating of an utterance (in Allen and Smith, 1999), and the theory of joint commitment as proposed by Margaret Gilbert (2000). Gilbert argues that individuals commit to a collective action and thereby become a collective body (2000). It follows that a film crew can be seen as a group in which the members share features of intention (individual and groups) and who, by collaborating, contribute to creating an utterance. However, Sondra Bacharach and Deborah Tollefsen point out the problematics of applying intentionalism, as the decisive factor in determining authorship, in a collective (2010). They identify the need to differentiate between contributing and authoring, and therefore set out to find an approach that can successfully distinguish between 'mere contributors' and 'co-authors' (Bacharach and Tollefsen, 2010). By contrast, Gaut dismisses the issue of differentiation,

arguing instead that authorship can be equated with the attribution (contribution) of artistic expression of an individual:

> Of course, the director, if he has authority over the other contributors, is likely to be the most important contributor of expressive and artistic properties to a film. But that is entirely compatible with the multiple authorship view: the view is not that the contribution of all authors must be of equal importance. Just because the director's is the most important 'voice' in the film does not mean that others' contributions do not entitle them to count as authors too.
>
> (2010: 122)

While Gaut's proposition might seem too simple, it relates to Perkins' view of 'noise' as an indicator of collaboration (1972 in Grant, 2008: 70), Wollen's perspective on the film as 'the result of a multiplicity of factors, the sum total of a number of different contributions' (1972: 104) and also speaks to Jack Stillinger's argument that, in film as an industry, the 'dispersal of authorship might be deemed appropriate' (1991: 175). Stillinger's theory is further developed by Cowan, in his attempt to construct a model of multiple authorship as 'primary method of filmmaking' (2016: 65). Cowan centralises the director, around whom he positions the writer, the cinematographer and the editor, as they are the 'primary collaborators at each distinguishable phase of film's production' (2016: 64). Other collaborators, such as sound and production designers (and even actors), are then listed as 'liaising or collaborating with the central four' (Cowan, 2016: 64). Collaboration thus represents the method of filmmaking and helps render the notion of authorship attribution more complex.

Despite recent attempts to define collaborative/multiple authorship and find an appropriate model, a final solution has not been found. My study is therefore predicated on the belief that there is scope for the development, expansion and testing of these definitions. I also believe that the solution may lie in researching the contexts and discourses that have surrounded the concept of collaborative authorship. The contexts can be explored through historical discourse research.

Thus, observing the relationships between the systems of film production involves observing the relationships between the creators themselves. My study builds on this perception: instead of focusing on the auteur, i.e. the director as the carrier of authorship of the representation codes and, consequently, the sole creator of the representation systems, it includes other individuals in the equation as well. Based on this principle, my study challenges the (new and traditional) auteur theory as the correct method for identifying authorship of creative work and practice. I argue that authorship in filmmaking needs to be studied from the premise that filmmaking as a process is based on the collective actions of a group of people creating, and a collaboration between individuals in the process of creativity. Kubrick studies represent an example of how various authorship theories/approaches have been applied in traditional analyses and how analytic practices have shifted to modern approaches based on the notion of collaborative authorship. My main aim is not to find a single 'correct' definition of authorship, but to problematise the attribution of it to one person only. By studying 'the inter-connected creative relationships' (Cowan, 2016: 65) in Kubrick's crews, these issues can be brought to light. It is, in fact, opposite to Wollen's view that 'these separate texts – those of the cameraman or the actors – may force themselves into prominence so that the film becomes an indecipherable palimpsest' (1972: 105). The noises should be subject to criticism and analysis because they are, in fact, also voices.

Next, I will present the application and development of theories of authorship in Kubrick studies.

Kubrick Studies: Authorship and collaboration

Kubrick studies have always been embedded in the debate on authorship precisely because of Kubrick's reputation as an auteur filmmaker. Two main approaches to researching Kubrick's filmmaking can be observed: traditional and new/modern. Traditional methods are based on the classic auteur approach, (post)structuralist and formalistic analysis of texts, employing theories of semiotics and philosophy. Auteur theory-based research in Kubrick studies is most evident in works that textually analyse his films and focus on defining his filmmaking style. Among the many themes discussed in Kubrick studies are, for example, sexuality and death

(*Love and death in Kubrick: A critical study of the films from Lolita through Eyes Wide Shut* by Patrick Webster, 2011) and the theme of the Holocaust (*The Wolf at the door: Stanley Kubrick, history, and the Holocaust* by Geoffrey Cocks, 2004). Such studies represent traditional auteur studies in that they are interested in the director's personal psychology and thematic consistency, which they seek to identify by employing a structural analysis of reoccurring motif(s). Their analyses are based on the initial premise of the director being a 'purely subjective psychological cause, whose free will, desires, beliefs, and intentions consciously determine a film's meaning' (Buckland, 2016: 7).

Auteurism is still one of the prevailing theoretical approaches in understanding authorship in Kubrick's filmmaking. 'I consider Stanley Kubrick one of the major auteurs of the twentieth century because whenever I re-watch one of his films, my viewing experience changes,' Elisa Pezzotta notes (*Journal of Irish Studies*, n.d.). Nonetheless, although evidently still popular, Kubrick studies have also followed the historical development in authorship studies and succumbed to the shifts that have occurred in studies of film and film history. For example, Timothy Corrigan's criticism of auteurism identifies the main reasons for the shift that Kubrick scholars undertook:

> Although auteurism provides the foundation for many
> excellent studies, it should be used with some scepticism
> for at least two reasons. Rarely does a director have the
> total control that the term suggests because anyone from a
> scriptwriter to an editor may be more responsible for the
> look and logic of a film.

> (2015: 107)

In response, Kubrick studies turned to new research methods and a new perspective on authorship. While Kubrick's auteur reputation is rarely denied, it has become subject to criticism and challenges by the inclusion of the collaborative factor in studying authorship.

New approaches are being applied in comparative analyses, adaptation studies, reception studies, authorship studies, production contexts and industry studies.

The shift was initiated by the 'New Film History' methodology introduced by James Chapman, Mark Glancy and Sue Harper (2007), which has expanded the framework used in empirical research (with the growing use of the archives) and has expanded the context of discourses the researchers engage with in their analyses. Included, but not limited to, are sociopolitical, sociocultural, industrial, economic discourses, Jewish studies and updated contexts of authorship, where the main focus has become collaboration. Kubrick, the cult-personality, the driving force of his films and other mythologies that are applied to him, are being challenged by revealing stories of collaboration (e.g. Ulivieri, 2016), new historical discourse and textual analysis (e.g. Ljujić et al.'s *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*, 2015) and, with the rise of media, fandom studies and online social appreciation societies, by the audience's growing participation in the interpretation of Kubrick's films.

In the next section, I review Kubrick studies, paying particular attention to contexts of authorship (auteur approach and its new variant, collaborative authorship). I structure the literature and other research into categories that reveal the types of studies. Each category comprises past and present studies and identifies the similarities and divergences between the approaches. Such a system enables me to identify the types of analyses applied in the readings I will engage with in my study. It has also assisted me in determining where the gaps in Kubrick studies are, how other academics have attempted to fill them and to position my argument for a new perspective in the framework of these various studies. Here, I also wish to add that strictly defined categorisation was not possible, as some works fall into more categories and some categories entail more approaches; nonetheless, the application of this structure provides a more coherent overview of existing literature.

Textual analyses

In their early beginnings, film studies were associated with the interpretation of films, specifically, the thematic patterns occurring in Kubrick's films, analysed through visual elements. Popularly based on philosophy, psychology, semiotics and formalism, these works resulted in combined thematic and stylistic (technical) analyses.

A traditional auteurist approach is employed by structurally analysing thematic motifs, which then leads to authors presenting their possible readings of the film's meaning. Norman Kagan does so in *The cinema of Stanley Kubrick* (2000), basing his auteurist approach on the fact that Kubrick is an excellent example of a 'true auteur'. Kagan searches for Kubrick's 'directorial presence' (2000: xiii) throughout his oeuvre by analysing Kubrick's storytelling. Mario Falsetto's collection of essays *Stanley Kubrick: A narrative and stylistic analysis* (1996) similarly offers interpretations of the narration style and analyses of genre, motifs and visuals, a 'Kubrickian' aesthetics of Kubrick's filmmaking, a context of signs and meanings which, in *Kubrick: Inside a film artist's maze* (2000), Thomas Allen Nelson refers to as Stanley Kubrick's cinematic maze. Kubrick's cinematic symbolism is also discussed in a highly philosophically supported work by Philip Kuberski, *Kubrick's total cinema: Philosophical themes and formal qualities* (2012), in which Kuberski employs a formalistic analysis of the cinematic elements that present themes. Maria Pramaggiore (*Making time in Stanley Kubrick's Barry Lyndon: Art, history, and empire*, 2015) also analyses the technical elements of Kubrick's filmmaking, engaging with discourses of culture and power, to identify Kubrick's stylistic means in the creation of 'aesthetic' time. Another strongly philosophical work is Antoine Prévost-Balga's interpretation of three types of 'machinic malfunction that operate inside the mechanic of three Kubrickian characters' (2017: 9). Roger Luckhurst (*The Shining*, 2013) employs a formalistic and structuralist approach to identifying the themes, analysing the narration of performances and scenes in the film.

Philosophical discussion of meaning is a popular method of analysis of Kubrick's films, although some works engage with other contexts in their analysis. One such context is comparison, whereby Kubrick is compared to other directors. Interestingly, the comparison tends to be with other auteur directors, for example, Robert Phillip Kolker's *The extraordinary image: Orson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick, and the reimagining of cinema* (2017a) and Matthew Melia's two essays comparing Kubrick and Ken Russell: 'Altered states, altered spaces: Architecture, space and landscape in the film and television of Stanley Kubrick and Ken Russell' (2017) and 'The post-Kubrickian: Stanley Kubrick, Steven Spielberg and *A.I. Artificial Intelligence*' (2017). Such comparative studies

demonstrate that the image of Kubrick, the auteur, still prevails among academics. While some newer approaches (in terms of inclusion of other contexts) can also be detected in textual analysis, they are not common. These newer approaches are more often applied in studies of production, reception, adaptation, including historical, industrial, social and cultural discourses.

Adaptation studies

Kubrick's films were based on novels that he adapted into scripts with the help of scriptwriters. Most studies of adaptations are based on Kubrick's reputation as an auteur, as evident from Jesse Bier's claim in 'Cobb and Kubrick: Author and auteur: (*Paths of Glory* as novel and film)': 'All in all, taking the part of a writer, photographer, prop man, and editor as well as director, Kubrick fulfilled the function of absolute, innovative auteur in this film if anyone ever did in the production of a motion picture' (1985).

Robert Stam's 'Beyond fidelity: The dialogics of adaptation' (in Naremore, 2000), focuses on the comparison between the books and the films from a literary perspective, among them *Lolita* (Nabokov, 1955) and Kubrick's cinematic adaptation (*Lolita*, 1962). Similarly, but with more focus on the process of adaptation and its influences on the film, cinematic adaptation is discussed by Charles Bane in his thesis *Viewing novels, reading films: Stanley Kubrick and the art of adaptation as interpretation* (2006). Other authors pay more attention to the stylistic approaches Kubrick employed in his adaptations, such as Greg Jenkins' *Stanley Kubrick and the art of adaptation: Three novels, three films* (2007), a comparison between story and novels, to the point of identifying Kubrick's adaptation strategies and applying them in their scriptwriting, as attempted by Brooke Nicole Sonenreich (2013). These types of adaptation studies, based on literary and stylistic perspectives, have however been updated by the newer approaches, which crucially include the notion of historical discourse.

In *Stanley Kubrick: Adapting the sublime*, Elisa Pezzotta approaches the analysis of Kubrick's adaptations by challenging the prevalent approach, focused on literary studies, instead proposing film adaptation as a separate category by employing an approach involving the 'diachronic historic discussion of the

dialogical exchange between different media' (2013: 6). Using historical, economic and other relevant discourses, she sets out to identify the patterns employed by Kubrick in his oeuvre. While positioning herself ideologically within auteurism, she draws on surrounding historical and industrial discourses, as newer adaptation studies do. The special issue of *Adaptation* (2015) features essays that explore Kubrick's status as an auteur of adaptation: 'For all Kubrick's unrivalled status as an auteur he was nevertheless always an adapter, mostly of little known novels and short stories' (Hunter, 2015: 278). The historical context is the focus of Graham Allen's 'The reader on *Red Alert*: Stanley Kubrick, Peter George and the evolution of fear' (2017). Also employing a historical perspective, specifically the concept of Jewishness, Nathan Abrams (2015) analyses the *Spartacus* (1960) screenplay, incorporating correspondence in the analysis. Mireia Aragay also approaches the analysis of the adaptation process from the standpoint of seeing adaptation as a cultural practice that needs, therefore, to take into account cultural and aesthetic needs and pressures (2005), confirming Gene D. Phillips's observation that adaptations need to be reinterpreted as an 'everlasting dialogue among artist and epochs' (2001: 13).

It can be observed that newer adaptation studies engage more with the notion of various discourses. They take the notion of 'dialogue' (Phillips, 2001: 13) or discourse, and apply the concept of collaboration in authorship, identifying Kubrick's process of filmmaking as 'one of collective authorship' that demonstrates 'that Kubrick was as much a creative collaborator as a shaping consciousness' (Stuckey in Ljujić et al., 2015: 134-135) who fairly credited and recognised his collaborators, like Diane Johnson, who Kubrick collaborated with on *The Shining* screenplay (McAvoy in Ljujić et al., 2015; McAvoy in *Adaptation*, 2015). Peter Krämer's 'Adaptation as exploration: Stanley Kubrick, literature, and *A.I. Artificial Intelligence*' (2015) addresses authorship exactly from the perspective of numerous voices that can be detected in the many drafts of the *A.I.* screenplay.

While not all works are indebted to Kubrick's readiness to collaborate, such as Frederic Raphael's book on the issues of autonomy he faced while working with Kubrick and the struggle for subsequent recognition of his creative input (1999),

when it comes to adapting novels into screenplays, most strive to demonstrate Kubrick's collaborative process as a repeating feature. The 'New Film History' approach has, therefore, influenced modern studies of authorship in adaptation studies; while never disputing Kubrick's authorial element, they stress the importance of considering the discourses that lead into a new version – Kubrick's collective and even multiple authorship of the screenplays.

Biographies and complete/combined works

Based on an industrial, historical and empirical approach, many works in this category combine biographical information on Kubrick and provide a detailed account of the production context of his filmmaking, specified by individual films.

Apart from shorter works like Charles River Editors' edition of *American legends: The life of Stanley Kubrick* (2014), only two extensive Stanley Kubrick biographies have been written up to now: Vincent LoBrutto's (1999) and John Baxter's (1997). They detail Kubrick's life and Kubrick's productions, detailing his relationships (private and professional), present Kubrick as a person (personality), basing the information on interviews with his co-workers and friends, revealing stories of collaboration, disputes, development of ideas and detailed technical analysis of his filmmaking style. LoBrutto's book sets out to break the mythology surrounding Kubrick by employing in-depth archival and film industry research (1999). Baxter's biography (1997) is written in a somewhat dramatic style, accenting Kubrick's nature as conflict-prone, and is thus inclined towards confirmation of the myth of the difficult director. Similarly, Raphael's *Eyes wide open: A memoir of Stanley Kubrick* (1999) reveals the controversial issues around authorship and autonomy over the screenplay for *Eyes Wide Shut* (1999); Michael Herr's *Kubrick* (2000) presents a story of friendship and collaboration with Herr, the writer of *Dispatches* (1987), which Kubrick adapted in *Full Metal Jacket* (1987).

At the same time the biographies present stories that possibly contribute to Kubrick's mythology and his auteur status. The combination of the Kubrick persona from a professional and private perspective offers insight into the possible

origins of the mythology and identifies the moments of creativity that lead to the ascription of authorship. However, the mythology is more clearly expressed in what I refer to as complete/combined works on Kubrick. These works combine different approaches simultaneously, usually, industry studies, revealing very specific technical information on the production processes and biographical information, revealed through the collaborative relationships and collaborative actions gleaned from archival research and interviews with Kubrick's co-workers. There is a sea of such literature, so I will limit myself to a few.

One of the greatest combined works is Michel Ciment's *Kubrick* (1983, updated in 2001), developed over many years and written with Kubrick's intervention. The work presents balanced technical, industrial knowledge and the nature of collaborations in Kubrick's productions. While the book is still focused on the 'idea' or 'myth' of the great director, Ciment realises the limitations of writing about Kubrick: 'Every critic, I feel sure, who has attempted to come to terms with Stanley Kubrick's work has been made painfully aware of the limits of his own discourse' (1983: 7). Ciment's stance indicates that he put careful thought into recognising notion of discourse and supplemented the void with contributions from collaborators, although how successfully this was achieved is questionable, given that it was Kubrick who approved the written words. Such practice was not an exception: Kubrick 'cooperated' with other writers, most notably with Alexander Walker. Walker's *Stanley Kubrick directs* (1972), later updated together with Ulrich Ruchti and Sybil Taylor's in *Stanley Kubrick, director: A visual analysis* (1999), is a thorough technical analysis of the productions as well as biographical documentation. Visual analyses like Walker's have initiated a body of work that focuses on the analysis of cinematic elements in Kubrick's films, drawing on (re)occurring themes, relying on the myth of Kubrick as the auteur, as exemplified by Joseph Gelmis in *The film director as superstar* (1971).

Newer works on Kubrick, like Robert Phillip Kolker's, are based on auteurism as a seminal theory of film. Kolker's *A cinema of loneliness: Penn, Kubrick, Scorsese, Spielberg, Altman* (2000), *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey: New essays* (2006) and *The extraordinary image: Orson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick, and the reimagining of cinema* (2017a) combine biographical

data with rich visual analyses of the auteurs' films, drawing connections between them and identifying them as the driving, creative forces of their films. 'Kubrick was the embodiment of the film auteur, in control of all facets of his work from inception through distribution,' Kolker writes (2006: 10), elaborating on the idea of Kubrick the auteur who, despite depending on other writers 'to initiate the words of a project', always finalised the final script 'to his liking' (Kolker, 2006: 4).

Much of the combined works on Kubrick are based on the premise of the director's auteurist filmmaking style, but the trend of discussing Kubrick in terms of collaboration, as in the already mentioned collection of essays, employs an empirical approach, focusing on historical discourse, which they claim is missing in LoBrutto's biography (Ljujić et al., 2015: 13). The essays are detailed studies of different stages of production, with a strong focus on the historical, industrial, cultural and social discourses surrounding the collaborative aspect of Kubrick's filmmaking practice. At times, Kubrick's auteurism is even challenged, especially evident in McAvoy's deconstruction of myths in creating *The Shining* (in Ljujić et al., 2015), and Kubrick's inclination to collaborative practice demonstrated in the industrial context, as employed in Regina Peldszus's essay on collaboration between Kubrick and NASA (in Ljujić et al., 2015). A few more collections that represent the new approach in Kubrick studies have emerged in recent years: Vincent Jaunas and Jean-François Baillon's collection of essays *Stanley Kubrick: Nouveaux horizons* (2017); Mick Broderick's *Post-Kubrick: On the filmmaker's influence and legacy* (2017); 'The Stanley Kubrick Archive: A dossier of new research' collection of essays in *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* (Fenwick, Hunter, and Pezzotta, 2017); Broderick's collection *The Kubrick legacy* and Nathan Abrams and Ian Q. Hunter's *The Bloomsbury companion to Stanley Kubrick,* set to be published in 2019. Such collections include essays on an array of subjects, based on a philosophical understanding of themes and on research done in archives and by interviews. Essays still employ interpretation, but also focus on the production context, inter-relations and communication among Kubrick's crews. The said collections also focus on individual films. A single film analysis that combines contextual and thematic analysis, comprising essays on narration, performance, technology and visual analysis is *Understanding*

Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey: Representation and interpretation (2018) by James Fenwick. The collection details Kubrick's technical innovations, experiments, research and his philosophical and genre discourses, also offering new perspectives on authorship. The collection adopts new approaches that utilise empirical research and draw on various social, cultural and industrial contexts.

Lately, biographies on Kubrick's co-workers have started to emerge (as already mentioned, Filippo Ulivieri (2016) and *Filmworker*'s stories of Kubrick's personal assistants Leon Vitali and Emilio D'Alessandro) and other works written by Kubrick's collaborators, for example, Matthew Modine's *Full Metal Jacket diary* (2005). Modine's book discusses technical and organisational aspects of production but also uncovers the nature of collaboration and collaborative relationships between the crew, actors and Kubrick. Such works have become a mixture of information on Kubrick as a director, Kubrick as a collaborator and stories that elaborate on the film industry environment within which Kubrick's filmmaking took place.

Industry studies/production contexts

An array of work details the pre-production, production and post-production processes in Kubrick's filmmaking. Studies mainly focus on individual films, such as Peter Krämer's *2001: A Space Odyssey* (2010) and *A Clockwork Orange* (2011), for example, which are detailed production, adaptation and reception studies, and Mick Broderick's *Reconstructing Strangelove: Inside Stanley Kubrick's 'nightmare comedy'* (2017), which focuses on the myths surrounding the film's production (specifically the editing stage). Both note individual collaborations that occurred in the process: Krämer (2010, 2011) speaks of the collaborations at all stages of production, whereas Broderick (2017) focuses on the specific collaboration between Kubrick and writers Peter George and Terry Southern. Philippe Mather's *Stanley Kubrick at Look magazine: Authorship and genre in photojournalism and film* (2013) elaborates on the collaborations Kubrick was involved in when working as a photographer, emphasising these experiences as being crucial to developing the collaborative authorship Kubrick was later to practise in his filmmaking.

Research about Kubrick's production processes also features in works that focus on films that Kubrick did not make, such as *Aryan Papers* and *Napoleon*. Alison Castle's *Stanley Kubrick's Napoleon: The greatest movie never made* (2011) is an example of a pre-production study, detailing location research, costume planning and other relevant research material, also including the original treatment of the story. More technology-specific works are based on the representation of technical solutions employed in the process. Based on historical accounts, but also very specific technical knowledge, are 'making ofs' such as *The making of Kubrick's 2001* (1970) by Jerome Agel, Piers Bizony's *2001: Filming the future* (2000), Stephanie Schwam's *The making of 2001: A Space Odyssey* (2000) and Michael Benson's *Space Odyssey: Stanley Kubrick, Arthur C. Clarke, and the making of a masterpiece* (2018), which focuses on the collaboration between Kubrick and the writer of the novel. Many essays and articles have been written about the influence of collaboration on the development of the production, among them Filippo Ulivieri's unpublished research paper on Anthony Burgess-Kubrick communication (*A Clockwork Symposium: A Clockwork Orange – New Perspectives*, 2018) and Simone Odino's 'Dear Arthur, what do you think? The Kubrick–Arthur Clarke collaboration in their correspondence from the Smithsonian and London archives' (2017).

While industry studies have always been popular due to an interest in technical specifics or historical documentation of the filmmaking process, they have been on the rise in recent years, and it can be observed that they have undergone a transformation to some extent. The context of collaboration has, in many ways, become central to an understanding of Kubrick's filmmaking practice. It is, therefore, plausible to refer to the studies as modern approaches. While they are by no means new, they are new in that they focus on the discourse of authorship, paving the way for theories of collaborative/collective/multiple authorship to be seriously considered and widely discussed, not only among professionals but in academia and among the general readership too.

Another new approach in Kubrick studies is based on the interpretation of Kubrick's legacy, as observed in fandom. I specifically refer to extreme variations of textual analyses that can be observed in some fandom studies, and which

indicate that auteurist enthusiasm could be growing among audiences. I do not refer to forum groups but, for example, Rodney Ascher's documentary *Room 237* (2012), an amateur conspiracy analysis by Jay Weidner (*Kubrick's Odyssey: Secrets hidden in the films*, 2011), books like Derek Taylor Kent's *Kubrick's game* (2016) and Isaac Weishaupt's *Kubrick's code* (2014). The occurrence of such extreme reading is, however, also strongly related to the public image of Kubrick the persona. The cult of personality that emerged from auteur theory is the pendulum of such approaches. The mythology around Kubrick has created a persona, who, due to his eccentric and private nature, combined with stories of his relentless perfectionism and the mystery surrounding his films' meaning, has contributed to this trend. Lastly, some exciting research is still in development, for example, Abrams and Kolker's *Eyes Wide Shut: Stanley Kubrick and the making of his final film*, awaiting release in 2019, and other studies that are works in progress.

This literature review has demonstrated that, while many Kubrick studies are still based on the premise of Kubrick as an auteur, the focus of the research has shifted from understanding Kubrick's filmmaking as the work of the sole author, to a broader view that considers the importance of collaboration. Comparative analyses, studies of adaptation and reception, of historical, social, political and cultural contexts and studies of Kubrick's creative practice (production studies) are being researched in an attempt to provide a fresh perspective on Kubrick's filmmaking. Much research is still to be done and, due to research approaches or/and technological advances that make sources more accessible, is accessible to a wider framework of researchers and other members of the public. I discuss this in detail in the next section on methodology.

Methodology and thesis structure

Previous sections have indicated that historical analysis, used in the history of film studies and film history, is an appropriate choice of method in researching the phenomenon of filmmaking. However, what does historical research in its essence mean?

In *The New Film History sources, methods, approaches* (2007), James Chapman, Mark Glancy and Sue Harper explain that the focus of historical research is in the cultural, aesthetic, technological and institutional contexts of the film medium; the research is, therefore, based on a search for the structures and processes that are encompassed in and shape the film and film industry. These processes are a combination of industry practice, strategies of production, relationships with 'external bodies' (social institutions) and 'individual agency', which refers to the crew's 'creative and cultural competences' (Chapman et al., 2007: 8). This complex identification of the research method only emerged, however, in the late 1980s. Before this, the historical research methodology included 'classical' approaches, aesthetic, technological, economic and social, as identified by Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery's *Film history: Theory and practice* (1985). As demonstrated in the literature review, Kubrick studies have employed more methods in research, and they can be categorised into the identified two types of approaches – traditional and new.

Traditionally, theories of philosophy, linguistics, semiotics and formalism are applied to interpretation, approached through textual analysis of the text (or oeuvre). Traditional approaches are thus mainly analytical. Textual analysis is most often employed with a (post)structuralist method of reading the texts in search of patterns that reoccur in the film(s), as in Falsetto's search for elements that will inform of 'Kubrickian' aesthetics (1996), often strongly supported by auteur theory. Technical research or 'making ofs' are very straightforward in that they employ historical research (information obtained from interviews and other sources that contain technical information, such as film production documentation), which indicates that empirical research has taken place in the traditional approaches already. It also implies a lack of concerted analysis of those sources, based on the assumption that they simply represent the 'truth', which I address by drawing on Thomas Elsaesser's criticism of traditional studies (1986).

New approaches are represented by a turn to the 'New Film History' methodology, which was first introduced by Elsaesser in *Sight and Sound* magazine (1986) and later developed more thoroughly by Chapman, Glancy and Harper (2007). Reviewing Allen and Gomery's book (1985), Elsaesser justified

the 'New Film History' approach due to the 'polemical dissatisfaction with the surveys and overviews, tales of pioneers and adventurers that for too long passed as film histories' (1986: 246). 'New Film History' brought changes in the interpretation process, an insistence that 'the film historian should be able to decode the visual style of a film by emphasizing the relationship between the different discourses within it' (Chapman et al., 2007: 8). It encouraged seeing films as cultural products with 'their own formal properties and aesthetics, including visual style and aural qualities' (Chapman et al., 2007: 8). This change can be seen in Kubrick studies, where the scholars and critics base their interpretation methods within the social, historical, industrial and cultural contexts of Kubrick's films. One of the most recent works is Nathan Abrams's *Stanley Kubrick: New York Jewish intellectual* (2018), which researches the intellectual, cultural and ethnic atmosphere in Kubrick's filmmaking and argues that Kubrick's films contribute to the same debates that the New York Jewish intellectuals were having in post-war America. The new historical methodology also developed as a result of the growing trend of archival restoration and preservation, which has expanded the extent of information and documentation available to researchers; this includes archival documentation such as production documents, scripts, censors' reports, publicity material and reviews (Chapman et al., 2007). These have become central to the methodology, because they are able to draw attention to what Wollen (1973 in Grant, 2008) and Perkins (1972 in Grant, 2008) have acknowledged with their reference to the importance of collaboration in filmmaking: consideration of creative inputs of other crew members.

My analysis of collaboration practices and discourses in Kubrick's productions follows this new methodological approach, as it combines extensive research of the Stanley Kubrick Archive at the University of the Arts in London, which I have been researching for over four years. My analysis contains extensive mediatised interviews and three new interviews with Kubrick's collaborators that I conducted myself. The mediated interviews were obtained through a thorough research of the internet: collections like *The Kubrick Site* (2013-2014) and *Archivio Kubrick* (2001-2016), which include (aside from essays, discussions, press material, reviews) a wide range of interviews with Kubrick's collaborators and Kubrick himself, and depositions that were collected during Kubrick's filmmaking career.

Other sources included bibliographies from academic works that listed interviews, interviews that were published online and transcripts of interviews that I found in the Stanley Kubrick Archive. Due to the enormous databases of interviews, I narrowed down the search by looking at the theme of the interview, the interviewed collaborator and by searching for reference to discourses of collaboration, conflict, authorship, creativity, innovations, experimenting, press material and other themes that applied to my research. I analysed both the information and the general 'tone' of the interviews by reading 'between the lines'. This said, the mediated interviews often included the same interviewees, which allowed me to compare the information given in different time periods and contexts. I also analysed many interviews that were not written in the form of questions (and answers), presenting another chance to identify the discourses around Kubrick mythology.

The focus of the research encompasses pre-production, production and post-production stages of Kubrick's filmmaking (excluding the development stage, which I decided against due to my focus on the more 'practical' nature of production processes). Such a broad focus also broadens the framework of individual case studies and expands the manoeuvring space in which collaborative relationships are observed and, in this way, is the collaborative nature of Kubrick's filmmaking process identified. My study emphasises the nature of these collaborations and, as such, brings focus to the cultural context and social nature of the connection between collaborative/collective work and creativity. Joining the components of collective work and opportunities to observe 'the distinctive voices among prevailing babble of discourses during a film's production' (Chapman et al., 2007: 70), or to observe, in Perkins' words, the 'interaction between the various personalities and talents engaged in making a film' (1972 in Grant, 2008: 70) resulting in 'separate texts' that need to be decoded (Wollen, 1972: 105), will offer a new interpretation of creative collaboration and an alternative perspective on authorship and creative autonomy in the film industry.

My research began with an extensive review of already available information on Kubrick through which I developed in-depth knowledge of the production process. I also attended conferences to familiarise myself with the existent

Kubrick scholarship and present research. This allowed me to identify some of the reoccurring discourses in Kubrick studies, which I then focused on when analysing the archival material and interviews. I decided to combine the two methods because I was aware of the limitations of both of them when used individually. Although I later expanded to studying the approaches of research applied by Caldwell (2008) and Rowlands (2009), initially, two studies served as examples.

Miranda Banks employs a historical analysis in her examination of trends in media industry studies, combining an understanding of economic and political aspects of cultural history (2015) with observations of information obtained from her interviews with the writers, as well as archived, historical interviews. Inconsistencies in reappearing themes of authorship, recognition of it and the writers' perceptions of inclusiveness of their professional environment are identified in this study. Similarly, Catriona McAvoy combines interviews and archival data in analysing intertextuality in the production of Kubrick's *The Shining* (in Ljujić et al., 2015). Her study of the pre-, post- and production process is based on examination of the relevant documentation from the Stanley Kubrick Archive, combined with archived interviews and personally conducted interviews with Kubrick's writer Diane Johnson, assistant director Brian W. Cook, co-producer/assistant Jan Harlan and daughter Katharina Kubrick. Her research on the production process is based on the predisposition of myths on Kubrick that, through the process of revealing the stories, shapes an alternative to the mythology.

My initial starting point is similar: the existing mythology on Kubrick. While biased, the information helped me identify the discourses that were indicative of potential alternative information on the actual process of collaboration in Kubrick's productions. With the assistance of film practitioners, I came into contact with three practitioners: Douglas Milsome, cinematographer, Colin Flight, operational director at Rank Laboratories, and Peter Hannan, Kubrick's special effects camera assistant. After conducting two telephone interviews and one interview in person, I analysed the information, taking Banks' note on the essentiality of understanding the research material's versatility (2015) into

account. Namely, the interviews should not be seen as sources of information that are presented objectively, but one should take into account their versatility by regarding them as memories and observations. As such, the information obtained was put into a wider context, which results in an enriched interpretation of the sources from various additional perspectives: historically, socially, culturally, psychologically and inter-relationally. This allowed an expansion of the context and the acquisition of more information that is essential to understanding complex themes such as collaborative creativity analysed in this study. Interestingly, much of this information came to light when the interview would wander away from the structured questions and the interviewees narrated their stories freely.

I repeatedly juxtaposed the interview data (mediatised and personal) with the findings from the archive, taking care to interpret the vast documentation[3] in the form of production papers, scripts, Kubrick's communication via faxes and letters, lists, pictures and original props from individual films, pay lists, location research material, promotion material and very specific technical logs on editing and cinematography, according to Sue Breakell's definition of the archive material as 'a set of traces of actions, the records left by a life – drawing, writing, interacting with society on personal and formal levels' (2008). This was also applied to film workers' stories, as memories and impressions that the individual crew members have of the production process that they engaged in. The archive documentation provided an alternative insight into the stories that were told through myths and interviews, and allowed for different conclusions to be drawn from it. Simone Odino does so by initially launching his research from the mythology and published memoirs of collaborating with Kubrick on the *2001* screenplay by Arthur C. Clarke (2017). Odino then broadens the research framework by drawing on the Stanley Kubrick Archive in London and Arthur C. Clarke Collection in the Smithsonian Museum in Virginia, studying their correspondence through letters and drafts with comments, to shed light on the various processes that occurred during their collaboration, challenging the myth 'about Kubrick the dictatorial genius' by identifying the moments of 'fruitful and enjoyable' collaborative relationship (2017: 174).

---

[3] For the purpose of clarity, this thesis references archival documentation by the folder numbers and (if available) the date of their production.

Much new research on Kubrick is carried out using the deductive method, in other words starting from the mythology and existing knowledge; however, Krämer adopts the opposite, inductive method in his research of Kubrick's unrealised projects, first researching them and then drawing on relations between the made and unmade films ('Stanley Kubrick: Known and unknown', 2017). Alternatively, Ulivieri's research (2016) is primarily based on interviews he conducted with Emilio D'Alessandro. The combined methodology employed by the 'New Film History' researchers joins the archives, that offer 'a way for them to see how the process of coming-to-be came to be' (Kolker, 2017b) and the interviews that provide other contextual information, importantly, about the social context.

Of course, there are negative aspects/dangers to a critical analysis using archival research and interview methodology. Representations are by default subjective, influenced by external and internal factors such as the creative environment and an individual's perceptions and experiences of the filmmaking process. While this expands the context in which they are made sense of, it also complicates the interpretation of the data from both the interviews and the archive. The interview-obtained information can be questioned for its validity due to the subjective narration of the interviewee: 'Interviewees tend to present themselves in a favourable light and to portray themselves as central to the creative process,' (Chapman et al., 2007: 69). While triangulating the filmmakers' testimonies through archive material can assist in solving this issue, there is a negative aspect to this methodology, too: the gaps occurring in the archive material itself. Kubrick's archive is selective (curated), and the collection is not complete. It was Kubrick who created (curated) it, and after his death, the material was subjected to another selection process by his wife, before donating it to the archive at the University of Arts in London. There is, therefore, much information missing, presumably the sensitive information that was not documented or not included in the archive. As Kolker also points out, another source is missing: Kubrick's favourite communication technique was by way of phone calls, which 'of course, were not recorded and therefore are not archived, meaning that a large part of the creative process is still left unknown' (2017b). How can the effect that these circumstances have on the authenticity of the research be overcome? The solution is to identify the inconsistencies and understand the divergence of the information.

Jacques Derrida and Eric Prenowitz explain the goal of this approach: 'Because the archive will never be either memory or anamnesis as spontaneous, alive and internal experience. On the contrary: the archive takes place at the place of originary and structural breakdown of the said memory' (1995: 14). I identify the divergences as crucial moments that complicate the existing mythology and assist in the finding of new discourses. This is based on Claude Lévi-Strauss's observation that, 'If there is a meaning to be found in mythology, this cannot reside in the isolated elements which enter into the composition of a myth, but only in the way those elements are combined. Although myth belongs to the same category as language, being, as a matter of fact, only part of it, language in myth unveils specific properties' (1955: 431), to which I add that language (with all its divergences and inconsistencies) unveils various discourses that form and originate from the myth. In order to unravel the myths, I analysed the curated Kubrick archive, the mediated archive interviews and the new interviews and kept returning to them each time a pattern started to emerge. In the themes, production stages, films and authors of the documents structured archival data, it was my noted observations and inquiries that guided me when analysing the occurring discourses in the interviews. When the data was combined, it revealed certain patterns which I reflected upon, coming to a hypothesis that either agreed with the myth at any point or did not.

My case study of Kubrick's collaborations differs from existing research in a number of ways. Firstly, the analysis of the discourses of collaboration, creative autonomy and (collective) authorship is wider in scope: I research Kubrick's production process from the formation of the crew to the advertising of the finalised product, thus widening the research frame, which also creates the possibility of hidden discourses/contexts to be revealed. Secondly, I focus solely on the practical process of filmmaking, which is an unusual approach (as much of the research is still based on textual analysis and a search for the signs of the director's intention). With this, I reaffirm the need for such research, already expressed by Elsaesser: 'The cinema is a complex historical, sociological, legal and economic phenomenon: films are merely one manifestation of the working of the system which fascinates them' (1986: 247). Thirdly, I apply some specific sociocultural theories and combine the concepts of knowledge and experience to

assist the process of identifying the individual elements that lead to these moments of collective/collaborative creativity. Fourthly, by engaging with the accounts of film practitioners, I wish to bridge the gap in the presentation of historical discourses on the collaborative medium of film between and combine the strengths of, academic and practice-based fields. This also leads to my last original contribution: my research aims to engage not only with academic readers but will strive to address a general readership as well. Krämer notes that such 'convergence between the writing academics produce for each other' and publications that are produced for the 'general reader' have lately started to emerge (2017). The reason I engage with this idea is to address the prevailing breach that exists between academia and the general reader. My research focuses on aspects of Kubrick's filmmaking that are of interest to both academics and practitioners, and it is in this sense that it could address a wider readership, which would show that combining academic and practitioner perspectives is a successful way of widening the horizon in Kubrick studies.

The thesis is structured in two ways: it is based on the stages of the filmmaking process and based on themes that arose in my analysis of the process of collective creativity. My decision to structure the stages of the process of filmmaking linearly (in other words, the stages of pre-production, production and post-production) is done with the intention of creating a clear representation of the processes that run in each stage. It is also hoped that this structure will enable the reader to become immersed in the world of Stanley Kubrick's film production and will highlight differences, inconsistencies and complementation within existing myths on Kubrick and his collaborations. In parallel, in order to highlight the nature of the creative process and the autonomy of an individual's creative input in the cluster of voices and noises, the analysis is structured around the application of different theoretical frameworks, namely social, philosophical and psychological perspectives. This approach, in effect, problematises the function of the relationships built among the crews with regards to authorship and recognition of collaborative power.

The first chapter will present and debate individual stories about the nature of crew formation in the pre-production process of Kubrick's films, with a specific

focus on *The Shining*. Origin stories are represented by individual experiences, impressions and learning outcomes, derived from the process of forming a crew-to-be. They address the process of collaboration in its initial stage of formation and chase the initial moments of creativity. The moments can be found in two processes occurring at the pre-production stage: the origin of a creative idea and the act of forming a new collective to create a unit that is about to enter the creative process. Individual expectations, perceptions and comparison with actual manifestations will be analysed from a social point of view in terms of the formation of a collective, demonstrating that a film crew follows similar procedures and faces similar obstacles as any group in society that is put together to pursue a collective project and to become a collective per se. They will be detailed as socio-cognitive and sociocultural elements that occur in the creative process, elaborating on the possible connection between them and the existing myths regarding the origins of Kubrick's crews and creative ideas. The circumstances in which this process is started, proceeds and ends, include active components of decision-making. These components are based on individual representations and their match with representations of the force of decision-making – the director and circumstances existing in the film industry at the time Kubrick's productions took place.

The second chapter focuses on the effects that the conditions of the creative environment have on individual and group creativity in filmmaking. Environmental conditions/regulators that guide the film industry range from physical, psychological, economic and cultural to social ones and they affect the expression of creativity, autonomy and attribution of authorship of an individual's work in a collaborative environment. War stories are represented as the crew's testimonies, attitudes, experiences and consequences that film workers are subjected to when working in the film industry at all stages – pre-production, production and post-production. By employing various styles of narration, which Caldwell refers to as 'against all odds' allegories, 'war mythos' and 'thriller presented story' with a strong dramatic arc (2008: 38), I will identify the techniques with which these stories are told by Kubrick's crew in order to paint a picture of the working environment of Kubrick's films as seen from his crew's perspective. Concepts such as Pierre Bourdieu's idea of cultural capital (Bourdieu

in Richardson, 1986: 242) and occurring phenomena of conflict and limitations, will support the argument of this chapter. In this regard, the film industry can be seen as a field of interaction and exchange, a field in which the ability to create within the conditions that govern it reflect in and on creativity.

The third chapter will explore the processes that take place before and during the production of a film, with a focus on identifying the approaches and initiatives to solving issues/complications that arise in practically challenging situations. Processes will be addressed from both practical and creative perspectives and will, thus, include technical and creative practical specifics on the solutions that were applied by individual members of Kubrick's crew, or resulted from collaborative actions in the individual departments and between various sectors of the crew such as props, art production, costume and the camera sector. The practical stories will serve as case studies of the creative solutions that are based on a combination of an individual's knowledge, experimentation and innovation/creative solutions. They will, therefore, deal with themes of originality, creativity, types of collaborative practice taking place and the nature of communication in the collective. The analysis of planning and organisation that takes place before the day of principal photography and the issues faced will identify individual contributions and sources of creative ideas. The goal of this chapter is to challenge the myth of Kubrick as the uncompromising authority and provide insight into practical solutions as collaborative creative actions, at times taken with Kubrick's approval and sometimes rejected, based on the myth of Kubrick's reluctance to take another crew member's idea into account. The chapter will be based on a case study of *Full Metal Jacket*, a film that proved to be practically challenging in re-creating the actual setting of the story, namely re-creating the atmosphere and visuals of the environment of Vietnam on location in the urban environment of London. The solutions taken by the crew will provide insight into the effects of the physical environment on Kubrick's filming practices and, by introducing Kubrick's combination of two approaches in collaborating within the crew, explain the shift in his alleged complete control in the film's production stage.

The fourth chapter will analyse the post-production stage, the stage at which Kubrick's control of the creative process was challenged. While his control of the

previous processes of pre-production and production is notorious, at the stage of working with the material he had gathered, he began to lose his total control over the film's development. His knowledge of the post-production process was scarcer and therefore, he had to rely on his collaborators to take creative control. For a director who wanted to be in charge of his filmmaking at all times, this proved to be a challenge, and the extent to which he exercised his control over collaborations with people that were more knowledgeable of the process of post-production, will be questioned. This chapter will analyse the development of the filmed material carried out by laboratories, the work of editors, music composers and post-production work such as grading and special effects. The central issue at this stage of Kubrick's filmmaking is his trust and confidence in other people's abilities and their creative capacity to complete the filmmaking process as he had desired. Putting the control in the hands of his external collaborators shifts Kubrick's power of decision-making, as his work was subjected to collaborations that he was, at times, not able to choose. This primarily refers to laboratories, due to the options available at the time, regarding both opportunities for innovative techniques and availability of physical access to them. Laboratory work and the editing process were crucial for the release of the final print, which represented the finalisation phase of Kubrick's filmmaking in terms of producing a creative product. Dependence on external collaborators was the biggest challenge for the auteur-labelled director, and the extent to which it affected his creative vision remains uncertain.

The fifth chapter discusses the issues Kubrick faced at the advertising stage of filmmaking and identifies the actions taken to achieve the finalisation of his projects. Studying the circumstances surrounding the final stages of producing *A Clockwork Orange* will show how Kubrick's control was challenged and how this loss of control affected the film's release in the UK and abroad. The controversy the film generated due to its content is reflected in the various distribution problems that followed, such as issues with the institutions MPAA and BBFC, both responsible for film censorship. But it is the promotion technique used before, during and after the release of the film that was majorly affected by the controversies and resulted in Kubrick's significant loss of control over his filmmaking. The end of the chapter will discuss the use of the promotion effect

resulting from the controversies around *A Clockwork Orange* at the time of its release, and how Warner Brothers adopted Kubrick's promotion tools after his death when they re-released the film in the UK. Their success in distribution challenges the myth that Kubrick's authority in the promotion stage of filmmaking was essential to the success of his creative process.

The study is structured so as to explore the processes of filmmaking in Kubrick's productions. Accordingly, the stories are structured linearly according to the film process, but at the same time are structured non-linearly; they emphasise the intertwining features of the processes Kubrick's filmmaking employed. Combining the two structures is an effective way of representing the debates in Kubrickian and film industry studies, setting out the substance of these debates whilst also addressing the open endings to stories that surround the myth of Stanley Kubrick. These stories, many from newly emerged sources, have started to become widely known to the public and have contributed to the growing interest in exploring them. With reference to the complexity of Kubrick's filmmaking process in terms of identifying the moments of creativity as expressed through collaboration, the stories also reflect the themes of individual autonomy and attribution of authorship in such moments.

My research on collaborative authorship in Stanley Kubrick's films challenges the existing mythology on Kubrick's filmmaking in important ways. It sets out to present an alternative view of a director whose filmmaking practice has tended to be considered authoritative and autonomous. I argue that while his films inevitably bear his distinct signature, filmmaking is a collective and collaborative practice that encompasses a number of individuals who engage in the creative process. Indeed, this research is predicated on the premise that Kubrick's filmmaking practice was, in fact, collaborative. The analysis of the network of 'inter-connected creative relationships' (Cowan, 2016: 65) and the discourses that arise from them, reveals a complex set of individual perceptions of authorship and individual and collective creative input in the intrinsically collaborative environment of film production. Situating my analysis within the historical, industrial, social and cultural contexts of Kubrick studies, I aim to form a new perspective on what has been considered merely production 'noises' (Wollen,

1972: 102) and to highlight the importance of listening to these commonly disregarded production 'voices' (Gaut, 2010: 122). By using Kubrick's productions as a case study, I challenge a strongly engraved mythology around creativity and authority. My findings provide a strong argument for reconsidering the appropriacy of auteur theory in the study of Kubrick's filmmaking practice. Instead, I advocate for a collaborative/multiple authorship model that will enable scholars to read and analyse Kubrick from a wider angle and will allow a more flexible understanding of the creative flow in film practice.

Chapter one: Origin stories

Collaborations among a film crew are formed in stages of pre-production, production and post-production. This chapter investigates the process of pre-production as the origin of crew formation. Origin stories is a term I use to specify the crew's individual stories and anecdotes on entering working collaborations with Kubrick, demonstrating the crew members' perceptions of Kubrick as a collaborator and how working with him affected their creative work and perspectives on their role in the film industry. The crew's perceptions are, in Caldwell's words, the 'glue matter' that is intended to create social cohesion in a work/trade group (2008) and, as such, make sense of the specific working environment that Kubrick's filmmaking existed in. To understand the nature of Kubrick's working practice (i.e. the nature of his working relationships), one needs to break free from the existent myths on Kubrick as a collaborator.

Kubrick's collaborative relationships are discussed in various works on his filmmaking, such as John Baxter's biography on the director (1997), James Howard's stories of Kubrick's career (1999), a series of interviews and archival research on Kubrick's projects gathered in Alison Castle's exploration of 'the cinematic genius' (2005), documentaries like *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures* (2001) and newly-emerged works presenting life stories of two of Kubrick's long-time assistants, Emilio D'Alessandro's biography (Ulivieri, 2016) and a documentary on Leon Vitali (*Filmworker*, 2017). While the last two focus specifically on the collaboration between the crew member and the director, other works require some digging to find information about Kubrick's collaborative relationships, as collaboration does not constitute the main focus of these biographies or studies. This chapter assembles existing stories, introduces new stories and clarifies the origins of Kubrick's crews by focusing on how the collaborations among Kubrick's crews began. It describes Kubrick's communication and operating skills and, by breaking free from the prevailing perceptions of Kubrick, presents a new perspective on the origins of these collaborations. The intricate connection between the origins of co-working relationships and those of collaboration, requires an explicit elaboration of the characteristics of these processes. The ways in which collaborations are formed

mimic group formation in society in general, and I elaborate on them by analysing Kubrick's techniques in forming crews and the collaborating techniques he employed in his filmmaking. I approach the analysis of their implementation in Kubrick's case by considering collaboration as a social phenomenon, employing social theories on group work and group formation (Gilbert, 2000; Glăveanu, 2011).

A film crew is a group of film workers who engage in the creative process with the common aim of producing a film. At the same time, the crew is not only a unit but a body formed of individuals. This positions collaboration as a social process that takes place in a social environment.

> It's a very special world. It's like a circus. Whatever those worlds are they have an attraction that goes beyond how creative your own work is that you are a part of it. There is always a place you can go to as long as you function socially.
>
> Stellan Skarsgård (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017)

In this analogy, the crew is represented as a form of social environment and, consequentially, displays its own social rules and practices. Glăveanu's two theoretical approaches to analysing collaborative creative work (2011) help identify and analyse the characteristics of collaboration in Kubrick's projects. The socio-cognitive approach (Glăveanu, 2011) encompasses cognitive elements such as the conditions that guide working in the film industry and it is through this lens that the circumstances present in Kubrick's working environment are described. The sociocultural approach explores techniques used to connect the individuals in a film crew, through working towards compromises between collective and individual intentions on the one hand and communication techniques that promote higher motivation in groups on the other. The socio-cognitive and sociocultural features detail an individual's career path up to the moment of becoming a part of Kubrick's crew.

Kubrick operated with the two social concepts simultaneously, and the constant shifting between them resulted in a mixture of methods and practices.

Collaboration in Kubrick's crews can be analysed by using the same approaches that are employed in observing groups in general. At the same time, the film industry is not only a part of society but also functions as a society on its own. It follows certain conventions that I identify by separating the stories into two thematic blocks: perceptions of the crew's shared creative vision and perceptions of individual power on the ladder of hierarchy within the film industry. In this way, the characteristics of origin will be defined and origins of Kubrick's collaborative relationships identified.

Origins

Studying origins in the film industry can be approached from various perspectives. One can discuss the origin of the industry itself, the origin of an individual's career, the origins of a project or the origins of an idea. I define origins as moments in which people's actions begin or from which they arise. This might involve information on the source (which could be a person, the beginnings of an individual's career, specific individual and group motivations, inspiration) and the circumstances that initiated the realisation of a creative idea, in the process of putting together a film crew to initiate the pre-production phase. The circumstances, in which this process starts, proceeds and ends include active components of decision-making, based on individual representations and their match with representations of the oft-perceived central force of decision-making, namely the director.

In the pre-production process, the creative moment consists of elements of individual creativity and its development depends on the circumstances, including people who are involved in this process. In his research on production culture in the film and television industry, Caldwell categorises film workers' stories into three trade genres: war stories, making-it sagas and genesis myths (2008). Genesis myths pertain to the above-the-line creative sectors, such as the director of photography, the production designer, the producer and the writer. Caldwell's genesis myths are to be understood as the generating moments of the creative process in the film industry. While he succeeds in categorising film workers by the narrative style they employ in their stories and gathers them according to their industry position, categorising members of a film crew by sector is problematic.

When it comes to the analysis of individual contributions, the limit between 'above the line' and 'below the line' workers (Caldwell, 2008: 38) becomes blurred. Different cultural functions that Caldwell ascribes to trade genres that are present in specific sectors are not exclusive to those sectors but can be applied to many of them. Indeed, the crew of the technical craft comprises execution personnel, following the instructions from their supervisors.

However, in the same way, one can ask whether DOPs and other 'above-the-line' workers (Caldwell, 2008: 38) respond to decisions made by people in higher positions on the hierarchal scale. The writers answer to the director, the director answers to the producer, the producer might depend on the funding institution. Due to the intertwining of characteristics of the conditions and circumstances of the film workers' stories, I adopt Caldwell's idea of *genesis* (2008) but employ my definition of the process. Similar to Caldwell's definition, I understand the genesis to be the beginning, the creation, the generating moment of creative engagement, the beginning of the work in the film industry and the beginning of the collaboration. Whether the individual workers enter the industry 'out of nowhere', or their career has been 'inherited' through family ancestry or as a result of successful mentorship, the stories about their starting point function as a connecting element in a group. While I adopt Caldwell's concept of genesis, I base my engagement on a discourse of myths and perceptions of the genesis, by referring to them as *Origin stories*.

A film project develops in stages, and the development stage is where the initial idea is formed. In his accounts of the 'genesis' of ideas, Kubrick followed a specific pattern, which I see as the philosophical understanding of an idea originating in the individual's imagination. It is actively or passively displayed to the creator through a metaphor. They are either unaware of the process or are intentionally searching for a solution – a thought and decision process that Berys Gaut describes as 'imagination as a vehicle of active creativity' (in Gaut and Livingston, 2003: 159). Rightly so, as the process already employs some of the conscious processes used in the search for the solution. Kubrick claimed that he engaged in both methods, actively and passively searching for an idea. He would be 'anxiously awaiting getting an idea' (Kubrick, quoted in Molina Foix, 1980),

or he intentionally started searching for it immediately after he had finished one film: 'When I finished *Barry Lyndon* I spent most of my time reading. Months went by, and I hadn't found anything very exciting. It's intimidating, especially at a time like this, to think of how many books you should read and never will' (Kubrick, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 181).

Alternatively, the initial spark can come from another source – an external one. The idea for the next film was born without an intentional search for one:

> *The Shining* didn't originate from any particular desire to
> do a film about this. The manuscript of the novel was sent
> to me by John Calley of Warner Bros. I thought it was one
> of the most ingenious and exciting stories of the genre I
> had read.
>
> (Kubrick, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 181)

What happened in the case of *The Shining* is that, after reading the book, an idea started to develop in Kubrick's mind. This process can also be referred to as an inspiration. The myth of 'Kubrick – the genius' could have well been generated at this stage and coincides with Friedrich Nietzsche's idea of an artist as someone with a biological impulse for transforming ideas into matter (Kemal et al., 1998). What makes his creative process unique is not so much that Kubrick was, according to Howard Saul Becker's definition, a creator as a special person who has no choice but to create (1963), but the development that follows.

The inspirations can either be abandoned as such, or can be developed further by beginning the journey to realisation. This journey is based on a cognitive process of planning and Kubrick excelled at it. He spent years researching themes of interest, gathering information as meticulously as possible. His research of a theme reflected a complete devotion to the project by an immersion in specifics. Kubrick's *Napoleon*, his years-long thorough research of the historical figure, a never-executed project, exemplifies this (Castle, 2011). The material he had gathered assisted him in preparing for the realisation of an idea that had been developed with an intentional search for a solution. Despite being abandoned, the same process was repeated in every one of Kubrick's projects. The inspiration is

thus not a sufficient enough process to enable the creative process to develop further. For this to happen, social elements of collaboration have to be employed. This is how an original idea becomes executable.

Pre-production is the stage where the social aspects of filmmaking come into the foreground. By displaying individual stories on the origin of collaboration between crew members, i.e. their perceptions of various circumstances in which they entered into a collaboration with Kubrick (the individual's way into the team), individual origin myths and origins of the collaborative creative process can be analysed. They are connected because, as soon as an individual becomes a member of a crew, the creative process ceases to be individual and becomes collective and collaborative. Many people engage in sharing the idea and, consequentially, the creative process ceases to connect with the Nietzsche-ian notion of the 'lone genius' (Kemal et al., 1998) and becomes a matter of group work. A discussion about the creative process occurring in groups is essentially about collaborative creativity. Researching film crews is based on the notion that a film crew functions as a social group. Therefore, analysing the formation and functioning of a crew can be approached in the same way as the analysis of group formation in society in general. The social approach to the analysis is, therefore, an appropriate one. This chapter employs two variants of this, Margaret Gilbert's plural subject theory (2000) and Vlad-Petre Glăveanu's socio-cognitive and sociocultural theory (2011).

A film crew is a group of film workers who, according to Gilbert's plural subject theory, form a 'holism' (2000: 3); this is not a sum of individual personal commitments but individuals who subject themselves to a joint commitment. However, while Gilbert's theory might be successfully applied to social groups in general, it becomes questionable when it comes to the film industry 'society'. A film crew is a unique and complex case. It is not just a social group with rules that apply to other social groups. This is because of two central processes that characterise filmmaking: creativity and functionality.

Neither Margaret Gilbert (2000) nor John R. Searle (1990) view collective behaviour as a sum of individual intentions or commitments. It is true that film workers take on a joint commitment and engage in a collective creative process

that leads to a common goal, namely the production of a film – a process that refers to functionality. The other process that differentiates 'general' social groups (such as football teams) and creative industry social groups, is the creative process. Individuals do not only engage in a joint commitment but also engage with an expectation that they will be able to express their creativity. In other words, a participant in an artistic industry has creative aspirations. He wishes to contribute and, at the same time, express, his creativity. The film industry is an artistic industry as well; to be specific, it is the 'seventh art form'[4] (Canudo, 1995). Thus, in filmmaking there are two types of creative processes: joint and individual. These processes not simply coexist; rather, the individual creative process is crucial for the joint creative process to function. For example, it can be said that without soldiers, the army cannot function, or without individual musicians, the orchestra cannot play a unified piece. Searle agrees: 'There clearly aren't any bodily movements which are not movements of the members of the group,' (1990).

Searle continues to elaborate on the functionality of the joint creative process by comparing individual and collective concepts of intentionality (1990). Individual intentionality is expressed without connection to other members of the group (which the individual creative process represents), but at the same time, 'each player must make a specific contribution to the overall goal' (Searle, 1990). This can be achieved by employing the individual's knowledge: 'The manifestation of any particular form of collective intentionality will require particular background skills' (Searle, 1990).

Background skills can be easily defined. Film workers contribute to the creative process with their knowledge in one or more specific sectors. For example, in designing scenography, the production designers apply knowledge that other sectors usually do not possess. They collaborate in their sector, e.g. prop masters and art directors work collectively in executing the designer's instructions. They are subjected to a joint commitment within a small unit but also share a joint commitment with the whole crew (with the director/producer in charge) and work towards a common goal. 'Filmworkers are slightly different than other people.

---

[4] The other six arts are: architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry and dance (*Bordwell and Thompson, 2010: 29*).

They are usually there for the love. They work worse hours, and they are usually not at home. And they do all this with a fantastic capacity of creating a functioning social unit that is extremely intimate, within hours' (Skarsgård, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017). To become a functioning social unit, they have to collaborate. At the same time, as with all groups engaging in collective work, collisions in collaborations are bound to happen. But what is it that affects collaboration and why do conflicts between individual and collective creativity, individual and joint commitment, individual and joint intentions, emerge?

As established, the collective creative moments in the pre-production stage consist of elements of individual creativity. Their development depends on circumstances, not only environmental but also because a group by default incorporates more people involved in the creative process. The collective creative process is shaped by individuals, who come with their individual psychological, philosophical, economic, social or ethical predispositions. They influence collaboration by forming a specific set of circumstances; this is because the circumstances within which the process begins, develops and ends include active components of decision-making, which are in turn, based on individual representations and the extent to which they match the representations of their superiors and the main decision-making force – the director/producer.

Two conclusions can be drawn. The complex inter-relations, interactions between individual members form a 'holistic', 'collective body' (Gilbert, 2000: 3) subjected to a joint commitment and a common goal. At the same time, the collective body consists of individuals who form inter-relations, interact with others and are subjected to certain circumstances. In this way, they affect the nature of the collaborations they take part in. The circumstances guide a joint commitment and collaboration. To understand how Kubrick's crews were formed and how they functioned, both the origin of the collective bodies and the origin of the joint commitment need to be identified. This can be achieved by searching for the cognitive and cultural elements in such collaborations (the crew), as demonstrated in Glăveanu's socio-cognitive and sociocultural approaches to studying group creativity (2011).

Forming collaborations

People's abilities to do something are only functional with *what* and *whom* they are working with:

> 'The best of film, and the worst of film is that it is such a collaborative process,' notes director Alan Pakula. 'You are dealing with incredibly different kinds of people and, even worse than that, you are dependent upon incredibly different people… In the end, if the film is successful, it is a synthesis of so many people that it is impossible to remember who did what and when.'

> (Jones and DeFillippi, 1996: 100)

Director Alan J. Pakula refers to both the negative and positive side of collaboration, but it is his mention of the inability to remember who did what and when that draws attention. If working on a project with other crew members means that everybody's actions blend into one, this adequately addresses the joint commitment and circumstances. The relationship between joint commitment and the circumstances dictates a film worker's experience of collective work and collaboration. The circumstances can be understood as a creative environment, which Mooney defines as a physical and ideological setting in which the creative process takes place (Taylor in Sternberg, 1988). The film industry is a particular environment due to the industry's versatile and continuously changing nature (e.g. fluctuating economic resources or arrival of new technology). However, these cognitive elements of the environment function in the film industry through sociocultural elements. For example, certain norms might exist, but circumstances change with time, and so do the conditions that guide them. Knowledge of sewing is a norm for the costume designer, but perhaps the designer does not have access to the desired materials. Therefore, an adjustment will be made; for example, there may be a suggestion to use another type of material, or the costume buyer will ask the production company to attempt to get hold of the needed material by ordering it from another country. Whether successful or unsuccessful, the changing circumstances mean that the crew has to collaborate within the sectors. The

circumstances – in other words, Searle's 'background' (1990) – make it possible for individuals to function in social collectives. Collaboration becomes the norm in situations where several creative people are gathered with a shared vision and a joint commitment, and the collective chases the common goal.

Perception(s) of a shared vision (sociocultural approach)

A shared vision takes the form of 'we-intentions' (Searle, 1990). This means that a space (environment) is created for individuals to engage in a collaborative working process in which the crew is seen as a group or unit. The individual members of the crew who are involved in the process are aware of the goal and strive to achieve it, but also form a group of crew members which, by default, is put together for a common goal – joint commitment (Gilbert, 2000). The collective effort involves connecting the individuals in a film crew. The joint intention connects the group while at the same time defining it. Coordinated actions or functioning collaborations in the film crew, are a result of the intentions that the crew members share. In its simplest form, this is the intention to create a final product, namely a film. A more complex definition would be the perception of ideas and concepts that are shared in the making of the project. A shared vision is so represented by group intentions as the motives of 'we-intentions' (Searle, 1990). These have to be communicated so that every crew member can understand them and can (or perhaps choose not to) follow the shared vision.

Although mythologised as a single-minded director, Kubrick was in fact inclined towards good communication with his crews. Contrary to popular belief, he was not just set on delivering his vision, but was also open to suggestions and ideas from other crew members. James B. Harris, Kubrick's partner in their first production company, testified Kubrick's inclination to good communication: 'He was a listener, which is rare. When he was with people, they really felt that they were appreciated. He was very interested in what people had to say' (quoted in DuVall, 2010). This 'instilled a high degree of loyalty' among his collaborators (Falsetto, 1996: 4) and the relationships Kubrick formed through this technique enabled him to form many recurrent collaborations. Just a few examples are Douglas Milsome, Kubrick's long-time focus puller; Roy Walker, the production designer; Jan Harlan, his co-producer and friend. The latest testimony to a lifetime

collaboration is presented in *Filmworker*, which portrays Leon Vitali's life story. Vitali and Kubrick enjoyed such mutual trust that they continued their collaboration until Kubrick's death. The same can be said for other long-term co-workers Jan Harlan, Anthony Frewin and Martin Hunter. How did Kubrick achieve such enduring collaborations?

In the process of crew formation, Kubrick employed specific communication techniques. Many times Kubrick would express a desire to work with somebody and would then give them a call or send them a script. Vitali, who first met Kubrick as an actor in *Barry Lyndon,* was surprised six months after the film was finished to receive Kubrick's invitation to work with him on *The Shining*:

> I got a phone call and he said, 'How would you like to go
> to America and find a little boy (the character of Danny)
> for *The Shining*?' He'd sent me the book actually. He'd
> sent me the book with the equivalent of a Post-It on the
> cover. He said, 'Read it!' It was like an instruction. And so
> I thought, if he tells me to read, I better read it. And I read
> *The Shining* in a day. And he rang me the next night. And I
> picked up the phone, and he said, 'Leon, did you read it?'
> It wasn't like, 'Hello, it's Stanley,' or anything like that.
> He says, 'Leon, did you read it?' I said, 'Yeah, I read it.'
>
> (quoted in Schreiber, 2013)

Kubrick often used the phone call as a mode of direct and semi-personal address; this was a strategy he used to spark somebody's interest in a project and sow the idea of a possible collaboration. Sometimes, he would be direct. Sara Maitland, writer of the screenplay for *A.I.,*[5] recalled: 'One morning in 1995 the telephone rang. I answered, and a gruff voice said, "This is Stanley Kubrick. Would you like to write a film script for me?"' (1999). Larry Smith, who started as chief electrician on *Barry Lyndon* and continued as a gaffer on *The Shining*, recalled the

---

[5] The film, initially referred to as *Pinocchio*, was never made by Kubrick, but later as *A.I.: Artificial Intelligence* by Steven Spielberg (2001).

same element of surprise Kubrick employed: 'He just called me one day' (quoted in DuVall, 2012).

However, the conversation did not always begin with Kubrick asking to collaborate. Vitali was approached with Kubrick presupposing that collaboration would happen, whereas Smith was approached in a more subtle, calculative manner. Kubrick asked Smith about novelties in lighting and invited him to 'come over' to show him (Smith, quoted in DuVall, 2012). They spent an evening catching up on each other's lives during which Kubrick found out that Smith had become a cameraman. This was followed by a period of no communication. Then, Kubrick called again and asked Smith to come to his home. Kubrick drove him to a house and asked how he would light it in a night shoot situation. Smith shared his idea and after another three weeks, received a call from Kubrick during which he was finally directly asked if he would be interested in *Eyes Wide Shut*:

> In a way it wasn't unexpected it wasn't a huge shock to me
> but I… Just having worked with Stanley on *Barry Lyndon*
> and *The Shining* and knowing really what's required in
> terms of body and soul. I didn't say yes immediately which
> a lot of people find hard to understand. But I didn't say yes
> because I had my own career, I was working as a DOP and
> I had a company which I was running as well. I just
> thought I don't know how difficult this would be? So I
> went away and said I will speak to you in a few days. I
> thought about it. I thought about it long and hard. Thought
> about it some more. And then, in the end, I said that I
> would do it.

> (Smith, quoted in DuVall, 2012)

The element of surprise was omitted in Smith's case. However, Kubrick employed an additional technique. Possibly aware of Smith's attitude based on their first collaborative experience, Kubrick decided to use a milder technique of persuasion. He did not immediately ask Smith for collaboration, but gradually built on their shared passion and knowledge (cinematography) until he finally

proposed that they work together again. By that time, Smith had already been 'caught' in the persuasion process, and the decision to collaborate was more likely to be taken.

It is possible that this was Kubrick's intention from the beginning, considering the reoccurrence of the telephone technique when it came to forming his crews. The characteristic of this technique is that, because of the distance (telephone line) and more extended periods between communication, Kubrick formed a sort of semi-personal contact and, with it, affected the correspondent's decision, as was the case with Smith and Vitali. The persuasion technique that Kubrick employed in negotiating collaborations was based on the 'power' that Kubrick possessed, both in terms of 'social capital' (Jones and DeFillippi, 1996: 91) and 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu, in Richardson, 1986: 242). The two forms of capital are closely connected. Cultural capital is the 'accumulation of knowledge and skills that affect one's social status', which is a result of the accumulated social capital (Cole, 2018). That Kubrick possessed both forms of capital is evident from his co-worker's perception of him:

> As soon as I began working on the show, though, I realized that Stanley was not an ordinary person; he had tremendous vision, as well as a unique and very charismatic presence. His personality was quite understated, but when people were around him, they didn't know quite how to comport themselves. They definitely became intimidated, even though he never resorted to tactics like shouting, screaming or foot-stamping. Rather, their uneasiness stemmed from the fact that he was a very smart man who asked intelligent and searching questions. Interacting with Stanley was a bit like playing tennis with a professional; if you were quick enough, you could hit the ball back to him, but if you weren't, you wouldn't last long.
>
> (Smith, quoted in Pizzello, 1999)

Kubrick's cultural capital was based on his rich knowledge of the film production process, which, as discussed above, which was apparent not only in how he communicated verbally (his 'intelligent and searching questions') but also more subtly, in his innate disposition or 'habitus' (Bourdieu in Richardson, 1986: 245). The knowledge gave him the skills to employ this embodied cultural capital as a tool to effectively accumulate his social capital.

Social capital dictates whom to approach in the industry and with what means. The amount of social capital that one possesses depends on the nature of the relationships one builds in the industry. The more social capital one has, the higher one's position in the industry business. Kubrick was aware of this, employing the 'being close without being close' approach in his telephone conversations. Gilbert Taylor, DOP on *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* described Kubrick's sporadic but consistent contact over the years:

> Stanley used to telephone me at home, at around midnight,
> and say, 'Gil, I want to buy a camera, what shall I buy?
> And what should I buy along with it?' He'd spend a whole
> hour talking to me about which camera he should buy – it
> was nothing whatsoever to do with [his current] movie or
> anything! I'd talk to him about it, say 'Bye-bye, Stanley,'
> and not hear from him for another year. He was a very
> strange man.

> (quoted in Magid, 1999)

Such contact enabled Kubrick to keep in touch with his previous co-workers, perhaps driven by the intention of leaving a window of opportunity open, in case of possible collaborations in the future. Such tactics assisted Kubrick in negotiating collaborations but also gave him sufficient control over planning the production of the film, due to not facing his (potential) collaborators in person. Dennis Muren, a visual effects supervisor and a consultant on *A.I.*, believed that it was the constant awareness of what was happening around him that justified why

'Stanley lived on the telephone, just sort of keeping up with things' (quoted in Magid, 1999).

Similarly effective was Kubrick's fax and letter communication. Not only did he persistently employ it during the production (and pre-production, post-production, distribution and advertising stage) of his films, he also used it to communicate more privately. Many faxes in the archive feature Kubrick conveying his congratulations on certain occasions or similar personal communications.[6] This is by no means to suggest that Kubrick was not close with anyone, but merely to highlight the tactics he used, intentionally or unintentionally, in his negotiations in the pre-production process when forming collaborations.

The extent of the power of his social capital can be demonstrated in Kubrick's willingness (and ability) to offer opportunities for further development of an individual's career. Gordon Stainforth, the first assistant editor and music editor of *The Shining*, advanced in his career while being on Kubrick's crew: 'I got the job to edit Vivian's (Kubrick) documentary on the making of *The Shining*, and little by little, I hung out with the editors until I became part of the team editing the film,' (quoted in Martinez, 2001). He even got an opportunity to assist the chief editor, Ray Lovejoy. Lovejoy had cut his hand and was not able to physically cut the negative in the editing room, so he suggested to Kubrick that Stainforth did it – but, of course, only by following Lovejoy's instructions (Martinez, 2001). Kubrick agreed, granting Stainforth an opportunity for work practice. This situation is also an example of an often-used technique, namely entering or advancing one's career in the film industry through a recommendation or 'through a name' or 'name dropping' (Caldwell, 2008: 49). An example of the actual effect of this technique can be seen in how Diane Taylor joined the crew.

Diane Taylor, Gilbert Taylor's wife, found out about her husband's project[7] and 'was desperately trying to get on', so she asked the actor Peter Sellers[8] to suggest the idea to Kubrick:

---

[6] The letters and faxes can be found in almost every folder and among documentation for every film in the Stanley Kubrick archive, London.
[7] *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb.*
[8] He acted in Kubrick's *Lolita*, *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb.*

> Well, being very young and naive, I didn't realize that you
> didn't ask actors to do that sort of thing. The next time
> Stanley phoned, I asked, 'Could I come and see you?' I
> went to his office and said, 'I'd like to do the continuity on
> your film, please.' There was a total, terrible silence, and
> he replied, 'What's your relationship with Peter Sellers?' I
> said, 'There isn't one at all.' Stanley told me, 'You're very
> young, and I don't think you could really manage this, but
> you could probably do the flying stuff. Have you flown?' I
> answered, 'Oh, yes!' – I said 'Oh, yes!' to everything. And
> he said, 'Come up with some sort of system that would
> convince me that we could keep track of every shot.'

<p align="right">(Taylor D., quoted in Magid, 1999)</p>

Diane Taylor got the position as a result of successfully convincing Kubrick of her competence. It is, therefore, tempting to say that, in order to be part of Kubrick's crew, a worker somehow had to prove they had the knowledge that was required for the position in question, but this was more likely with 'insiders' (repeating co-workers) than with newcomers. For example, Kubrick was so impressed with Vitali's acting skills that he ended up adding scenes to the script during the shoot of *Barry Lyndon* so as to continue the collaboration, finally offering him the possibility of a continuing collaboration: 'If you really are serious Leon, do something about it and let me know' (Vitali, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017).

As indicated, by 'insiders' I refer to film workers that were already on Kubrick's team. If they wished to advance to another working position, they had to demonstrate that they were worthy of the opportunity, i.e. they had to demonstrate some quality that would continue to grow in another position. Stainforth, for example, seized the opportunity and proved his competence to both Lovejoy and Kubrick, which is evident from another opportunity he was given on the same project: editing *The Shining*'s music track.

> Wendy Carlos was hired to do the score, and some of it
> still exists in the film. But something happened, and

> Stanley came to me with a challenge in early April.
> There was no score, and he asked me if I could edit
> together previously recorded music and create the
> soundtrack. He said, 'can you handle it?' And I said,
> 'sure!'

<div align="center">(Stainforth, quoted in Martinez, 2001)</div>

While Stainforth saw this as a fortunate coincidence enabling him to further his career, Kubrick might have had another agenda. Promoting Stainforth might have been a strategic move. Discussing Kubrick's strategy and working methods in forming crews, some interesting observations can be made. I refer to them as the tools of cultural capital that Kubrick used in his working methods. In an attempt to ensure that he kept creative control over a project, Kubrick followed the *divide et impera* principle.

Divide et impera

Divide et impera, *divide and conquer* or *divide and rule* is an imperial strategy that was employed by many rulers (e.g. Philip II of Macedon, Caesar, Napoleon, Habsburgs and The British Empire) and is based on creating and encouraging divisions among the subjects to prevent alliances that could affect the sovereignty and dominance of the ruler (Posner, Spier and Vermeule, 2009; Xypolia, 2016). The strategy is relevant in various studies, e.g. in law, history, politics and even social studies, but I decided to combine Eric A. Posner, Kathryn E. Spier and Adrian Vermeule's (2009) and Ilia Xypolia's (2016) research of the strategy in examples of history and politics, as they seem to fit the distribution of power of decision-making in film crews.

According to Xypolia (2016: 10), in historical and political situations the strategy functions in two ways: the ruler 'bargains' with the group for an acceptable outcome (e.g. promoting subjects who are willing to cooperate) and/or 'intentionally exploits' problems in coordination of the group (fostering distrust between the subjects). Posner, Spier and Vermeule (2009) add the economic spectrum (reducing expenses to keep dominance strong in the financial sense). In Kubrick's case, bargaining and exploitation were both conditioned by the

economic factors, but in connection to creative decisions. He applied the strategy, dividing power by distributing creative and decision-making power into smaller groups – the crew sectors and alliances formed between the above-the-line workers (the producer, the director and the production designer, for example). He would bargain with the above-the-line workers, exploit occurring problems as a means of control (applying the rewards and penalties), based on the economic and creative freedom he would grant. While one might argue that this is just how the general structure of a film production crew functions, the elements of the *divide and rule* strategy can be observed in Kubrick's working strategy in dividing power in the crew and also explains why this technique proved to be successful for him.

In analysing military and legal strategies, Posner, Spier and Vermeule (2009) identify the first technique of the strategy as bribing: taking advantage of non-discriminatory, discriminatory and conditional bribes. When the production designer Ken Adam was asked to enter into collaboration with Kubrick on *Barry Lyndon*, he first declined but was later bribed by being offered a higher fee (Adam in Magid, 1999). This is non-discriminatory bribing, as individual film workers negotiate their fee, but discriminatory in comparison to other members who had not been offered this option. Bribing is connected to penalties such as Kubrick's actions of firing crew members whose work was not up to his standards. Bruce Logan, one of the animation artists on *2001*, recalled: 'I did get fired at one point. There were several other animation cameramen hired, and I was relegated to the night shift. The new cameramen were journeymen technicians and I was just a young kid, so they often tried to torpedo me at dailies. Being on nights, I did not attend dailies to defend my work and was fired' (2016). However, Kubrick was satisfied with Logan's work as, after a week, Logan was called back. 'I agreed on the condition that they doubled my salary. I guess I had a lot of nerve for a young kid! I don't think they doubled it, but it was a hefty raise' (Logan, 2016). This is an example of how bribing resulted in a reward for the worker.

Other types of reward would go even further, resulting in a promotion, or 'graduation' (Hill in Castle, 2005: 718), of individuals whose work Kubrick was satisfied with. The conditional bribing (resulting in rewards or penalties) was

combined with setting the limitations of the frequency or duration of interaction, such as the deadline for completion of a task. Again, the film industry functions in the application of deadlines, but it was precisely the combination of these techniques that proved to be successful because it was being applied, characteristically for Kubrick's filmmaking, to small groups – 'no more than ten of us in the basic filming area' (Alcott, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 216). In this way, Kubrick was able to control how the groups functioned.

However, at the same time, this strategy encountered problems resulting from the dissatisfaction of the individual crew members, who felt that their autonomy was being curbed (e.g. Garrett Brown, in DuVall, 2011) and that their creative autonomy was not recognised. For example, Wally Veevers' special effects work in *2001: A Space Odyssey* was not recognised. Despite receiving a note from Victor Lyndon (Kubrick's associate producer) detailing the specifics of Veevers's work – 'painting and animated serial view of Burpelson base', 'fabulous hotel treated photo enlargement', 'smoke overlay for burning B52' and 'animated cloud backings for falling bomb' (SK/11/3/7, 1963-1965) – it was Kubrick, and not Veevers, who received an award for the special effects in *2001: A Space Odyssey*, which was viewed with disapproval by his collaborators, for example Peter Hannan (personal interview, 2016). However, what is interesting is that the occurring problems (and the crew's reactions to them) did not always result in Kubrick's control failing. They also had the opposite effect, resulting in the formation of alliances. While as in the latter Hannan's example, dissatisfaction could grow among the crew (a shared opinion), at the same time the formation of alliances also represented a strategy to keep the group (individual units and the sector combined) functioning as a collective.

The reason lies in the basic predispositions that the crew shares – the 'we-intentions' (Searle, 1990), and the fact that they are a group formed of plural subjects who have some predispositions in common, such as a love for cinematic art and the filmmaking profession. Candace Jones and Robert J. DeFillippi point out the most obvious one: 'A passion for film motivates one to enter and remain in a highly competitive industry. Passion is required to meet the challenges of intense time and commitment demands' (1996: 94). The common predisposition

and the shared intention lead to the group functioning accordingly: 'In practice, players with similar characteristics find it easier to coordinate on behaviours that are in their mutual interest, and can more easily detect deviations by others' (Posner, Spier and Vermeule, 2009: 13).

Kubrick's power was based on the coordination of behaviours and mutual interests. He would give the individual crew members a chance to practice creative freedom, but only in, for him, controllable units. Placing the crew into sectors is common structural procedure in film production, so this process was not unusual. However, the calculated choice of people to be made sector leaders was. In this way, the crew was divided into sectors, controlled by the sector leaders and the sectors were also divided into smaller units, or executioners, who were controlled by sub-leaders. An example is the sector of production design. The production designer is in charge of the sector, giving orders to the art designer, who in turn is in charge of the prop department, who then instructs the builders. The advantage of this structure is that it not only divides the tasks between workers, but it also prevents small powers from linking forces by creating smaller collaborations within the sector. The fact that sector leaders communicate is clear. That they also formed alliances with Kubrick is also understandable. However, there were specific alliances that were created by Kubrick himself, which were not only bound to the sector leaders but the below-the-line crew as well. These relationships are represented as mentorships.

Mentoring

A mentor in the film industry is the key person who introduces the individual to the conception of filmmaking, leads and assists them in functioning in the industry by equipping them with skills to practice their profession and to socially engage in filmmaking, becoming one of the crew, the society in the film industry. The process of mentoring can, therefore, be explained as 'a developmental relationship that is embedded within the career context' (Ragins and Kram, 2007: 5).

Kubrick's mentoring technique was complex. Mentor-student relationships were a way of forming smaller collaborations in the crew and so enabled him to

implement the divide and rule strategy. He would employ it in his collaborative relationships and set them as examples for other crew members to follow, by forming mentorships in their sectors. To understand the nature of the process, I will present the characteristics of Kubrick's mentoring practice and then address mentorships that occurred in other sectors, first practised by Kubrick himself, whereupon some specific features can be observed.

Firstly, Kubrick was remarkably willing to be a mentor to his co-workers. Anthony Frewin, Kubrick's long-time personal assistant, claimed that Kubrick rarely gave opportunities to newcomers – because he demanded perfection, but confessed that, at the same time, he was excellent 'at spotting a face in the crowd who can handle responsibility and had potential' (Frewin, quoted at *2001: Beyond 50-Film Symposium*, 2018). Kubrick's collaborators testified this characteristic of Kubrick's working practice often: 'If he saw someone that he thought had potential, was young, very enthusiastic, hardworking and had some talent, he would give any young person a break in that role' (Cook, quoted in DuVall, 2012).

Kubrick invested energy and time into newcomers and workers who wished to advance their career. This process demanded the acquisition of new knowledge and Kubrick was willing to provide it. Alcott witnessed this himself: 'He is willing to bend over backwards to give you something you may desire in the way of a new lighting technique, and this is a great help' (quoted in Lightman, 1980: 788). Chester Eyre, the director of operations of Rank/Deluxe Laboratories, confirmed: 'Everyone who's ever worked with the man has learned a lot from him – about both the industry and themselves. He always managed to draw more out of you than you thought was there' (quoted in Magid, 1999). It is therefore understandable that Peter Hannan, a focus puller, referred to his experience with Kubrick's mentoring as an apprenticeship: 'To get the opportunity to work on *2001* was extraordinary. I was being paid to go to university, really. It was extraordinary' (personal interview, 2016). This indicates that not only did Kubrick share his technical knowledge, but he also, contrary to popular belief with regards his tyrannical attitude, which is witnessed in the documentary *Making The Shining* (1981) and in Adam's testimonies of the nature of the collaborative relationship

with Kubrick, encouraged the workers. There exist, of course, stories of the tyrannical director, most notoriously told by Ken Adam. He described collaborating on *Dr. Strangelove* as 'soul destroying' and declared that he lost self-confidence because Kubrick questioned everything he did (quoted in Magid, 1999). But Anthony Frewin gives an opposing account: 'I was 17 when Stanley first employed me, and he had more confidence in me than I had in myself' (quoted in *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures*, 2001). The truth is, of course, impossible to establish, as both testimonies are subjective, but it is the objective fact that Kubrick did practise mentoring that is important.

Aside from the choice of assistants, student-mentor relationships regularly occurred in the camera sector: focus pullers, cinematographers and camera operators. The reason lay in the fact that cinematography was Kubrick's passion (and origin), so much so that he frequently operated the camera in his scenes by himself, e.g. the low-angle shot of Jack in the freezing room in *The Shining*, which can be seen in his daughter's documentary on the making of the film. Brian W. Cook, Kubrick's first assistant director, explained that it was because Kubrick originated from a photographic background that he was especially critical of focus pullers (in DuVall, 2012). However, Alcott, who first began working with Kubrick as a focus puller himself, believed that 'he will give you all the help you need if he thinks that whatever you want to do will accomplish the desired result' (quoted in Lightman, 1980: 788). One might rightfully say that Kubrick nurtured relationships in which he was able to pass the knowledge on to his students and, if satisfied with the quality of their work, he would continue the collaboration and the mentoring process for years. Alcott summed it up: 'When you're with Stanley, the working relationship benefits from picture to picture' (quoted in Lightman, 1980: 788).

This leads to the second observation regarding Kubrick's mentoring practice: that the student-mentor relationships often led to long-lasting and strong collaborations. The 30-year old collaboration between Kubrick and Vitali began in this way and continued to grow from the mentor-student relationship. After Vitali joined Kubrick's *The Shining* crew, he was regularly involved, not only managing production administrative work but also assisting actors with their lines and taking

care of the youngest actor. Despite the busy schedule, Vitali was mentored by Kubrick. He recalled scouting for the setting in the film, including taking photographs of potential locations. Kubrick 'patiently' taught him the use of a still camera. Even during the shoot on the set, when Kubrick was busy with directing, he would instruct Vitali on technical specifications of the camera. When Vitali returned with '100 rolls of film from hotel pictures' (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017), Kubrick praised his work. Vitali felt rewarded because 'he made you feel a part of it', a part of the film crew and, thus, a part of the filmmaking process (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017).

Kubrick strived to create the collaborative (a close relationship) atmosphere and, as Simone Odino puts it, with his distinct capability of 'creating a creative space' (2017: 109), very successfully did so. This was especially the case when he saw the potential for a long-term collaborative relationship. Jan Harlan confessed that he did not have the 'slightest intention of working with him' and had, after the experience of going with Kubrick to Romania to assist him in the organisation of his project on Napoleon, already decided to return to his native Germany (quoted in Whitington, 2015). But Kubrick employed the same technique as with Vitali; he played the 'making one feel a part of the filmmaking process' card: 'We've worked well together – why don't you stick around? It might be nice to do something else' (Harlan, quoted in Whitington, 2015). The 'something else' turned out to be *A Clockwork Orange* and, collaborating on it with Kubrick, Harlan learnt about the filmmaking process. 'I loved it: I liked him, he liked me, one thing led to the other and I ended up working with him for 30 years' (Harlan, quoted in Whitington, 2015). Kubrick had quite a few collaborators who stayed for a significant number of years, such as Frewin, Vitali and D'Alessandro, who initially assumed the position of a chauffeur but ended up working as Kubrick's assistant for 30 years (Ulivieri, 2016).

By creating his circle of continuous collaborators, Kubrick's mentoring process pertained to 'newbies', and his divide and rule strategy was able to continue. The established sector leaders, as seen above, often Kubrick's ex-students, would continue the mentoring process in their sector. This third characteristic of Kubrick's strategy can be seen as 'passing the baton of mentorship' to the

individual sectors. As with Kubrick's mentoring relationships, these mentorships were, for many individual film workers, the origin point of entry into the industry and led to advancement/promotion to other positions in the crew, which they would take for the first time. I will exemplify how this worked in the camera department.

Alcott had a close connection to his sector's members. As the leader of the sector, he assisted in executing Kubrick's vision but was, at the same time, aware that he had begun his career by taking the same steps as many of the DOPs and camera assistants. 'I was Geoffrey Unsworth's assistant, and I was naturally brought in to work with him on *2001*' (Alcott, 1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 213). After entering Kubrick's production through a name (Unsworth), he advanced to the position of cinematographer by entering a student-mentor relationship with Kubrick. A successful collaboration led Alcott to become a mentor later himself. He built a good collaborative relationship with his focus puller, Douglas Milsome, working with him on *The Shining* and *Barry Lyndon*, so he was on track with Milsome's training and progress. Together with Kubrick, they recognised Milsome's working quality and Kubrick offered Milsome a promotion. He asked him to take over the shooting of *The Shining* after Alcott had to leave for America for another project, which was scheduled in advance but had, due to Kubrick's prolonged shoot, already began before *The Shining* was finished. Milsome recalled this as a chance for a step forward in his filmmaking career:

> I got a break really to do some photography for Kubrick on
> *The Shining*. Which was largely second unit stuff. So I got
> not just named, not just as an AC, I got named very well in
> every department really. The process of committing myself
> to… Applying myself to the DP role, if you like.
>
> (personal interview, 2016)

The final decision to assign Milsome to a new position in the crew was inevitably Kubrick's, as he was the lead producer of *The Shining*. The origin of this move can perhaps be found in the logic of organisation and the feature of trust.

The most logical step in continuing the shooting was to employ somebody who was closely already involved, preferably from the beginning and was familiar with the techniques used, Kubrick's general instructions and the way to execute them – learning by example of the previous crew member. Alcott explained that he used the ideas Kubrick gave him in many films to follow, and Milsome confirmed that his learning practice was based on 'Alcott's system' (Howard, 1999: 164; Hill in Castle, 2005: 719). At the same time, Kubrick's decision is likely to have been influenced by the relationship built between himself, Alcott and Milsome. Repeated collaborations developed a level of trust between the co-workers. Given testimonies that trustworthy collaborative relationships were rare (e.g. Ulivieri, 2016), it is possible to conclude that these rare relationships played a significant role in Kubrick's power division. In *The Shining*, some of the creative decision-making was therefore passed on to Alcott, and later to Milsome and Harlan, when they were entrusted with the task of going to America to do the aerial and other scenery photography (personal interview with Milsome, 2016).

Trusting his students, who would also be willing to continue their collaboration with Kubrick, allowed for a faster formation of the crew, whether forming a crew for the next project or replacing workers in the current one. The relationship worked both ways: Kubrick would be more confident that his vision and demands would be executed to his liking and the students would have a better chance of being considered for the next crew formation. Although this can be the practice in collaborative relationships in general, on the whole, it is not referred to as such in Kubrick's filmmaking. But this demonstrates that, despite his issues with perfectionism and distrust, Kubrick practised collaboration by entrusting people with creative decisions.

Garrett Brown, the Steadicam operator on *The Shining*, claimed the perfectionist myths to be true: 'Stanley is correctly reported to be in charge of every detail, and interested in everything from the air-conditioning to the nature of lunch' (quoted in Magid, 1999). Cook agreed with the description of Kubrick as a demanding director, but at the same time stressed the result of Kubrick's trust in some of the crew members: 'The real key people had a tough job with Stanley, designer, cameraman, assistant director, editor, those sort of key roles were very, very

difficult with him and you notice a lot of people fill those roles as they did with most big directors. Once they find somebody that's good they obviously like to keep using them' (quoted in DuVall, 2012).

Besides repeated collaborations, the mentor-student relationship also influenced the individual film worker's chances of being granted a certain amount of creative freedom. The opportunity of being mentored in a Kubrick project meant that the crew members entering that relationship were presented with a chance to acquire new knowledge: knowledge of the industry, of Kubrick's practices and how the process of creativity evolves (runs) in Kubrick's film crews. Larry Smith commented on the cinematographers' eagerness for the opportunity to be a part of the crew on a Kubrick film: 'Obviously, most cameramen would give their right arm to work with Stanley' (quoted in Pizello, 1999).

Learning and becoming confident in one's role in the production process creates certain perceptions of the creative momentum that can be achieved. Individual workers can then compare their perceptions with Kubrick's and come to recognise differences between them. For example, Adam's understanding of his work practice differed from how Kubrick perceived it: 'For me, design, like so many other creative processes, is instinctive. Stanley knew practically every other job as well as and better than most of the other film technicians – he certainly knew photography and had a brilliant visual sense – but he didn't really know design!' (quoted in Magid, 1999). Such differences can then lead to discrepancies, as seen in Adam's case when it comes to expectations about the working process, and this can lead to collisions and difficulties in negotiating the working conditions.

A recurring issue among individual workers in the film industry is the individual's creative freedom and autonomy. As sector leaders, the above-the-line workers emphasise creative freedom of expression and autonomy as the essence of their work. Their work and collaboration practice reflect the 'personal element', the feature of autonomy. 'Autonomy is a personal, psychological feature that you could experience yourself as having an experience that would strike you as being qualitatively different from those instances in which you've felt compelled, coerced, externally directed, or at a loss for self-control' (Ponech, 1999).

Kubrick's filmmaking practice is often described as limiting individual autonomy. Milsome certainly remembered it in this way: 'But even if it was your idea, you may not get to shoot it. He might combine other people's ideas, he might just use his own idea' (personal interview, 2016). This indicates that collaboration affects the individual's creative control and creative freedom. Milsome also observed this in Kubrick's working practice with actors, claiming that they were able to express their creativity only 'to some extent' (quoted in DuVall, 2011).

This indicates that the level of creative autonomy depends on the individual's perception of the originating moments of creativity (such as the actor's creative expression) and the conditions that they are given to practise it in. When entering into collaboration, a negotiation takes place, and there is an exchange of expectations and responsibilities between the negotiating sides. Because the expression of creativity and the ability to practise autonomy in their work are perceived differently from individual to individual, in an environment (Kubrick's working practice) repeatedly viewed as limiting with regards to working conditions generally and the limitation in freely expressing creativity and practice autonomy in particular, it was inevitable that collisions of perceptions, ideas and expectations would occur.

Collisions

Two origins of possible discrepancies can be identified among Kubrick's crew. Such discrepancies can originate from perceptions about the nature of the working process in Kubrick's crews. Garrett Brown's observation is based on experience: 'Stanley is correctly reported to be in charge of every detail, and interested in everything from the air-conditioning to the nature of lunch' (quoted in Magid, 1999).

Therefore, the first discrepancy can be referred to as perceptions of intensity Kubrick's demands required in terms of the filmmaking conditions. Film workers who had already experienced Kubrick's filmmaking often had second thoughts about entering into further collaboration. Smith had misgivings about entering *Eyes Wide Shut* precisely because of having already experienced the conditions: 'Because I'd worked with Stanley before, I knew what kind of commitment he

demanded. I knew it would be a long schedule and that I'd have to be wrapped up in the project body and soul' (quoted in Pizello, 1999). Several film workers who repeatedly worked with Kubrick view this intensity as overwhelming. Working on the same project as Ken Adam, Andy Armstrong, second assistant director, confirmed Adam's perception: 'He was obsessed about certain things were the best things for that job' (quoted in DuVall, 2011). Thus, the intensity of the working environment and the high demands from Kubrick were often reasons for hesitation.

Another possible origin of discrepancy is the difference between an individual film worker's perception of the origin of creativity and Kubrick's. Hunter encountered such a situation in the editing room when two different creative choices were discussed:

> [Stanley] would shoot take after take of people who were only observers in the scene, and didn't have any dialogue. Then, as we were cutting it, he'd comb through the material exhaustively. I remember saying to him once, 'Stanley, would you ever consider looking at a couple of takes and picking a reaction shot that works, and not bother to look at the others?' He looked at me in some shock and replied, 'I'd never think of doing that. So much work has gone into it so far, why not take it to its conclusion?'

> (quoted in Magid, 1999)

Discrepancies in the perception of the creative process can also be seen between Kubrick and Gilbert Taylor. On set, they would get into an argument over the accuracy of the process and lighting techniques used to achieve a specific creative outcome: 'He had a habit of taking Polaroids and saying, "I think you've got too much light on this." And I'd say, "Well, your Polaroids might have too much light, but on my negative, it's dead right!" I mean, that's the sort of thing you had to put up with' (Taylor, quoted in Magid, 1999). As seen in the latter case, the ideology responsible for the collisions is the recognition of the individual's creative input. Whether they were buying into Kubrick's vision or not, the result

of the discrepancies was to plunge the worker in the filmmaking industry into a personal battle.

Kubrick's demands generated very ambiguous emotions and reactions among his crew members. Having had the opportunity to collaborate with Kubrick was, and still is, considered a privilege. 'I actually really enjoyed working with him. He's one of my favourite experiences. And I admired him' (Brown, quoted in DuVall, 2011). Not only is Kubrick praised for mentoring and appreciated for transferring knowledge, but for providing a prestigious professional reference. Being spotted as a talent and employed on a project could be the starting point of a good career for an individual. The idea of collaborating with Kubrick was prestigious enough for most film workers to jump at the chance to take a position in the crew. 'You don't have that privilege when you work with somebody who lacks the visual perception that Stanley has' (Alcott, quoted in Lightman, 1980: 788). Martin Hunter, the editor, was aware of this and seized the opportunity to join Kubrick's crew: '[…] I just looked at his past track record and realised that I was going to come out of it with my name as editor on a very good film' (quoted in Lunn, 2014).

Even though working with Kubrick was a great opportunity, some first-time collaborators decided not to follow Kubrick's lead and conform to his integrity. After starting his work in writing the screenplay for *Eyes Wide Shut*, Raphael decided to refuse Kubrick's call for an official collaboration based on a contract.

> When he called to ask if I'd signed the contract, I said no
> and that I wasn't going to. I was really sorry, since I
> greatly admired his films, but I couldn't work with him.
> The stipulation that he should be the sole judge of who had
> written what was an implicit guarantee that I would be
> written out of the record, no matter how much I had
> contributed.
>
> (Raphael, 1999: 56)

The excerpt is from Raphael's written memoir (1999) of his collaboration with Kubrick, which caused severe dismay in Kubrick's family when it was published

after Kubrick's death. Raphael based his critique on his disappointment because Kubrick, in the end, rewrote his script (Harlan in Jacobs, 2007).

Some previous collaborators decided to refuse further collaboration as well. Adam was open about the reason for his decision:

> And so I got out of doing *2001: A Space Odyssey*. But he got me on *Barry Lyndon*. I didn't want to do it. He was a very difficult man to work with – extremely talented but on *Barry Lyndon* I had a sort of nervous breakdown and I said to myself, no film is worth going around the bend for – it's because we were so close, you know. He was impossible at times and I used to take his guilt onto me, apologizing to actors for something we had done, when I was really apologizing for Stanley. I lost my perspective and so did he.

> (quoted in Halligan, 2012: 16)

Adam's frustration can be well understood in Smith's account of Kubrick's working practice when it came to production design:

> Stanley would tell the production designers and set dressers exactly what types of lamps, chairs or decor he wanted, and he always preferred using the best materials – he wouldn't use paper and wood if it was possible to do it with plaster, cement or brick. If we didn't like the colour of the walls or something else in the scene, he'd have them changed.

> (quoted in Magid, 1999)

The intensity of Kubrick's demands seems to have been perceived by his crew members as a distinctive form of control over the project and the group's creative process.

At this point, the question of power arises and the success of the sociocultural tools aimed to increase motivation in groups, combined with emotional satisfaction that individuals feel when their work is recognised to the same extent as everyone else's. Although film productions aspire to these aims, the extent to which it occurs in practice is questionable. Real working practices in film production can be ambiguous. If the sociocultural approach were entirely successful, the collective intention would initiate greater motivation and recognition of creative input. However, the issue of power in Kubrick's crews is raised continuously. Some film workers would buy into Kubrick's vision of origin (not only of the project but of the whole creative process itself), whereas others rejected the idea of Kubrick as the mentor. By bringing attention to cognitive elements in the group formation process, this notion can be explored from another perspective of Kubrick's working practice: Kubrick as the individual power at the top of the hierarchical ladder.

Hierarchy of individual power (socio-cognitive approach)

Kubrick possessed a strong knowledge of the rules and restrictions in the film industry. He exercised his power of decision-making by taking advantage of his hierarchal dominance in the film industry while also manipulating the framework of rules and hierarchies existing in the industry. He was notorious for persisting with his vision, which dictated both his behaviour and actions and affected the nature of the relationships he formed in the process of filmmaking.

An existing hierarchy dictates the individual film worker's career path in the form of external restrictions. Producers might appear to be the main actors in enforcing the 'corporate scripts' (Caldwell, 2008: 3), as embodied in the conditions and rules guiding the production/film industry, but they only follow the rules set by film culture. The rules refer to various limitations, forming a framework of film industry rules that are implemented by people in directorial positions. For example, a producer implements certain ethical or legislative restrictions that come from positions of power in the industry (e.g. *British Board of Film Classifications*). The British Board of Film Classifications employs legislation regarding allowed work material: 'If a work is found to contain material which falls foul of UK law, then it will be cut from the work. If the work as a whole is

found to be in breach of the law, then it may be denied a certificate and rejected' (2018). The rules imposed on institutions and people in positions of distributing power, need to be followed by workers operating in the film industry. The impact that the hierarchal order has on the framework of rules in the industry profoundly affects the relationships formed in the process of film production. The effect can also manifest as pressure.

Exploitation and undermining the status

Pressure is a specific form of control that is enforced in the film industry and has distinct connotations for film workers. Pressure has two origins: it can derive from the individual worker or is enforced on him by external sources of power. Observation of Kubrick's practice demonstrates that he engaged with both types of pressure. He employed the techniques of *exploitation* and *undermining of the status* to secure his position on the hierarchy ladder, which assured him the power in decision-making and control over the creative process.

The film industry is a competitive and demanding business. Barbara Daly, the make-up artist on *The Shining, A Clockwork Orange* and *Barry Lyndon*, affirmed: 'It's an incredibly physical job. You've got to understand boundaries' (quoted in Jones, 2009). The boundaries she refers to and the pressure that is exercised on the worker, are usually a combination of both, namely internal (personal) and external (coming from the source of power). The pressure to deliver high-quality results on schedule, dealing with changes on short notice and long working hours (often resulting in the crew's claims on overtime; SK/14/4/15, 1976-1977) is combined with the pressure of personal aspirations and attempts to exercise one's creative autonomy in the given circumstances. This can result in the worker becoming exhausted, a notorious example being Shelley Duvall, the lead actress in *The Shining*.

Vivian Kubrick's documentary *Making The Shining* vividly portrays the actress' exhaustion on the set. Shelley DuVall referred to the experience as 'almost unbearable' (quoted in Ebert, 1980). A few years ago she elaborated on her experience, detailing the reasons for her exhaustion:

> As most people are aware, the shoot was very hard on me
> and I got to the point where I just couldn't take anymore, I
> needed a break, but taking a break costs money and people
> need the shot done, so I had a little breakdown. I think it
> was only 10 minutes but I just needed to get my head
> together, we were shooting long days, sometimes 15-16
> hours, and it really does take a lot out of you.

(S. DuVall, quoted in Gambin, 2011)

As observed in Shelley DuVall's case, the 'rules' are often broken, unofficially, of course. In *Filmworker*, Vitali presents what he labelled as 'a book of lies', a notebook detailing the child actor's working hours. The notebook notes the child actor's few hours on set, but he was shooting much longer (*Filmworker*, 2017). The reason for the 'lies' is the control of the Unions. There are Unions for every sector, Editor's Guild, Writer's Guild, among others. They are external bodies that protect the film worker's rights, which are enforced in contract negotiations. Caldwell refers to the Union's role in an example of an undertaken 'job safety campaign with a slogan 12 on/12 off' (2008: 44). The goal of this is to reduce the film worker's schedule to 12 hours a day, five or six days a week.

Kubrick was 'afraid' of the Unions. He would always ask a worker before joining the crew if he was a member of a Union, as that would mean that the 12 on/12 off would have to be enforced, which would have limited Kubrick in his usual work practice (Vitali in *Filmworker*, 2017). Bob Jeffords, a producer, explained that he believes the producers – or, in Kubrick's case, the director – were against such practice because it 'curbed some of the creative flexibility' (quoted in Caldwell, 2008: 46). According to what has been established about Kubrick's work practice, this is undoubtedly the case. Not only was Kubrick dissatisfied with the lack of creative flexibility caused by the rules imposed upon him, but the producer with financial limitations also confronted him. Following the hierarchal order in the film industry, Kubrick, after himself being subjected to external conditions, directed these conditions on to his crew, setting limitations and conditions. These were the reasons for the film workers' dismay and feelings of resentment.

The pressure derived from the economics of the production, the urgency of the schedule and the challenging conditions affect individual performance and influenced the worker's perception of Kubrick's technique as undermining their status. With regard to collaboration and creative autonomy, Armstrong demonstrates this issue, stating that Kubrick's control hindered an individual worker's creative expression, resulting in feelings of depreciation (in DuVall, 2011). Brown also alludes to a lack of freedom of creativity: 'We executed Stanley's vision. […] Mere contributors. As was the art director and the production designer Roy Walker and the costume designer, the great Milena Canonero. All of us were marching to Stanley's toon' (quoted in DuVall, 2011). Brown tried to overcome his frustration with Kubrick undermining the worker's status, by stressing the significance of his contribution to the collective result based on the use of his Steadicam invention: 'I was lucky, and in some ways Stanley was lucky. It would have been a different movie on a dolly' (quoted in DuVall, 2011).

Although many collaborators depicted their experience of working with Kubrick as negative, this does not mean that imposing his hierarchical status always hindered collaboration. Some crew members felt uniquely appreciated and were treated as genuine collaborators. Martin Hunter defended Kubrick's collaborative working process by relating the director's actions and behaviour to the uniqueness of his working practice:

> I know his methods drove some people nuts. They'd say,
> 'it's completely illogical, the way he's doing this', but my
> response would always be, 'I don't think logic has
> anything to do with this. This is part of his process, and his
> process has proven to yield pretty wonderful results, and
> I'm happy to go along with it.'
>
> (quoted in Lunn, 2014)

Film workers were aware of Kubrick's full overview of the production process. Some film workers were offered collaboration and refused it because Kubrick's control, in their opinion, was not only exercised over the project but the crew as

well. Ken Adam declined future collaborations precisely because of his previous collaborative experiences with Kubrick. Others still opted for entering collaboration, whether it was, as indicated above, for prestige, a question of economic benefit/necessity, or, as in Smith's case, providing assistant to, and collaborating with, a friend. Hunter decided to collaborate for the prestige. Despite being familiar with Kubrick's practice, Hunter's decision to collaborate was based on a compromise: the importance that the outcome of a collaborative relationship with Kubrick would have for his career outweighed the negative aspects.

Previous knowledge of Kubrick's work methods generated some predispositions with regards to expectations, when entering the collaboration. It follows that the film industry, as a business, follows certain conventions in the process of forming working relationships. I focus on the first act of entering into a collaboration in film production, that of the negotiating process between two parties, a process I understand to be a communication between a minimum of two people, commonly between the producer and the film worker joining the production crew. A favourable outcome of the negotiation depends on the skilful juxtaposition of various cognitive and cultural elements with those employed by Kubrick.

Negotiations: Combining socio-cognitive and sociocultural aspects

The nature of collaboration is determined at the beginning of the pre-production process when negotiations take place. Negotiations are the phase during which film workers demonstrate their 'specialised expertise' and do 'the one thing required of any professional – negotiate their own value' (Caldwell, 2008: 68). They negotiate their working tasks, working fee, obligations, rights and possibilities. It is possible for the dialogue between the potential collaborators, the producers and the director to run smoothly, but this was not standard practice with Kubrick. The origin stories testify to constant bargaining in negotiating collaborations.

Kubrick's meticulous financial organisation was one of the reasons he was a successful producer and a hard negotiator. The most common challenge was negotiating the work fees. Evidence of Kubrick's rigor in negotiating an effective

agreement is evidenced in the lists of exact calculations on payrolls for all the crew members (SK/15/2/4/2, 1979). Kubrick's manipulation of economic investment when it came to crew formation is best represented in Adam's anecdote about their negotiations for *Barry Lyndon*:

> Stanley said he's got this film for me [*Barry Lyndon*] and he can't afford my money. So I said, 'Stanley, it's not a good way to start talking to me, you know.' So we had an argument. He said, 'Well, I'll have to use the second-best production designer.' And I was quite relieved at that time. Five weeks later, I got another phone call from him saying that the second-best production designer didn't seem to understand what he wanted, money is no problem and will I do the picture?

> (quoted in Magid, 1999)

Because of the large amount of social capital Kubrick had accumulated in his career, he had the power to dictate the work process and negotiations and, consequently, affect someone's career. Being at the top of the hierarchy, he had a negotiating advantage. His implementation of sociocultural tactics such as his persuasive telephone technique, divide and rule strategy and willingness to function as a mentor, incorporated the socio-cognitive elements of Kubrick's knowledge of the rules and restrictions in the film industry. Therefore, the success of a negotiating process depended on the individual worker's prior knowledge of the film industry, its demands and opportunities and their understanding of the social conventions that guide the process of forming collaborations.

Film workers benefit considerably from having an awareness of the structure of film production, what work-specific working positions comprise and where their role fits in the collaboration. Hunter's previous collaboration with Kubrick on *The Shining* had given him insight into Kubrick's production structure, as well as the characteristics of the collaborative environment conventions it functioned by. This knowledge, based on experience, had given him an advantage in negotiating for continued collaborations with Kubrick:

> I first worked as a sound assistant on *The Shining*, and I
> helped Kubrick with the making of the foreign versions of
> *The Shining*. At a certain point, *The Shining* had been
> released for more than a year and I was anxious to get on
> with my career, so I said to Stanley that I was looking for
> other work and he said, 'no, no, don't do that, stick
> around, I'll have something for you'. Eventually, I said
> 'well, if it's the editing job on your next picture, then yes, I
> will stick around.' And so he eventually said, 'All right,
> yes, you can edit *Full Metal Jacket.*'

(Hunter, quoted in Lunn, 2014)

Hunter's knowledge of the film industry reflected a better understanding of the hierarchy that existed in Kubrick's productions. He was conscious of its effect on the collaborative environment of the production he was about to enter. Hence, he employed a negotiating technique that resulted in a fruitful collaboration. Hunter's example represents a skilful use of socio-cognitive aspects found in collaborations. Knowledge about how to develop and maintain relationships by working on his social capital, coupled with excellent communication skills, made Hunter a good negotiator.

It follows that for negotiations to end productively for both parties, a combination of socio-cognitive and sociocultural aspects has to be used. Communication, specifically conversations, as the basis of a negotiation and knowledge acquired before or by the experience of working with Kubrick, influence the outcome. Kubrick's first-time co-workers or film industry newcomers benefited from the confusion caused by a first collaborative experience, too; it represented a learning curve for future negotiations and collaborations.

Conclusion

Origin stories has explored the various circumstances in which individuals entered into collaboration with Kubrick, their vision of it and how it affected their perception of the myths that surrounded him in the film industry. By referring to group formation in pre-production as a social process, the already established

approaches to studying creativity have helped detect the moments to focus on. An investigation of the circumstances in which Kubrick's crews were formed has helped to identify cognitive elements, such as the conditions and the rules that guide film production (e.g. the hierarchal order of power) and cultural features, such as Kubrick's use of different techniques (based on the strength of his cultural and social capital) in forming collaborations. The information gathered from the testimonies of Kubrick's co-workers and archival material has allowed me to analyse how these findings affected individual perceptions of group work and their function in the industry.

The myth of Kubrick as an 'insufferable tyrant who traumatised his actors and employees' (Sigel, 2016) who is well aware of his status and exploits it to get his way can be challenged with the discursive evidence of his mentoring work. An individual worker's learning experience could end with a promotion in another Kubrick film, as was the case with Hunter, Adam and Milsome, among others. However, Kubrick's working practice could also be understood as a controlling tool that limited the potential for co-creation and collaborative creativity, one that created confusion and dissatisfaction among workers who thought they understood the working environment of film production. It appears that Kubrick had knowledge of all the processes taking place in the production and tried to manipulate them in order for his vision to be realised on the screen. However, there are inconsistencies in the development of the relationships that suggest that Kubrick not only had the understanding but also practised the idea of collaboration. To creatively operate he had to – and did – cooperate.

Origin stories of successful and unsuccessful individual negotiations between the industry circumstances and Kubrick's vision are illustrative of the intricacy of the creative environment in film production. The collaboration process as seen through the eyes of Kubrick's crew members, the memoirs of whom can still be accessed today, would further expand the evidence that would help to determine in what way the process of collaboration was affected by the changing circumstances over the years. It is possible that, if the circumstances had been different, Kubrick's work practice might have taken a different shape.

Chapter two: War stories

Emilio D'Alessandro once told Kubrick that he was planning to engage in a marathon run. Kubrick begged him not to do it: 'You're joking. Please don't. Because you will die.' Surprised and amused, D'Alessandro replied: 'What? If I haven't got a heart attack working for you, how can I get it over there?' (quoted in *S is for Stanley*, 2015).

Working with Kubrick was often described as an over-demanding, draining and overwhelming process. His collaborators, whom I also refer to as workers or co-workers, would often describe Kubrick's sets as extremely challenging and, in this way, assisted in the further development of the myth of the tyrant director. *Making The Shining* documentary features a famous behind-the-scenes conflict between Kubrick and Shelley Duvall on the set of *The Shining*, an event that presented Kubrick as an over-demanding and terrorising director to the public. Reacting to Kubrick's sharp criticism and harsh directing approach, Shelley Duvall suffered a mental and physical breakdown from exhaustion. In comparison to her previous collaborations with directors, she referred to Kubrick as being in 'another category', describing her days on the set: 'Going through day after day of excruciating work. Almost unbearable' (quoted in Ebert, 1980). Another actor, Ryan O'Neal, described his experience with Kubrick's habit of shooting for long periods and with many repetitive takes: 'We shot for something like 350 days, and afterwards, they had to carry me away' (quoted in Whitington, 2015).

Such descriptions of Kubrick's film sets are very common and have contributed to the creation and continued existence of the myth of Kubrick as the dictating auteur, whose sets were excruciating for his collaborators to the point that expressing individual creativity was difficult, if not impossible. However, attributing such experiences of a ruthless working environment to Kubrick's 'tyrant' nature is too simplistic. The creative environment was challenging because many factors made it so and not solely Kubrick's dictatorial work practice. I, therefore, argue for a more thorough elaboration of the concept of the creative environment, the complex role it plays in Kubrick's filmmaking and how it affects the nature of collaborations that were formed in his productions.

My thesis refers to the filmmaking environment as a working environment that is both an industry (a business) and a creative (artistic) practice. I therefore also refer to it as a creative environment, which I conceptualise as two types of space: the physical and the social. The physical environment is very straightforward; it is the physical location – the film set (studio, exterior) – whereas the social environment represents a cluster of psychological, economic, social and cultural features. Teresa M. Amabile and Nur D. Gryskiewicz refer to the social environment as the 'climate' of an organisation (1989: 232), which I also understand as the atmosphere present in the production. It is a conglomerate of interactions between individuals, informed by various psychological, social and cultural processes. It is controlled by institutions and by social and cultural practices, which guide the creative environment with pre-set conditions and, consequently, the possibilities that are available when engaging in it. A film production's working/creative environment is guided by the conditions (e.g. economic conditions) that are regulated by the production management, most often with the producer/the director as its representatives. They not only set and regulate the physical environment but also guide the sociocultural creative environment in which the individual workers interact.

This chapter presents stories about the various circumstances surrounding Kubrick's productions, which are presented in the workers' testimonies – their impressions and their experiences of the working environment as members of Kubrick's crew. I will approach the study of the creative environment in Kubrick's productions by considering the collaborators' testimonies on the creative atmosphere, the conditions, the limitations, the conflicts and other circumstances that portray the complexity of the creative environment and I will juxtapose these with relevant archival findings. This combined approach will assist in determining how the individual and group creativity were affected by the creative environment the crew were subject to, how its features affected individual perceptions of it and what role individual perceptions played in the functioning of the environment. The various discourses found in the archival evidence and personal perspectives of the workers allows a more flexible approach to identifying the processes that occurred in Kubrick's production practice and allows them to be seen from a perspective that differs from the dominant one.

For the research presented in this chapter, I consider three existing creative industry studies on television and film workers: John T. Caldwell's *Production Culture* (2008), David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker's research on creative labour in cultural industries (2011) and Lorraine Rowlands' study of film workers in New Zealand (2009). Each of these three studies adopts a unique approach to the categorisation of the participants' stories and analyses of the various phenomena observed in the process of storytelling. Rowlands juxtaposes the mythicised portrayal of the film industry with a realistic one (2009), similar to Caldwell's study of the film workers' narration patterns in relation to the professional, social and personal psychological aspect of production work (2008). Hesmondhalgh and Baker are specific in defining the creative environment from a sociological and economic perspective, focusing on the theme of creativity, autonomy and commerce (2011). These three studies will direct attention to details such as values, rituals and repetitive patterns of behaviour and actions, observed in the stories of Kubrick's filmmaking practice. I approach the analysis of the creative environment and its effects on collaborative creative work from an economical, psychological and social perspective. The combination of these perspectives helps to identify the features of the creative environment, allows the analysis to take place and leads to the findings regarding the nature of Kubrick's creative environment. It will discuss the effects of its features, address the mythology around it and point out the specific moments that influenced the creation and perpetuation of the mythology. The stories in this chapter address the presence of recurring phenomena like conflict, limitations, (not) overcoming them and the influence of, and on, the personnel's knowledge of the film industry. The chapter will problematise the expression of creativity in collaborating relationships. Due to the persistent mythology regarding Kubrick's production practice, identifying the moments of myth making can help to identify alternative accounts.

Based on evidence and the fact that his collaborators often used such terms, I compare the notoriously challenging working conditions in Kubrick's productions to a war zone. In telling their stories, Kubrick's collaborators employ a very similar technique to the one war veterans use in telling theirs. In the same way as war veterans reflect on the war, crew members recollect the events on the set, the

overall attitude to work among the crew, the technical and personal challenges and document the effort invested into accomplishing work by employing various problem solving techniques. I borrow Caldwell's term 'war stories' (2008: 38), as it appropriately describes the nature of the narration employed by Kubrick's collaborators in their tales of the fight. I also draw connections between the war stories and an archetypal story pattern that is commonly employed in myths and modern adventure literature – Joseph Campbell's *The hero's journey* (Cousineau, 1990). Combining the stages of the hero's journey and the narrative patterns analysed in the stories of the warriors more closely, helps to examine myths by approaching the interpretation from at least two perspectives, both of which focus on the narration style. Each perspective identifies specific characteristics that are possibly also evident from the archival data, indicating recurring types of creative practice (or only moments, characteristics of the practice) in Kubrick's productions.

The hero's journey charts the stages the storytellers went through and the war stories identify the storytellers' narration style. Addressing the core of the myth helps to identify the moments that can be challenged through identifying other discourses, and address the significance of the narration of the stories and its application to the practice occurring outside of the mythology. In this way, I will demonstrate that it could be used to achieve a more flexible, open approach to researching Kubrick's film production environment. Such an approach will assist in identifying the 'labour mystique' (Caldwell, 2008: 38) in Kubrick's productions and address the meaning of the 'project team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 131), being the moments/actions of collaboration and collective effort that were employed in combating the challenges of the creative environment they faced.

The creative environment

Filmmaking takes place in a physical and social environment that encompasses all the elements that influence the individual's work from the beginning (the origin of their work), during the working process, to its conclusion (the reception of their work). The elements of the physical environment are very clear-cut, comprising the weather conditions, the complexity of the location, such as the type of terrain

(e.g. *Barry Lyndon*'s rural environment), the type of the designed set (e.g. *Full Metal Jacket*'s rubble and explosion set), the exterior or interior setting (e.g. *The Shining* was, with the exception of a few scenes, filmed in a studio), and the time (night or day). The social environment, the climate (Amabile and Gryskiewicz, 1989) or atmosphere consists of a combination of social features such as relationships, hierarchical division of labour, psychological features such as individual or group motivations, expectations and aspirations, economic circumstances (workers' fees) and cultural features like cultural capital or institutions. Göran Ekvall, a researcher in the psychology of creativity, identifies these as conditions for a creative environment in organised groups, formed with an intention (1996), which a film crew is. A study of film crews expands the ways in which the creative environment can be understood because film crews represent complex collective structures with multiple participants who not only function as individuals but also as a group. What complicates working processes and the effect of the environment on the functioning of the group and the individual is that the work is both individual and collective at the same time. In order to productively problematise this debate, I further develop the idea of the creative environment, basing my analysis on research carried out in the creative industries.

Hesmondhalgh and Baker's study of the working conditions in the cultural industries between 2006 and 2007 is based on 63 media workers (film/television, recording and magazine industry) in the UK (2011). Through interviews and participant observation, they identified individual assessments, interpretations, conceptions and attitudes, and drew on connections between them, to create a representative pattern of influential factors. The authors classified the workers' discussions into the following themes: management of autonomy; creativity; commerce (e.g. obligation to the networks); pay and security; involvement, freedom and esteem; creative careers, self-realisation and sociality; emotional and affective labour; creative products; audiences; the meaning of creative work; and the politics of work (unions). This enabled me to predict the themes that were likely to occur in my research as well. In order to focus on the influence of the creative environment, however, I expanded the theoretical framework by including the psychological perspective proposed by Lawrence C. Repucci. He considered 'varia' – different combinations of facts and impressions of the

environment that a creative person functions in, as one of the criteria for assessing creativity (Taylor, in Sternberg, 1988: 118-119). Identifying 'varia' is essential for my study because the facts and impressions of the environment affect individual perceptions of the environment and, as such, influence the way in which the individual functions in this environment, i.e. the varia influences an individual's way of approaching collaborative practice in film production work. Thus, the creative environment of filmmaking – both physical and social – strongly influences the participants active in the filmmaking process and influences the process itself. Both types of environment are connected and their features often intertwine, reflecting the complexity of the environment and the various conditions the film workers are subject to. The conditions thus dictate the workers' functioning in the creative environment, and so impact the creative practice of both the individual and the group. In order to ascertain the impact of these conditions, they first have to be identified and then analysed. I will employ some of the approaches used in studying creativity, specifically the role of the creative environment. Many disciplines address the theme, but I will limit myself to the psychological, socio-economical and sociocultural perspectives, which, when combined, best reflect the complexity of the creative environment, primarily, in this case, the social creative environment.

While the basic predisposition of the sociological perspective is that an individual is a part of a social group, existing in a common environment, variations of the social perspective address the complex relationship between collective creative work and the collective environment. 'Artistic creativity is subordinate to the general laws of social development but, being a special form of consciousness, has its own distinctive features and specific patterns' Marx and Engels claimed (Blunden, n.d.). While Marx and Engels are not often included in discussions about creativity, they, in fact, connect the artistic and social elements in society: 'Art objects are not isolated phenomena, but are mutually dependent with other cultural activity of predominantly social, political, moral, religious, or scientific character' (Morawski and Baxandall, 1973: 8). They refer to creative (artistic) work as 'civilizational activity' and address the concepts that become relevant in the process: artistic freedom and alienation, functioning of artistic activity with regard to the class division in the society, and the emergence of art in the labour

process (Morawski and Baxandall, 1973: 6-7). I focus on Marx and Engels' interest in the artistic activity emerging in the class division (the hierarchy) because it is also present in the film industry.

It has been discussed in *Origins stories* that the film industry is divided hierarchically and governed by capital, not only financial but also cultural capital. As currency works as a means of trade and runs the society (Bourdieu in Richardson, 1986), it can be found in three forms: embodied state (actual money), cultural goods (photographs, books, machines), and the institutionalised state. All three forms of capital exist in the creative environment, both physically and socially. These forms also represent the conditions that guide the environment and guide the individual's experience of the environment, which indicates a correlation between cultural capital and Repucci's varia (Taylor in Sternberg, 1988). The physical environment (e.g. cultural institutions) and social environment (e.g. hierarchal division of labour) represent conditions that function as influential factors. I, therefore, refer to them by the term *regulators*.

Regulators of the creative environment, which combines the physical and social space in which productions function, are a set of physical, mental, ethical and economic conditions that workers face when entering the creative environment. These conditions that guide their work are often given in the form of restrictions (set by the managing institutions and the people in managing positions, such as the producer and the director) and influence the workers' perception of the creative environment they are working in. It is eventually the worker's choice to accept or not accept those conditions, but it can come with at the cost of limitations on their creative work. Their motivations, expectations and aspirations can be altered by the implications of economic certainty, the role of social status and the psychological effect the conditions evoke. In the film industry, this is reflected in the restrictions on creative expression, the 'rules' guiding the creative process of filmmaking. Thus, when talking about regulators in the film industry, we are talking about limitations, restrictions and rules set by the governing institution (for that genre). Institutionalised regulators are policies (framework of rules, beliefs and predispositions) and, at the same time, the politics of the film industry whose goal is to regulate the executive process of filmmaking.

Kubrick's productions were especially prone to such practices because Kubrick himself co-produced his films, which gave him the managing role in the conditions/restrictions of giving and receiving. He would negotiate his deals, which is well demonstrated in his deal with Warner Bros. Colin Flight, Kubrick's collaborator at Rank/Deluxe Laboratories, explained that the Warner Bros. contracts demanded the use of their external collaborators in laboratory work, namely Technicolor, but Kubrick stood his ground and was 'allowed' to collaborate with Rank/Deluxe, whom he considered as most 'trustworthy' (personal interview, 2018). He was an excellent negotiator and was able to manipulate the restrictions enforced upon him and also the restrictions he would impose on his crew, being their employer and their director at the same time. While his high position in the hierarchy enabled him to do so, his crew was in a subordinate hierarchal position and would face the consequences of the restrictions much more often. This was problematic because the workers' reactions to the conditions (restrictions) they faced resulted in a set of impressions of the industry that then shaped their stories; as a result, the content and narration style of their stories affected the mythology that developed around the creative environment within which they worked.

The creative environment is thus affected by regulators and guided by the people and institutions that manage them. This was the case in Kubrick's productions, and, although he was himself subjected to certain limitations, he was often the implementer of them as well. These practices influenced the workers' experiences and, consequentially, their stories about the production conditions and the way they perceived the creative environment. Myths surrounding Kubrick's creative environment often paint it as challenging, even 'troubled' and full of 'consistent drama' (Armstrong, quoted in DuVall, 2011). Stories like Armstrong's show that the effects of the conditions/regulators that guided Kubrick's productions were viewed negatively, but not all stories do. Taking into account Gaut and Livingston's three types of impact that the restrictions had on the workers' experience (2003), Kubrick's collaborators perceived them as not only negative, but also as neutral and positive. Furthermore, the negative impact of the restrictions would often encourage positive outcomes. In the next section, I

analyse stories in which crew members combat the restrictions and challenging conditions of the creative environment of Kubrick's productions.

'Against all odds' and heroes

Caldwell identifies a narrative genre subcategory he calls 'war-mythos' – the 'against-all-odds' stories (2008: 38). These stories are specific to the below-the-line sector, and characteristic traits are physical perseverance and the workers' diligence. They are stories of heroism, of achieving well-earned success, of facing discrimination and of complaints about the working conditions and lack of respect. The narrative of the story is often similar: the storytellers present themselves as heroes who successfully overcome the rough conditions they were subject to, due to their ability to endure even the hardest conditions. The 'fight' is successful due to their endurance and total commitment to work, and the workers come back from the 'war' with an unforgettable experience, whether positive or negative.

This romantic and 'thriller-like' storytelling that the crew members employ in their stories of the challenges they faced due to restrictions and the harsh conditions, resembles a pattern of narration introduced as 'a monomyth' (cycle of mythology) or *The hero's journey* by Joseph Campbell (Cousineau, 1990) and was later adopted by many writers, Christopher Vogler (2007) being one of them. Vogler and Campbell's stages differ to some extent, but both include three stages that the hero goes through: departure/separation, initiation and the return. I would characterise the crew members entering a film project as 'warriors' embarking up a hero's journey. Some of the stages need to be tailored to the process of film production, but perhaps the on-screen hero's journey and the crew's adventures behind the camera are more comparable than they seem at first glance. I analyse the crew's stories using the notion of mythology as 'a set of symbols we use to describe our purpose and what each one of us is capable of achieving' (Milum, 2003). Narrative patterns and narration genre are identified in the process of analysing the experiences and their meaning for Kubrick's collaborators. The departure stage has already been discussed in the first chapter of the thesis, so this chapter continues the journey by focusing on initiations and ordeals and their role in the individual and collaborative creative process. I show how these moments of

initiation and ordeal have actively assisted in the construction of the myths surrounding Kubrick's creative environment.

Caldwell observes that 'against-all-odds' war allegories (2008: 38) are told by the below-the-line sectors. Although accurate in many cases, this is not applicable to the stories about Kubrick's productions. The film collective has been described as a hierarchically divided structure, but a crew is a far more complex construct. It is an accumulation of different individuals who form groups within groups, a cluster of individual and collective contributions to the project, a unit of collaborative relationships as well as hierarchal power. Firstly, the crew is a collective, and certain features can be observed on more levels than solely the below/above-the-line division. Secondly, as a collective entering a film project, it is the entire crew that faces the creative environment they find themselves in. This was the case in Kubrick's productions as well. One could argue that above-the-line sector workers did not experience the exhausting conditions that were present on the set, e.g. the location of the filming. However, they did experience them off set, in their offices or in the editing room, as can be observed in overtime claims (SK/14/4/15, 1976-1977) from, for example, Margaret Adams (the production secretary) and the assistant editor, Peter Krook. In other words, the administrative and editing sectors also experienced long working hours and heavy work loads, similar to the crew on the set, facing the challenges of the physical creative environment as well as experiencing the social one (the psychological stress). By adding the 'above-the-line' category to the 'against-all-odds' war allegories (Caldwell, 2008: 38), I expand the framework of the storytellers. In doing so, I imply that Kubrick's crews experienced the creative environment in very similar ways. This also increases the breadth of contributions to the myths surrounding Kubrick's production practices.

Tests and ordeals – the road of trials

Working conditions were challenging for the whole of Kubrick's crew, the above-the-line, the below-the-line workers, the actors and the director himself. The productions materials in the archive demonstrate the amount of work that went into making his films; for example, the long periods of production (often a year or more), the duration of the working days, the number of takes, the amount of the

work invested in the preparations. This was unique to Kubrick's productions because of the way his practice worked. Due to his high position in the hierarchy, he had enough power to make decisions that other directors could not. Again, referring to his unique collaboration with Warner Bros., he was given more creative freedom and allowed for more negotiation regarding the conditions. He was not the only director with such power as Francis Ford Coppola wielded similar power, but he was one of the rare ones that did enjoy such freedom. The other reason why his projects were so labour intensive is that Kubrick was a perfectionist in his filmmaking. This actively contributed to the image of him as a demanding and controlling director. However, while he did have a substantial amount of power, there were conditions that he was not able to control, such as the physical environment, e.g. the weather conditions. Alternatively, he was the decision maker, determining what kind of physical environment would be chosen. It is from this fact that the myth of the tyrant director emerged; his insistence on using a specific location was, due to his hierarchal position, the conditions the crew were presented with and if they decided to collaborate, was a condition that had to be accepted. In this sense, the physical creative environment was enforced on the crew, but also retained certain characteristics of the social creative environment. The physical, psychological, economic and social conditions are, at times, clearly visible and at others, need to be inferred, at which point personal testimonies are brought in to juxtapose the information. I begin with presentations of cases that describe the fight to overcome the physical conditions, the physical creative environment.

The shooting conditions in *Full Metal Jacket* were extremely challenging. Because the city of Vietnam was constructed in London, the war atmosphere had to be artificially created by using pyrotechnics (smoke, firecrackers and fire), which not only made the set challenging but also dangerous. An archive photograph of a girl in a white protective suit holding a camera and filming demonstrates that the conditions called for protective clothing (SK/16/9/2/1, 1985-1986). Mathew Modine, the lead actor in the film, elaborated on this image, recalling the set of the explosions being scattered with asbestos and other toxins, representing a hazard for the cast and crew's health, which was then exposed to further dangers due to the Chernobyl disaster in 1986:

Then, to top it off, Chernobyl happened. Radiation was
falling all over Europe and there was real danger of it
poisoning people, and especially nursing children, which
my son was. And then, on top of that, there was the
asbestos and the blue chemical of Becton and the trailer
toilets which I describe in my diary. I felt that everything
was imploding and exploding. Everywhere and everything
pointed toward environmental disaster. Hard days they
were.

(quoted in Silverstein, 2011)

In comparison with *Full Metal Jacket*, *Barry Lyndon* did not involve such
challenging artificial sets, but the crew still testified to difficult conditions. The
shooting took place in the green fields, plains and woods of Ireland and, later, the
UK. While the locations were beautiful, it was 'hard work, though' (Harlan,
quoted in Whitington, 2015).

The conditions were appropriate to the landscape and season: filming in Ireland
took place in harsh weather conditions and involved difficult-to-access locations.
Andy Armstrong, the 2nd assistant director on *Barry Lyndon*, drove one of
Kubrick's two jeeps to the meeting points, where he then picked up Kubrick, the
1st assistant director, Brian W. Cook, DOP John Alcott and the production
designer Ken Adam. 'Then we'd all drive to some incredibly difficult remote spot
to look for camera position. I would often have to drive this group of strange
people to the most weird places, through the mud, trees and forest to look for
something that might be a perfect sunset or some perfect position' (Armstrong,
quoted in DuVall, 2011). While Armstrong's story falls into Caldwell's category
of the warriors' practice of complaining about the working conditions (2008), it
also gives an insight into the psychological effects of the environment. The
conditions, specifically harsh conditions of the physical creative environment,
affect the worker who is working in it. The reaction to physical challenges is
automatically followed by mental reactions to them, which is a popular approach
that psychology studies employ in analysing the human psyche (e.g. Rutter,
2005). This is important for my argument about the complexity of the filmmaking

environment and supports my definition of it as having both physical and social dimensions. I demonstrate the connection between the physical and mental challenges workers face in the physical environment of filmmaking (which can be demonstrated in the occurrence of PTSD) to those facing warriors and heroes whose 'willpower' is tested on their journey (Hartman and Zimberoff, 2009).

In Caldwell's account, production workers begin to recognise the effects that the 'Spartan-like conditions' (2008: 42) have on their mental strength. Mental stress adds to the physical stress, a situation Caldwell describes as a 'boot camp experience' (2008: 42). It functions as an endurance test: the individuals concerned endure physical exhaustion from long working hours and mental stress due to the difficult physical conditions, as well as pressure coming from the above-the-line sector – in this case, Kubrick. How the combination of the physical and social creative environment (Kubrick exercising his hierarchal power when executing pressure on his crew members) is reflected in actions can be observed in Bruce Logan's (an animation artist on *2001*) experience: 'As a filmmaker, he was intensely driven and ruthless on the journey to create his vision. Once when I was sick for a couple of days, he rang me up at home and threatened to send an ambulance to my house and bring me in on a stretcher to shoot animation' (2016).

Logan's story is an excellent example of a testimony that strongly plays up to the idea of Kubrick as a tyrant and exemplifies how a myth of Kubrick 'the dictator' was able to form, but also identifies the situations (moments) that the myth originated from. Of course, one story does not suffice to create a myth, but when more stories in the same vein are added, the myth begins to form. To my knowledge, Jan Harlan never alluded to Kubrick's ruthlessness, but he did mention the challenging physical environment on *Barry Lyndon*, by employing a less suggestive, more neutral narration style, with reference to 'Kubrick's endless retakes' and 'tricky location shoots' (Harlan, quoted in Whitington, 2015), rather than more emotionally charged language. By contrast, Armstrong does use such language, referring to Kubrick as 'obviously a very obsessive person' whose 'mode of operation was certainly to be the only one with some form of order in his own mind in a shear of chaos' (quoted in DuVall, 2011). By addressing the chaos that was present when filming *Barry Lyndon*, Armstrong further contributed

to the development of the myth about Kubrick's directing practice, not only identifying chaos as characteristic of the creative environment in Kubrick's productions, but also stating that chaos was intentionally generated by Kubrick himself: 'And I realise that's why he could never solve this chaos – because it was being permanently and intentionally created. He really did quite like the chaos and this sort of outlived weirdness and oddity that came out of that' (quoted in DuVall, 2011).

The above stories are examples of different narrative styles; Armstrong's testimony is a story that has negative connotations while Logan's plays up to the same result, but is told using neutral rather than emotive language. Harlan's story is even more neutral, perhaps even a diplomatic description of the creative environment, attaching neither negative nor positive connotations to Kubrick's practice. Each of these narratives portrays the creative (working) environment by demonstrating how the physical environment and the psychological aspect of the social environment affect individual impressions and experiences. 'It was difficult for young people, two eventually left. They were used to a set schedule, which people were actually gonna try to achieve,' said Cook (quoted in DuVall, 2012) as he described the impact on the workers. On the same project (*Barry Lyndon*), Peter Krook, the assistant editor, handed in his resignation on 30 July 1976 (SK/14/4/15) and Ken Adam was hospitalised for mental exhaustion during the shoot (Adam in Morrow, 2013).

While other co-workers persevered, the creative environment still had an impact – it affected their impressions of working with Kubrick. The atmosphere on the set, Kubrick's attitude and that of other collaborators were decisive for Armstrong, who described *Barry Lyndon* as a 'very troubled picture':

> There was a lot of egos, a lot of incidents that happened. It
> was just a very large, slightly out of control movie.
> Largely, a lot anyway, because Stanley would change his
> mind a lot. Every day would be at least two, three different
> call sheets and the entire crew, a company that was huge,
> would wait and see depending on weather and light,

> whether we'd go to location A, B, C or, whatever the
> weather would say, we'd go inside.

<div align="right">(quoted in DuVall, 2011)</div>

Such chaos had consequences for the organisation of the whole crew and actors, prolonging the duration of the shoot, thereby intensifying the physical creative environment.

> You know it's a massive enterprise, huge company on the
> road every morning, but then to have tons of variations
> where you'd have ten different actors... Sometimes there'd
> be such chaos in the morning, that you'd turn up on one
> location and the crew and cast would go to another location,
> and it would be midday before we'd all got together.

<div align="right">(Armstrong, quoted in DuVall, 2011)</div>

As the stories presented above suggest, *Barry Lyndon* exemplifies a project characterised by challenging logistics and organisation, which both originated from the environmental conditions and formed the future environment of restrictions and limitations for the crew. The above-discussed responses to the creative environment all testify to the rules and limitations that were applied in Kubrick's filmmaking. These rules and limitations influenced the workers' perceptions of the filmmaking process and affected their social experience, which in turn influenced the workers' impressions of Kubrick and their view of what working in his productions was like. As more stories about negative experiences of the creative environment emerge, the formation of these myths is understandable.

Restrictions, rules and limitations (politics, economic and social conditions)

The production process has its policies and rules, regulated by hierarchal and political factors. Hargadon and Bechky describe the 'status hierarchy' within organisations as inhibitors of the actions that precipitate collective moments (2006). Film workers operate in social creative environments governed by status hierarchy, which means they operate within a corporate hierarchy that exists

among the workers, the producers and the regulative powers (e.g. BBFC in the case of censorship of the film). Individual workers are subjected to various restrictions, comprised of political, economic, regulatory, technological, cultural and organisational factors (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011).

Film production is a corporate body and is managed by the corporate hierarchy. Trevor Ponech introduces the concepts of the 'A-plan' and the 'agents' who are responsible for it (1999).

> It settles practical matters of what and how to do things. Such a network of intentions might be fairly abstract, leaving much to be filled in as one's project advances. Yet the A-plan is nonetheless a global, synthetic blueprint or recipe regarding the finished movie's content, structure, properties, and effects, along with some of the means to achieving these ends.
>
> (Ponech, 1999)

In its simplest form, the A-plan can be an actual filming schedule, production plan at the beginning of filming, or a daily call sheet. The A-plan is a product of the agents, usually represented by the film producers and the directors, who have the financial, organisational and creative autonomy over the film project. As such, the A-plan defines the conditions of the creative environment in the film industry. According to Ponech, an agent who produces the A-plan possesses 'at least modest capacities for reason, reflection upon its own as well as other agents' beliefs and desires, and deliberate or intentional action' (1999), and Kubrick did. His control over the production process was based on his self-directive in the filmmaking process. He explained his deep involvement in and careful thinking about, the strategy of hierarchy: 'I risk my popularity with some of my department heads by continually pressing home the point that merely giving an order to somebody is only a fraction of their job, that their principal responsibility is to see that the order is carried out accurately, on time, and within the budget' (Kubrick, 1971, quoted in Walker et al., 1999: 38-39). It follows that the producer's directive, which is dependent on the technical/organisational and economic

circumstances and possibilities, is targeted to deliver the best results within the available options. The production company is obliged to distribute funds according to the organisational and regulatory factors, especially if the funding is coming from an external source (e.g. the BFI Film Fund). These obligations then influence the arrangements and the working conditions, making them an intrinsic part of the social creative environment.

It is a common perception that Kubrick tended to spend as little money as possible. This is, in fact, common for producers and, understandably, in Kubrick's case too, as most of his films were made in collaboration with major production companies such as MGM and Warner Bros., who held the majority of the investment in his projects. However, the consequences of such actions are often reflected in the working atmosphere of the crew, the social creative environment. Kubrick's attempts to minimise the costs and work within financial limitations can be best demonstrated in the production design, specifically art production in the sector of prop design.

Tony Frewin, Rod Stratfold and Les Tomkins worked as prop list designers on *Full Metal Jacket*. They forwarded their lists to Bill Hansard, the production buyer, who appeared to make bad decisions in his choice of props and equipment prices. Letters and faxes in the archive demonstrate Kubrick's dismay with Hansard's 'expensive' buys (SK/16/8/3/22, 1984). As the (co)producer, Kubrick meticulously monitored the decisions taken by his workers and, if he did not agree with them, he would reject them. He did so with the purchase of a sound recording machine for *The Shining*, causing dissatisfaction in the sound sector and creating conflict with Cook, who was an intermediate in the communication of this purchase. In 1978, Cook wrote to Kubrick about Ivan Sharrock's requirements for a new sound filming device. Kubrick rejected this idea, writing back 'why did Ivan go and buy it as it was expensive' and demanded that Sharrock explain 'why he thought it was a better idea' (SK/15/9/24, 1978). Despite having been challenged on his decision, Sharrock was given a chance to explain. Kubrick's meticulousness in financial matters and his decisions on the technical equipment to be used thus set the conditions for the creative practice, which indicates how economic factors in the social creative environment affect the physical creative environment as well.

Sharrock's case demonstrates how economic factors influence the technical conditions that guide the working process, as they dictate the possibilities and the means available to the workers to engage in the creative practice of filmmaking. Because the technical equipment is bought with production money, it is determined by the production management and represents a condition that is most often not negotiable. I say 'most often' because there are moments when different decisions are made.

Sometimes, Kubrick raised the budget needed to fund his ideas, while cutting funds elsewhere. In *Dr. Strangelove*, Victor Lyndon, the associate producer, and Ron Phipps, the production accountant, handled props purchases/rentals. Payslips, order forms and letters exchanged between the production manager, Clifton Brandon and the prop buyer, Godbold[9], provide information on demanded, executed and exchanged/returned purchases/rentals, sometimes accompanied by notes explaining the decision (SK/11/2/8, 1963). This was the case with a wallet prop for Lieutenant Ripper's office desk; it had to be made out of leather and was ordered in many editions, but was returned and exchanged several times on Kubrick's command (SK/11/2/8, 1963) – which, of course, raised the available budget. This tells us that Kubrick at times changed the conditions of the environment, thereby impacting the creative environment in other areas. Some sectors were given priority, and more financial means meant more technical equipment, for example. However, it also meant that the conditions were tailored to some while not to others. While financial limitations in the film industry are inevitable, they affect the workers on a larger, sociocultural scale, impacting the social creative environment.

The film industry has its own sociocultural rules of functioning, which comprise not only technical and economic possibilities (means available), but also phenomena like rituals, practices, and values. Hesmondhalgh and Baker believe the processes of the production function in this way (2011), as does Caldwell (2008). He presents the workers' stories about the cultural practices occurring in film and TV productions that often follow a pattern: firstly, they address the specific conditions; then they explain how it should and how it actually functions

---

[9] First name is not indicated in the archive.

in reality; finally, they list the consequences that these conditions carry for them, and address their 'fight' for a change.

Workers are already familiar with the industry's conditions due to their individual or 'passed-on' experiences and, partially too to organisations such as the unions. They operate in the industry according to their knowledge and experience and the compatibility of their vision (and acceptance of the conditions), with the vision of the director/the producer, and their willingness to follow the proposed A-plan. The A-plan itself indicates the conditions and some of the restrictions. I say some, as many of the restrictions are only revealed when the filmmaking is already in process. A good example is the length of Kubrick's shoots. Shoots would often be prolonged; this would prevent the worker from accepting other work or, if they decided not collaborate beyond the advanced set date, resulted in the end of their work contract. This was the case with Alcott leaving *The Shining* seven weeks before it was finished due to scheduled commitments in America (personal interview with Milsome, 2016). Such discrepancies in regulation have significant consequences for the film workers, influencing their work ethics, motivation, feelings of autonomy in their creative contributions (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), at the workplace and the extent to which they feel their work contribution is acknowledged and appreciated.

The restrictions the workers face affect their work process and, consequentially, the end product. They are the 'global factors that affect motivation and opportunity and specific cultural factors that influence the means of production – genre, paradigm and style' (Johnson-Laird in Sternberg, 1988: 204). With his experience, Adam summarises the effect of the environment on collaboration and the created product:

> And I find when I worked on films where I had a great
> rapport with the director, the cameraman, and if it was a
> period picture maybe the costume designer too, then the
> film turned out to be great. If you are all on the same beam,
> the film will turn out to be a good film, you know – I've
> never been disappointed in that. If you have continuous
> battles, that reflects eventually.

Rules, limitations and restrictions dictate how the creative environment functions, establishing a particular system of conditions that the crew is subject to in their working process. The existing 'status hierarchy' (Hargadon and Bechky, 2006) crucially influences the workers, their perceptions of collaboration, freedom in creative expression and their feelings of autonomy. In this way, the workers' experiences of these conditions are reflected in their attitudes toward the working environment and, consequentially, affect their functioning in it. If the environment's effect is generally positive, the workers engage in a (mostly) satisfying collaborative practice; but, if the restrictions form a 'toxic' sociocultural economic environment that inhibits creative self-expression and causes dissatisfaction, then conflicts arise. The latter are dealt with in two ways: workers can reject the environment and choose to leave or decide to stay for various reasons, e.g. financial security, social status, or because of emotional engagement.

Emotional engagement as a pendulum of collaboration and fighting for autonomy

I will discuss emotional engagement as a characteristic of an individual film worker and elaborate on the important role it plays in the formation and functioning of the social creative environment in film production, consequentially determining the nature of collaboration. Emotional engagement, or 'pleasurable absorption' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 132), influences the level of motivation and energy that is invested in the work. Milsome still today testifies to this: 'I have to be doing something behind the camera. I can't do something that's not making movies. It's the thing you never stop doing, you know. You don't retire from it' (personal interview, 2016). Emotional engagement can be, therefore, considered the dominant factor in film work and a feature that enables the collaboration and thus the creation of a product or a result of collective utterances (Sellors, 2007; Livingston in Allen and Smith, 1999). Emotional engagement is a feature that most film workers share and thus experience the 'thrill of collectiveness' in creating. Hesmondhalgh and Baker define it as 'this sense of working with others to overcome challenges, widely prevalent in the

"project team" ethos of television production, but pleasures of sociality are bound up in the rewards of involvement' (2011: 131).

The project team's ethos or the thrill of collectiveness is also discussed in Gilbert's plural subject theory (2000). The team's ethos is based on the moral philosophy of the nature of obligation, where 'the moral jointness' represents 'a special standing with respect to the actions of that other person' and includes 'the right to conforming actions from the other and is under the corresponding obligation to that other' (Gilbert, 2000: 7-8). As Milsome said: 'You have to help each other and work as a team in that way' (personal interview, 2016).

It is useful to think of the experience of autonomy of creative labour as a pleasure or satisfaction that can very easily be compromised (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011). Autonomy is not only compromised by external sources but by internal, chosen restrictions/conditions (Gaut and Livingston, 2003). Workers decide to tolerate the creative environment and challenging situations 'to achieve the possibility of self-realisation through creative work', and so actively engage in self-exploitation (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 221). While the workers' increased motivation and energy contribute to a successful creative process, they can also negatively affect the individual to the point where the collaboration and collective work suffer. Ken Adam was the example of the latter. Despite being a devoted production designer, the effort he invested could not overcome the challenging environment, and the fight resulted in him becoming exhausted in the process of the production (Adam in Morrow, 2013). The stress that some of Kubrick's collaborators went through because of the challenging physical and social creative environment of his productions, and the constant battle between the stress and their struggle for creative expression, resulted in fatigue, arguments and even resignations (e.g. Peter Krook). The mental and physical strain caused by these emotional and environmental tensions affected their functioning in the creative environment and was, at times, exacerbated by the collaborative aspect of the environment and affected collaboration within the crew.

People's abilities *to do* are only functional with *what* and *who* they are working with. In other words, the conditions have to be right. In Kubrick's case, it can be observed that his working relationships influenced the conditions. If the

collaboration was based on a compatible point of view, shared interest and a similar approach to execution of the A-plan and Kubrick's vision, it was more likely to lead to a fruitful exchange of ideas. The next example demonstrates how mutual interests and emotional engagement in the creative process could affect collaboration.

Kubrick and Alcott's shared passion for cinematography had created a work dynamic based on mutual interest and defiance of regulations. As Armstrong observed:

> John was a very young DP. He had obviously an interest in a relationship with Stanley because Stanley used to operate the camera, although Union rules dictated that we had to have a camera operator, the cameraman used to sit in the van all day. It was a very odd dynamic there. So you'd have the director operating the camera and the director of photography were designing the look of the shot and would then be dealing with the director as if he was his camera operator, someone, slightly beneath him almost. A very odd, interesting dynamic there.

(quoted in DuVall, 2011)

This example indicates that specific working conditions can be tailored (depending on the relationship). The effect this has on the crew can be seen in their motivation level. The motivation level can increase, but it can also decrease for those workers who are not subject to the 'special' conditions but only to the 'ordinary' ones. This can result in feelings of marginalisation, of their work being less appreciated and in feelings of redundancy, as seen in Martin Stollery's research of British technicians' impressions of their work practice (2009).

At this point, I wish to emphasize the subjective nature of references to 'special' and 'ordinary' conditions. Kubrick and Alcott's relationship, as described by Armstrong, could be seen as indicating the superiority of their relationship compared with other collaborations, but other stories belie this inference. Vitali's observation of Alcott's character suggests that it was Alcott's character that

allowed the Alcott-Kubrick collaboration to run smoothly: 'Alcott was a quietly spoken man. He never lost temper. Kubrick had deep respect for this. Alcott would work out mental processes - lighting as calculation. One or two days of lighting tests. If Kubrick said to start from scratch, Alcott wouldn't even twitch, just did it' (quoted in DuVall, 2012).

Trying to retain one's autonomy – specifically, the creative autonomy (artistic and professional) – despite all the challenges in the film industry, is difficult, and for some, impossible. This is exemplified by many of Kubrick's co-workers. Precisely because of the strength of Kubrick's autonomy, the workers striving to express their autonomy learnt a dual lesson: how to endure/deal with somebody else's autonomy and how to practise their own despite the challenging situations to do so. This did not take place often, however. Cook explained that it was challenging to establish one's autonomy (let alone authority), even if the solution suggested by other collaborators was more perspective: 'And Stanley's ideas weren't always the best ideas… A lot of them were pretty pointless and a lot of times we knew before we would be reverting to the old trusted method. But, of course, you always went around Stanley's way of doing it' (quoted in DuVall, 2012).

As the stories above demonstrate, emotional engagement can function as the source of energy for film workers, but does not necessarily lead to an individual acquiring or having autonomy over their work. So, was there a way for Kubrick's collaborators to express their ideas and, despite the regulators challenging the execution, to preserve their autonomy? Some of Kubrick's collaborators told their stories of success in this regard.

Ian Watson, the writer of the *A.I. Artificial Intelligence* screenplay, explained how he defied the challenging conditions:

> In order to be able to work with Stanley, you had to be able
> to fight your corner to maintain your individuality. Stanley
> was a bit all-consuming, so at the very beginning, I said
> 'Stanley I'm only going to write in the mornings and I'm
> only going to be doing it week days', and he reluctantly

agreed. He kept on trying to chip a way out of this, you know, that I should maybe write at night or work all weekend. If I hadn't maintained at my own corner, I could have been consumed and destroyed by the business.

(Watson, quoted in DuVall, 2012)

Watson addressed the danger of overworking oneself and even being overridden by Kubrick. Adam's exhaustion, resulting from his inability to decline Kubrick's demands, is an example of why a certain degree of self-confidence is needed to 'fairly' collaborate within a film crew. One has to be able to set the limits and take a firm stand, and some of Kubrick's collaborators did challenge the conditions and restrictions. The ability to do this originates from the self-confidence of the person, not so much their position in the hierarchy. Adam was a leader of his sector and Kubrick wanted to collaborate with him on more films, but it is perhaps his calm, equable nature that led to his decision not to engage in challenging the conditions. Actor Modine did, however.

On *Full Metal Jacket,* one day Modine wanted to leave the shoot because his wife was having an emergency C-section but getting permission to go proved difficult.

He said 'You're just going to be in the way of the doctors.' I said, 'No, I have to go. I have to be there with my wife.' And he started telling me all these really practical reasons why I didn't need to be there. I had a pocket knife with me; I put it in my palm and I said 'Look, I'm going to cut my hand open and I'm going to *have* to go to the hospital, or you can let me go to the hospital to be with my wife.' He moved away from me and he said 'Okay, but come back immediately after it's done.' I think what pissed him off was that I told him that I wasn't going to work. I was assuming the director's role – 'don't tell me what I'm going to do or what I'm going to need.'

(Modine, quoted in Tennent, 2013)

As this story testifies, it was possible to curb Kubrick's 'obsessive control' and enforce a compromise. While this exchange did not automatically assert Modine's autonomy, it was the best predisposition for it. Perhaps also due to his success in challenging Kubrick, Modine felt that by standing his ground, he was able to express his creative freedom to a greater extent than other co-workers did.

Despite the physical and social demands of the creative environment, many individual workers opted not to challenge Kubrick directly to achieve greater autonomy in their work. This cannot automatically be seen as a sign of an individual's resignation but rather, a willingness to compromise. Instead of viewing it as confrontation, workers could choose to see their experience of collaborating with Kubrick as a reward for having been a part of the collective and could focus on the pleasure gained from the experience of practising the work they love within an environment that is filled with 'project team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 131). Based on the earlier discussion about emotional engagement, experiencing Kubrick's production as a rewarding collaboration can be seen as a successfully accomplished hero's journey, an unforgettable war experience (positive or negative) that results in valuable lessons learnt.

The reward: 'Triumph of the will' and the lesson learnt

Personal friends (e.g. Jan Harlan), close collaborators and film critics (Michel Ciment) confirm that Kubrick's perfectionism, his insistence on being 'in charge of everything' and the unforgiving work conditions of his productions were significant challenges. 'At times the things were incredibly frustrated, especially for a young kid like I was' (Armstrong, quoted in DuVall, 2011). Thus, how did the collaborators accomplish their journey?

According to Campbell (Cousineau, 1990), the hero successfully completes his journey by physically and psychologically enduring it. With this, he overcomes 'the road of trials' and concludes the journey by obtaining a reward. It is important to note that the reward is generally not an actual 'reward' in terms of financial or social recognition for the effort made. The reward is often the journey itself, the lesson learnt by embarking on it and the feeling of the 'triumph of the

will' (Caldwell, 2008: 38) to have endured it. A jazz drummer, engaged in a study of creative labour in the cultural industries, explained his interpretation of the reward: 'You either learn, you earn, or you enjoy it – hopefully all three' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 129).

According to Caldwell, film workers who are not sector leaders but executers (below-the-line workers) gain from experience in skills and cultural sense (2008). Learning the basics of operating the technology and simultaneously gaining confidence in their professional work also has other functions. The new learnt or practised skills represent a process of establishing the 'craft mastery' (Caldwell, 2008: 38) and can be a result of an employed mentoring system that brings the hero to the end of their journey. The hero/warrior has learnt a lesson, which, according to the nature of the experience, is either positive or negative. Generally, collaborators refer to their collaboration as a truly collaborative experience. In this sense, the reward is the experience of being mentored by Kubrick. Some film workers such as Milsome and Vitali describe themselves as fortunate to work on a Kubrick project. Garrett Brown, the Steadicam operator, believed his experience of collaborating with Kubrick was essential to his working career: 'Repetition of muscle memory, physical acts get better and better. The best stuff I ever shot ended up in the movie' (quoted in DuVall, 2011).

Kubrick's collaborators often speak of their lessons being rewarding in terms of advancing their careers and the vast knowledge they gained. For example, Vitali learnt photography with Kubrick's guidance (in *Filmworker*, 2017), Harlan would not have entered and stayed in the film industry (and today promoting Kubrick's legacy) if it was not for the learning experience with Kubrick. Such stories about positive experiences of Kubrick's collaborations, with additional evidence from archival sources can challenge and mitigate the mythology of Kubrick the dictating director. These testimonies, feelings expressed of the 'privilege' of working with Kubrick, can be, according to Tony Zierra, the director of *Filmworker*, who had the chance to carefully follow Vitali's narration of his life story, ascribed to the director's 'seductive' nature (2017). While Vitali spoke of moments when Kubrick would be impatient towards him, he also affirmed how

rewarding his twenty-year collaboration was: 'The thing with Stanley is that you worked for him, but you also worked with him' (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017).

However, the final reward, career advancement, was reserved only for the few. Many collaborations were not credited and these workers publicly shared their negative experiences of collaborating with Kubrick, resulting in a negative lesson. For example, Wendy Carlos and Rachel Elkind's collaboration with Kubrick on *A Clockwork Orange* was experienced as positive but on *The Shining* it was negative. Elkind stated that the reason for her and Carlos 'not being able to create as artists' was the 'traumatising' nature of *The Shining*'s scenes, which, when composing, they had to watch over and over (quoted in *TV Store Online*, 2014). She even claimed that the experience had been a significant factor in ending her career in film music (*TV Store Online*, 2014). Kubrick's control over their work was too limiting to Elkind's creativity and autonomy and the collaboration ended with Kubrick's decisions to decline their finished work. When the picture was edited, Kubrick asked Gordon Stainforth to edit the music/soundtrack. Stainforth refers to this situation as 'a problem occurring in the sound department' and recalls being approached by Kubrick to edit the previously recorded music into a soundtrack (quoted in *Stanley and Us*, 1999). Elkind is not credited in the finished film and her experience was not unique. Many of Kubrick's collaborators faced lack of recognition of authorship of their creative work. Philip Castle, the poster designer, was also robbed of the copyright for his *A Clockwork Orange* poster (in Mepsted, 2011). Such examples indicate that the idea of Kubrick being controlling and undermining workers' creativity and autonomy was not unfounded. Indeed, Julian Senior, the Warner Bros.' publicity director, explained that Kubrick's demanding nature 'drove a lot of people away from him' (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017), as evidenced by conflicts and resulting resignations.

Although Caldwell associates 'the triumph of the will' with operating/execution workers (2008: 38), it can be observed in operational (below-the-line) and above-the-line sectors. Douglas Milsome is a combination of Caldwell's categories. Being a representative of the warriors, his training, like that of all other technical workers, began in the film industry, in his case in the Rank/Deluxe Laboratories. Working together with 'masters and great DPs', he found himself 'in the front line

having to achieve that yourself, you know with no help' (personal interview with Milsome, 2016). Originating from a technical foundation, Milsome, as an above-the-line worker, embarked on an adventure to success. His journey continued from nominal beginnings of an assistant to a camera operator on *The Shining* and a DOP on *Full Metal Jacket*. It was in collaboration with Kubrick that he advanced in his career. Similarly, Peter Hannan began his career as a special effects camera operator/focus puller on *2001*. For such workers, working with Kubrick thus represented an achievement and, for many, a collaboration that launched their careers. Vincent D'Onofrio, the actor in *Full Metal Jacket*, firmly believed so: 'Stanley made my career, there's no question about that', despite the filming impacting his physical and mental state and continuously challenging his physical and mental endurance (quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). It was his perseverance that led to triumph and reward.

The film workers' understanding of the 'triumph of the will' (Caldwell, 2008: 38) as a reward is based on their pride at having survived the war. As observed in Kubrick's productions, this narration style is often shared by crew members and, in this way, connects to the concept of the 'project team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 131), as embodied in the collective actions and collaborative practices of the crew. Those workers who continue to work on a Kubrick project till its conclusion, pass the test (the obstacles that the workers faced in the conditions of the creative environment) of their resilience, emotional engagement and will power. Other film workers would fail: they would resign from their position in the crew or were subject to Kubrick's decision to fire them. The latter is an example of an imposed ultimate condition in which the workers had little say. They fell victim to an externally imposed condition that meant their journey was over early on in the fight. Such circumstances inevitably influenced an individual's impressions of, and how they talked about, the experience of working with Kubrick.

Although the stories told vary in specific details, they are told using a similar narration style and often, if juxtaposed, present some intersecting and revealing insights. This study has identified a number of narrative patterns among Kubrick's collaborators. The 'against-all-odds' narratives comprise the testimonies of

workers' collective engagement in 'the cooperative griping about working conditions' (Caldwell, 2008: 38). Stories of challenges to the workers' physical endurance and the resilience of the spirit problematise the workers' engagement in battles for attribution and autonomy; workers' perceptions of the rewards/lessons learnt reveal their understanding of the mystique of film production work, by following a collaborative ethos. Kubrick's co-workers have spoken of collaborative actions undertaken in his productions that demonstrate the role of the individual's emotional engagement in the power of the team ethos. Kubrick's creative environment was undoubtedly strenuous to the extreme and existing stories, partially responsible for the myths regarding Kubrick's filmmaking practice, keep such myths alive (e.g. Tom Cruise getting an ulcer on filming *Eyes Wide Shut* due to the stress). However, there are also stories that shed an alternative light on Kubrick's practice. For example, his supposedly uncompromising nature is challenged by stories about confrontations between Kubrick and his collaborators that show Kubrick's ability to 'step back' and compromise. A focus on war stories has identified the challenges for the crew and the actions that were taken when facing them. War stories have also been a means by which to analyse the complex role of the creative environment in Kubrick's productions and demonstrated the effect of individual and collective fights against the physical and social environmental conditions on the creative process in Kubrick's filmmaking.

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed the influence of the creative (working) environment of the film industry and how it affected the workers in Kubrick's collectives – his crews. I have addressed some of the limitations in a psychological, economic, operational, social and cultural sense and presented the effects of regulators on collaborative work.

The practice of filmmaking is dependent on many factors, which I refer to as environmental conditions, varia and regulators, all gathered under one category, the creative environment, which includes both physical and social dimensions. I have shown how the regulators function and what effect they have through a series of individual stories: interpretations, memories and connotations of events

that took place during Kubrick's productions. Borrowing Caldwell's term 'war stories' (2008: 38), I have developed an argument regarding the meaning of film workers' reflections on their work circumstances and the effect these have had on their understanding of their work and the conditions within which they work. While Caldwell mainly discusses the pedagogical and ethical effects such stories have on individual workers, there are other factors to be considered too. I have also addressed the effects that the regulators have on the social role and development of the worker's career, autonomy and the psychological effects on the workers' attitudes towards the nature of collaboration in Kubrick's filmmaking.

The war-mythos and hero's journey approach to the narration of stories from Kubrick's collaborators has identified the features of Kubrick's creative environment and its regulators. The stories identified individual trials within a demanding physical creative environment – involving remote locations, long shoots, at times even dangerous sets – and the social creative environment – involving economic regulations and available conditions which had an effect on technical possibilities and workers' motivation. Through these narratives, I have explored the role of hierarchy in collaborations and its psychological and social effects on the individual, on their creative process and autonomy. War stories highlighted workers' ability to endure ordeals and overcome challenges to their motivation; they faced these situations by fighting 'against all odds' (Caldwell, 2008: 38). They effectively engaged in cooperation, which resulted in gaining rewarding experiences or learning lessons (which could be negative as well). Engagement also could result in the experience of a well-fought war and the satisfaction of completing the hero's journey. I have shown the significance of the lessons learnt, how they shaped workers' experiences of collaboration with Kubrick and how these experiences, when leaked into the public domain, contributed to the formation of the Kubrick mythology.

The workers' contributions to the group were affected by both external and internal regulators of the creative environment they were subject to and often resulted in conflicts and in undermining their principles and beliefs. These were often resolved productively and had a positive effect on the individual's

motivation and the 'project team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 131), but could also lead to harmful consequences for the individual and the process of collaboration. Repeated conflict and termination of work contracts affected the social and psychological state of the individuals (over-exhaustion of workers like Ken Adam) and the atmosphere and functioning of the collective. The solution to misunderstandings and conflicts often resided in a worker's ability to function within the set restrictions, to comply with them or modify them, for example by negotiating with Kubrick, as Modine and Watson did, and by communicating effectively with other members of the collective.

Although popular myths describe collaborative practices as atypical in Kubrick's productions, they did take place. However, much depended on the individual worker's communication skills, personality, working methods and their willingness to collaborate. If these features were compatible with Kubrick's, there was room for negotiation and even the possibility that Kubrick would relinquish his demands. He could compromise and actively participate in the formation of genuine collaborative relationships in his crew. The result of such practices was rewarding for the collaborators, as they felt their efforts were rewarded and their contribution seen as meaningful. In the process, Kubrick not only achieved satisfying results but also created a circle of trusting and reliable collaborators (and friends) who would continue with him on future filmmaking journeys.

Chapter three: Practical stories

'These guys aren't scientists. They're making shit up as they go along.'

Actor Matthew Modine scribbled the above observation in the diary (2005: 246) he kept during the filming of *Full Metal Jacket*. He is referring to 'guys' in the special effects sector, whom he closely collaborated with during the shoot and highlights the experimenting that was employed in making the film. *Full Metal Jacket* faced many challenges, prolonging the shooting stage to over six months and having to be shut down 'for some twenty plus weeks due to injuries and accidents' (Milsome, quoted in Magid, 1987: 75). The pre-production stage was even longer: 'There's always an awful lot to discuss with Stanley during pre-production because there's so much involved with his films' (Milsome, quoted in Magid, 1987: 75).

Milsome's testimony leads to two observations. Firstly, the production of *Full Metal Jacket* was subjected to complex circumstances which affected the shoot; unexpected events (such as the injuries and accidents sustained by actors) and the challenging environment, which, due to Kubrick's habit of 'inventing his own locations' (Geller, 1990), called for innovative approaches from the whole crew. Secondly, the (pre)production was complex because of Kubrick's way of working. His working practice demanded that the crew pay considerable attention to detail and planning, believed to have been strictly controlled by Kubrick: 'The designer was Anton Furst, but it's generally believed that Kubrick oversees, more than oversees, everything' (Kauffmann, 1987). But there is another factor that connects both observations: the improvisation and experimenting that characterised Kubrick's filmmaking. By charting the pre-production and production of *Full Metal Jacket*, Kubrick's collaboration process will be analysed through focusing on the experimenting and creative practical solutions that were individually and collectively applied by him and his crew. These contributions are crucial in building up an alternative portrayal of the mythicised director, that of Kubrick as a collaborator, who was well aware of his reliance on his crew members' technical competences, their knowledge and their creative inputs, to successfully execute his vision. I argue that Kubrick's openness to other crew members' creative input

and experimenting created space for crew members to engage in searching for creative solutions. 'Stanley was completely and utterly open to free-wheeling. He would always say, 'Well, what do you think? And what do *you* think?'' Vitali told Cian Traynor (2018).

Kubrick's 'insatiable curiosity' (Frewin, quoted in DuVall, 2012) and openness to creative inputs 'from anybody' (Hudson, quoted in *The Visions of Stanley Kubrick*, 2007) enabled effective (although often challenging) collaboration and invention of practical approaches and solutions (and their initiators, authors, executioners). I refer to these discourses as 'practical stories', stories that are about combining existing (traditional) knowledge with innovations and experimental approaches (the creative solutions); they identify the moments of expertise and creativity as an essential functioning characteristic of the crew, not only of the director. I therefore approach these practical stories as indicators of the crew's creative input, mainly from a technological perspective, but also other moments of individual/collective creative initiatives that in hindsight portray the collaborative side of Kubrick's planning and execution of creative ideas. I repeat the leading argument of my thesis, which is that film productions function as a collective body and that the finished film is a result of many creative and innovative inputs from the crew; this is true for Kubrick's collaborations as well. *Practical stories* portray the creative solutions that were found to the challenges that occurred during the pre-production and production stages of filmmaking. They were achieved individually or in collaboration within the department itself, or with other departments (e.g. scenography/setting, props, special effects, the camera department, editing crew).

I have chosen *Full Metal Jacket* as a case study for this chapter because most often it is Kubrick's *2001* (special effects, the complex built set), *Barry Lyndon* (use of NASA lenses, candlelight lighting) and *The Shining* (invention of Steadicam) that are discussed in terms of creative solutions based on innovations and experimenting. *Full Metal Jacket* is generally analysed textually due to the prevailing psychological and philosophical themes, as exemplified in *Stanley Kubrick: Adapting the sublime* (Pezzotta, 2013), 'Full Metal genre: Stanley Kubrick's Vietnam combat movie' by Thomas Doherty (1988), 'Male bonding,

Hollywood orientalism, and the repression of the feminine in Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*' by Susan White (1988), 'Full-Metal-Jacketing, or masculinity in the making' by Paula Willoquet-Maricondi (1994) and 'Full Metal Jacket: The unravelling of patriarchy' by Michael Pursell (1988). The film has also been analysed from a film industry perspective, presented in interviews with the crew and the director. Kubrick debated the film's content and the specifics of the filming with Tim Cahill (1987), Daniele Heymann (1987, in Castle, 2005) and Gene Siskel (1987). Douglas Milsome discussed cinematographic specifics (in Magid, 1987; in DuVall, 2011; in personal interview, 2016) and the atmosphere of the shoot was described by actors (Modine, 2005) and other members of the crew (*Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). In addition, some academic studies have discussed the film's production historically, for example Norman Kagan (2000), James Howard (1999), Alexander Walker et al. (1999), LoBrutto (1999) and Baxter (1997). The most recent work to discuss collaboration from a practical aspect is Karen Ritzenhoff's research of the pre-production process in *Full Metal Jacket*, with a specific focus on the set design (in Ljujić et al., 2015). Ritzenhoff starts her research from a similar perspective to mine, that is, she focuses on the unusual location choice as the origin of the challenge, revealing some of the stories that came out about the set building, but then abandons the historical research approach and moves into textual analysis. The practical stories about *Full Metal Jacket*'s pre-production and production practice do not only elaborate on specific technical solutions and moments of experimenting/creativity that occurred when facing the challenges of recreating a 'war zone' (personal interview with Milsome, 2016) in an urban environment (and not a specially designed studio/film set). They also reveal the discourses surrounding the creative inputs. The leading argument is that, in making his location choice, Kubrick was well aware that collaboration was essential to meet the resulting challenges. He knew collaborators would need the space to express their creative input, collectively contributing their knowledge in finding innovative technical and creative solutions and to experiment.

This argument is contrary to the widespread discussion on Kubrick's practical creative process. Titles such as 'Kubrick's technical innovations' (White R., 2012), Kubrick as a 'technical genius', 'How Stanley Kubrick built atmosphere

with diegetic sound' (Fusco, 2016) support the widespread notion that choices and solutions to practical challenges of the shoot were made and found by the director only. Yet some of his collaborators testify to Kubrick realising that he depended on the technical knowledge and creative input of his crew: 'If he could focus he would also do it himself, but he couldn't, so I had to be there for that' (Milsome, quoted at *The British Society of Cinematographers* conference, 2016). The practical stories that this chapter analyses will provide insights into such moments, in which these realisations manifested, how they came about and how they affected the process of collaboration. Specific practically/technically challenging situations occurring in the film's production will be analysed to identify the discourses around the innovations and individual creative input, thereby demonstrating their crucial role in the process of pre-production and production of *Full Metal Jacket*. With this, Kubrick's 'Gordon Ramsey equivalent' nature (Vitali, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017) and his 'relentless, ridiculous perfectionism' (Freer, 2018) will be juxtaposed with the identified individual and collective creative inputs and Kubrick's openness to experimental (unplanned) approaches in the production of the film.

Full Metal Jacket

Full Metal Jacket is famous for its innovative approach in designing a very complex set in an urban environment. Ritzenhoff describes the film as 'a realistic representation of the theatre of war', in comparison with the war environment that *Apocalypse Now* (1979) portrayed (in Ljujić et al., 2015: 328). *Full Metal Jacket*, a film that attempted 'to say what *Apocalypse* never did' (Milsome, quoted in DuVall, 2011), was intentionally chosen to be shot in a completely different physical environment in comparison with some other war films made in that period, e.g. Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse Now* and Oliver Stone's *Platoon* (1986). The two iconic war films are famous for the realism of the portrayal of the physical environment they were set in. *Apocalypse Now* was filmed in the Philippines jungle. In comparison to the latter two war films, *Full Metal Jacket* was filmed in London, recreating Vietnam on an existing location owned by British Gas, the Beckton site (Howard, 1999). The location was 'absolutely perfect' for Kubrick: 'There might be some other place in the world like it, but I'd

hate to have to look for it. I think even if we had gone to Hue, we couldn't have created that look. I know we couldn't have' (Kubrick, quoted in Grove, 1987).

When asked by Daniele Heymann if a large amount of technical research had to be done in advance of the shooting, Kubrick replied: 'Nothing very special' (quoted in Heymann, 1987 in Castle 2005: 731). This, of course, is not entirely true, and the analysis of the pre-production and production stages of the film will elaborate on the moments where the experimental factor, innovations and individual initiatives impacted the film's production and essentially contributed to the success of the creative project.

Pre-production

Full Metal Jacket's pre-production stage is divided into two sections: research and planning (involving the choice of film locations). The next step is creating the set. This sub-chapter focuses on Kubrick's collaborative practice, which at this stage exhibits features of hierarchical but also complementary collaboration. Further elaboration will demonstrate that while Kubrick at times engaged in both forms of collaboration simultaneously, at other times, he was entirely immersed in one form of collaboration. The analysis of the research and planning stage in this section is predicated on a division of the sociocultural environment that the creative industry functions in into the core and periphery. I will discuss how Kubrick manoeuvred between them, also creating an intermediate space in which creative contributions were most likely to occur. The set building section will build upon these concepts and analyse how they were applied when the crew grew and demonstrate how the collaborative process incorporated more sectors. It is also a stage in which Kubrick possibly exerted less control, because the pre-production process expanded its focus on other preparations such as casting, costumes and preparations for filming (e.g. discussions with the cinematographer regarding lighting). My analysis of this stage will identify hierarchical and complementary collaboration and planned and experimental filmmaking in Kubrick's practices.

As argued in *Origin Stories,* Kubrick adopted a strategy of hierarchical division of power among his crews and a *divide and rule* strategy. He divided control (in

120

terms of giving instructions and supervising the execution of work) between the leaders of the sectors, who then followed the rules that traditionally exist in a hierarchal division system of production practice (e.g. construction manager supervising the construction workers, prop buyer answering to the art directors or assistant director following the instructions of the director). Kubrick carefully thought through the strategy in the communication and work assignments division among his crew:

> However, I keep trying and keep coming up with new systems, new means of displaying information, remembering, reminding, following up. I risk my popularity with some of my department heads by continually pressing home the point that merely giving an order to somebody in only a fraction of their job, that their principal responsibility in to see that the order is carried out accurately, on time, and within the budget.
>
> (1971, quoted in Walker et al., 1999: 38-39)

Kubrick's words illustrate his practice of constant checking, even 'pressing' the sector leaders to control how the jobs were being executed by their sector, making sure they would be finished in time and within budget. The collaboration between Kubrick and Anton Furst, the production designer, is an example. Furst recalled always working closely with the director and described Kubrick's tendency to work in small teams of his closest collaborators: 'He works with the smallest crews. In real terms, I'd say he only talks with myself and Dougie Milsome – the lighting and cameraman, the director of photography – and then through us to other people' (quoted in Geller, 1990). This description suggests a traditional working structure but I argue that Kubrick's practice diverged from the 'traditional' producer/director structure in important ways, exhibiting hierarchical and complementary collaboration. The intertwining of the two forms of collaboration is, at some stages, more detectable than at others, depending on production details.

Robert L. Olson describes the traditional process of decision-making in the sector of production design: 'Production designers and art directors need ways to communicate building information to cost estimators and construction shops' (1999: 13), and this was the practice in Kubrick's productions too. For example, *Full Metal Jacket*'s art producers Keith Pain, Rod Stratfold and Leslie Tomkins would receive the documentation and precise financial calculations for purchases from their prop buyers. They would then forward the information to the unit production manager, Bill Shepherd, and the co-producer Phillip Hobbs, always addressing the faxes with 'attention to' Kubrick, thus confirming his decision-making role and involvement in the organisation of the pre-production. This hierarchy is usual in film productions and essentially separates the creative work from organisational and administrative aspects. But Kubrick's practice of hierarchical and complementary collaboration meant that the two forms of collaboration intertwined in places, creating an intermediate creative space in which some of his collaborators were able to combine both organisational and creative roles. These intermediate spaces were central to the process and they continued to be in use throughout the pre-production and production.

Gino Cattani and Simone Ferriani develop the idea of intermediate space as a space between 'the core' and 'the periphery of the social system' (2008: 826). They adopt Stephen P. Borgatti and Martin G. Everett's definition of the intermediate positions of specific individuals as positions between the core as 'a cohesive subgroup of core actors' and the periphery as 'a set of peripheral actors that are loosely connected to the core' (Cattani and Ferriani, 2008: 826). Such a structure can be identified in Kubrick's crews. He had a small circle of close collaborators (the core) while other workers (e.g. painters, construction workers) represented the periphery. The intermediate collaborators combined both creative and organisational roles in the production and were the communicators between Kubrick and the periphery. They would supervise the working process but also enable creativity to flow among the crew. Kubrick's intermediates were his personal assistants Vitali, Frewin, D'Alessandro and Hunter, but also other individuals with organisational tasks (e.g. the production manager, the art directors) – individual crew members that came from 'both ends of the core/periphery continuum' (Cattani and Ferriani, 2008: 825). Kubrick appointed

them to these positions precisely because of their capability to function as intermediates.

Kubrick's practice of attributing more than one role to a single worker indicates his inclination to minimise his 'core' crew, but was also very likely a financial choice and a trust issue. Many of Kubrick's collaborators, mainly his close assistants, would combine more than one job. Vitali, for example, was a personal assistant, organiser, actor, acting coach, archivist and a distributor. 'You kinda had to be everywhere at once. It was just one of those things where Stanley utilised me in any way he thought would be effective and would work' (Vitali, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017). Hunter's job surpassed his original work of an editor as well:

> I was actually intimately involved in all of that because prior to the shooting of *Full Metal Jacket* I did a lot of location scouting for the film and I spent two months in Belize in Central America and sent back like, 20 hours of videotape and 100 rolls of 35mm slide film, and we were looking for locations that Stanley intended to use as background plates. There was a sense in which we modelled east London on Belize because I had been looking for these Vietnam-type locations there, and then in the six months before we started shooting I was very much involved in finding all those military bases: I went and videotaped every military base within 50 miles of London.

> (quoted in Lunn, 2014)

Kubrick's decision to use his assistants to manage as many jobs as possible also ensured that his closest collaborators exercised his control. The basic roles of the crew were divided by sector (e.g. props, location scouts, wardrobe, casting). Sectors were supervised by the sector leaders who would then report and collaborate with Kubrick's assistants – or, at times, with Kubrick himself. While this kind of hierarchal structure is usual in filmmaking (specifically the

Hollywood studio system[10]) and Kubrick did employ it, he combined it by creating the intermediate space in which complementary collaboration could take place. Complementary collaboration in the intermediate space enabled Kubrick to disperse control and grant creative freedom to his co-workers. I will demonstrate how this occurred in practice. While Kubrick is mythicised as controlling all the decisions made in the (pre)production process, for example by Ritzenhoff claiming that every element of the mise-en-scene was approved by Kubrick himself (in Ljujić et al., 2015), I will demonstrate that individual creative initiatives and logistic/organisational decisions were taken by other crew members, and this with Kubrick's approval.

To conclude, Kubrick's collaboration practice exhibits characteristics of the traditional hierarchical division of roles (and their responsibilities), but also characteristics of complementary collaboration, which was enabled by Kubrick delegating and allowing the contribution of ideas and creative inputs of his co-workers. How hierarchical and complementary collaboration functioned in practice will be first analysed in the research and planning stage, where organisational practices met the creative process.

Research and planning

Before the location was chosen, incredibly thorough research on war films about Vietnam began, as was explained by Hunter (Lunn, 2014) above. An analysis of the research stage illustrates Kubrick's practice of assigning responsibility and authority to his co-workers to carry out specific activities but also demonstrates the extent to which he was involved in the process. Practical stories from the research stage describe a detailed process of location research carried out by Kubrick's close collaborators and the director himself. Practical stories from the planning stage are analysed through their main source – the pre-production meetings. These meetings, described in the art department diary from the Stanley Kubrick Archive, are juxtaposed with the production designer's own account of his creative input in the preparation stage, his drawings and blueprints. The sub-chapter discusses these stories with regards to the delegated division of creative labour. It identifies moments of individual creative input, where they occurred and

---

[10] More can be found in Douglas Gomery's *The Hollywood studio system: A history* (2005).

how the pre-production process was affected by both the hierarchical and complementary collaboration practised in the intermediate space, created by the director.

The collaboration process early on in the research stage proved to be very complex and many locations were researched (e.g. an airport camp in Belize, SK/16/2/2/33/14, 1984) in great detail. Kubrick's archive demonstrates various research sources: videos/films and images of USA Marine, army and government activities (SK/16/2/1/2/13, 1983; SK/16/2/1/2/14, 1984) and various articles, among them a review of *Apocalypse Now* (SK/16/2/1/2/2, 1979), which trace the research back to 1983. Much of the video material was studied by Kubrick himself, as is evident from his handwritten comments on the watched videos in 1984 (SK/16/2/12), but the process of research did not necessarily run hierarchically. Sometimes, Kubrick watched the research material first and, if he believed it to be usable, he forwarded it to his intermediates. The intermediates also shared their research with him. The latter process can be seen as a confirmation of Kubrick's hierarchal position, but Kubrick's research demonstrates his involvement in a two way process that can be described as complementary collaboration.

Furst recalled the vast amount of the material that had to be looked at: 'We saw about 6,000 photographs of the Vietnam War. We took what we thought were the most powerful images with the most impact' (quoted in Geller, 1990). Reference to collective research, including himself, confirms Furst's involvement in group work and also leads to an interesting observation: in doing the research, Furst places himself in the intermediate space. Despite being a sector leader, which would officially position him as 'core', Furst collaborated with Kubrick and other assistants in the process, which also suggests that Kubrick too entered the intermediate space. Collaboration in the true meaning of the word is, therefore, evident at this stage. Of course, the final decision was Kubrick's, but this does not change the fact that he collaborated with the intermediates. This shifting between the decision-maker and researcher challenges the myth of Kubrick merely delegating and demonstrates that, at the research stage, he also functioned as part of the collective.

After comparing thousands of photos of the original city of Hue with the original signs, billboards and architecture (Kagan, 2000; LoBrutto, 1999) and the considered location of Beckton docks, Kubrick's collaborative practice shifted from complementary to hierarchical, asserting his decision-making role, making a choice and launching the production design. Once the latter began, Kubrick stepped away from the process, engaging with other pre-production work that had to be done (e.g. casting the actors, considering the costumes), leaving the production design room to create. The pre-production meetings constituted the first step, and were a space involving mostly intermediates, collectively planning the pre-production.

The pre-production meetings expanded the circle of collaborators; more sectors joined the pre-planning process and new intermediates became crucial to leading the collective. The pre-production meetings were a place of exchange of creative and organisational inputs between Furst and art directors Keith Pain, Rod Stratfold and Leslie Tomkins, who can be seen as intermediates because of their multiple roles. They were responsible for the administrative and organisational work in the department (the documentation, organisation and precise calculations of costs, schedules), but they also creatively contributed by, for example, creating prop lists together with intermediates like Anthony Frewin. Pre-production meetings, however, were guided by hierarchical decision-making, as evidenced by the presence of co-producer Phillip Hobbs. Hobbs very likely closely communicated with Kubrick. The suggestions and decisions travelled a communicative path that is difficult to define, because the faxes vary in addressees, usually including the art producers and Kubrick, sometimes Phillip Hobbs and often Bill Shepherd. It is, therefore, in the intermediate space that the planning can be observed to be in process and this is certainly the case with Furst. Furst's references to his involvement in the preparations, e.g. creating drawings, blueprints and sketches, by closely collaborating with Kubrick (in Geller, 1990), would mean that Furst was included in the 'core' of Kubrick's production. However, the communication between them was not always direct, but included intermediates who guided the pre-production process and communicated with Furst (on Kubrick's behalf). I will demonstrate this point by challenging Furst's own account – his creative practical story – with material from the archive.

Kubrick's communication through intermediates can be observed in the pre-production meetings chaired by Hobbs and production manager Bill Shepherd, who reported to Kubrick and then forwarded Kubrick's replies to the specific workers, instructing further development. For example, at a meeting in 1985, Shepherd and Hobbs delivered Kubrick's response to one of the worker's decision regarding a plastic plant in writing: 'Stanley Kubrick thought Adrian's [art director] technical advice dubious' (SK/16/2/8). As stated above, the instructions from Kubrick were addressed to Furst, too; Furst was also often ordered to redo his drawings, as can be observed in notes in the art department's diary, detailing the tasks to be executed by specific crew members: 'Redraw ext. pagoda courtyard', 'detail De Nang balcony' (SK/16/2/3/7, 1985). It can, therefore, be concluded that, contrary to Furst's self-perception as being a part of Kubrick's core, in the pre-production stage, he was a part of the intermediate space since he attended the meetings with other sectors and was subjected to the same process as other individuals from different sectors included in the pre-production. Once Kubrick approved his drawings, the division of work again followed the hierarchical process. The drawings were made into blueprints and were forwarded to the execution crew: the construction manager, George Crawford, his assistant Joe Martin, draughtsman Philip Elton, supervising painter John Chapple. Orders to build were then given to workers like the carpenters, painters and plasterers. The execution workers followed the construction manager's instructions, who executed the demands of the production managers, after they had gathered the list of jobs to be done; the list was created collaboratively between the intermediates (art directors, Furst) and Kubrick (directly or through Hobbs and Shepherd).

Due to the evolving nature of the pre-production process, pre-production meetings took place regularly. Research was carried out and preparations made in the art production sector, in a continuous production design process that was the outcome of a complex collaboration in the sector and between sectors. Meeting notes do not indicate that Kubrick was present but his close assistants were, and in this way, supervised the development of the project. The lists of jobs to be done, detailed in the art department diary (SK/16/2/3/7, 1985), were a result of the pre-production meetings and collaboration between the art directors, Furst and other production design assistants and through communication with Kubrick, guided by

his final decisions. Individual and collective creative moments occurring in the intermediate space indicate that creative freedom was granted to the crew, who also had a certain amount of autonomy in planning without Kubrick's direct involvement. Kubrick became physically involved when the construction of the set began. At that stage, his control and hierarchical communication style with his collaborators gave way to a more complementary collaboration.

Creating the set

'Creating the look' of Vietnam in an urban setting required various creative choices to be made in terms of building the set and the crew employed a range of creative practical solutions in the form of improvisations and experimenting to create it. Through this process of experimenting and improvising, Kubrick engaged in a complementary collaboration with his crew, in which individuals' knowledge, experiences and ideas became central to the process. Kubrick's complementary collaboration can be seen in his contribution to the set building.

> I don't think anybody's ever had a set like that. It's beyond any kind of economic possibility. To make that kind of three-dimensional rubble, you'd have to have everything done by plasterers, modelled, and you couldn't build that if you spent $80 million and had five years to do it. You couldn't duplicate, oh, all those twisted bits of reinforcement. And to make rubble, you'd have to go find some real rubble and copy it. It's the only way. If you're going to make a tree, for instance, you have to copy a real tree. No one can 'make up' a tree, because every tree has an inherent logic in the way it branches. And I've discovered that no one can make up a rock. I found that out in *Paths of Glory.* We had to copy rocks, but every rock also has an inherent logic you're not aware of until you see a fake rock. Every detail looks right, but something's wrong.

> (Kubrick, quoted in Cahill, 1987)

Kubrick's knowledge about rock modelling came from his previous war film and in this quote he reminds Cahill of his pre-existing practical expertise. Stressing that the challenge could not have been resolved better with a higher budget, he asserts his inventiveness and creativity. This said, he does also repeatedly refer to the crew as a unit, stressing the collective action that was needed to execute the work. The contrast is intriguing: Kubrick's collaborative attitude in the creative process is clearly expressed, but his specific production design input (although its origin is not clearly specified and was probably only gained by experience) is stressed to reassert the portrayal of himself as uniquely inventive and creative. This could also be read as Kubrick's attempt to take creative credit, which *Full Metal Jacket*'s actor Kevyn Major Howard recognises: 'No, the set was not small, and had tremendous personality thanks to Stanley's talents,' (quoted in MacIntyre, 2007). But such claims deny other crew members' 'talents'. As discussed in *War stories*, individual crew members were unhappy with Kubrick taking credit for the inventive work of other collaborators (e.g. Kubrick accepting *2001*'s special effects Oscar) and this will be addressed at the end of the chapter. This section, however, focuses on analysing the complex set of circumstances and actions that occurred during the set-building.

Choosing Beckton as a local location resulted in significant financial savings compared with moving the crew to Asia, and so the production was able to invest more into the building and dressing of the set. 'All we had to do was dress it up, put signs on it and blow it up,' said Vitali (quoted in Wise, 2017) when describing the workload of the production design. However, the process was not quite so straightforward. Kubrick's set building was subject to different conditions regarding the locations and, therefore, pre-production involved different creative decisions that Kubrick and his crew had to make. Both hierarchical and complementary collaboration can be seen at this stage. The collaborative effort and communication were remarkable and kept the creative process running. Many sectors were involved, both 'above-the-line' and 'below-the-line' workers (Caldwell, 2008: 38) collectively engaged in the search for solutions. In parallel, the hierarchical element ensured that the work was organised. This sub-chapter addresses how the combination of hierarchal and complementary collaboration

functioned in practice, where they intertwined and how they kept shifting, thereby illustrating Kubrick's role in this exchange of creative ideas and input.

A complementary approach to collaboration can be detected in Kubrick's references to the collective nature of work. When describing the set-building process, Kubrick spoke in the plural: 'We did little things, details people don't notice right away, that add to the illusion. All in all, a tremendous set dressing and rubble job' (quoted in Cahill, 1987). He was referring to the crew and, importantly, himself, as a collective, thereby encouraging the 'team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011), motivating the crew and recognising their input in the project. Such collaboration can be understood as an exchange of equal contribution (in terms of ethos, not in terms of the actual quantity of the input). At the same time, the hierarchical element can be observed in Furst 'walking around' and giving orders on 'how to cut down the pillars to make the buildings fall to the correct side' (Ward, quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007), guiding the process of re-working the set. Stratfold would then issue Crawford, the construction manager, the 'orders to construction' (SK/16/2/3/13, 1985), which specified the daily tasks to be carried out by the specific sub-sector of the construction team (SK/16/2/3/11, 1985). These sub-sectors were the execution team of carpenters, painters, stagehands and riggers (SK/16/2/3/9, 1985). Crawford would then report back to Stratfold on the jobs completed (SK/16/2/3/12, 1985). By again establishing the hierarchical control over the work, Kubrick incorporated Furst into his smaller unit of close collaborators. For that reason, Kubrick created an environment in which he was able to closely collaborate with the sector leaders, partly by physically detaching the sector leader from the 'periphery' (Cattani and Ferriani, 2008: 826). Furst recalled Kubrick's frustration with the peripheral space when coming to discuss the planning to Furst's '50-foot room':

> I saw him just go – like that. He walked out of the port-a-
> cabin without saying a word. Rung me up from outside on
> his car phone and said, 'I just want you to come out and
> meet me in the car for a minute, you've got to get your
> own office. We'll have another port-a-cabin brought down.

I cannot, I cannot talk in there.' He's like that. He has to be

in an intense, small unit and then he's happy.

(quoted in Geller, 1990)

The smaller units allowed Kubrick to engage in the creative process with his closest collaborators without facing the 'noise' of the periphery and, at the same time, assured him that the collaborators from this unit employed a 'divide et impera' strategy in the departments outside his small unit. With this practice, Kubrick again returned to employing the intermediates, which ensured that the collaboration in the 'outer' sectors functioned well without his direct interference. I will elaborate on how a similar hierarchical-complementary collaboration operated in the production design sector, where the work was controlled hierarchically while at the same time allowing room for individual creative input. I specifically focus on the planning of the props.

At the stage of dressing the set, the props people were given instructions in the form of lists created by a group of intermediates, namely Nigel Phelps (the assistant art director), Andrew Rothschild (the assistant art director), Rod Stratfold, and were supervised by Philip Kohler (the general production manager), and Anton Furst. The art department diary (SK/16/2/3/7, 1985) records the communication process between the intermediates/sector leaders and the periphery. For example, the diary's instructions to the construction sector list 14 men who were given the assignment to help with unloading the banana, bamboo and vine plants and palm trees that came for set dressing (SK/16/2/3/6, 1985). The instructions are precise about which plants were to go where and how to access them. They are based on the prop lists, which were created after the breakdown of the script, but are also a clear indicator of the evolving/changing nature of the creative process. As such, they show that there was enough creative space for the crew involved to contribute their creative ideas and solutions to the given tasks. The prop lists included vehicles, dressing props and graphics items (letters, newspapers, posters). They were initially facilitated by Anthony Frewin, working at the research stage. His list includes details of their origin, clearly stating which of the props he would provide himself, obtaining them from the UK or the US (SK/16/2/3/16, 1985). I refer to the list as 'initial' because it states that some of

them are 'only educated guesses' (SK/16/2/3/16, 1985), so changes were expected. The changes demonstrate the progress of the creative process and new creative inputs resulted in additional lists. Stratfold prepared a list for Parris Island barracks (SK/16/2/3/17, 1985), specifying the quantity and items needed, at which stage an alternative creative choice was made by Adrian Smith, who decided against a purchase and instead borrowed furniture from a depot in London (SK/16/2/3/6, 1985). This is an example where an individual's creative input (and a practical solution) positively contributed to the working process. Smith's contribution affected the pre-production in the sense that an alternative creative choice an individual had made led to a financial saving. Kubrick's openness to alternative individual suggestions can be attributed, as in the case above, to the management of the film's budget and the attention to achieving the most realistic results. Kubrick had previously demonstrated this in the costume design for *Barry Lyndon*, where, for example, costumes were also searched for in Italy and Vienna (SK/14/2/5/5, 1973).

Full Metal Jacket's other props, like weaponry and uniforms, are detailed in a list that Frewin had acquired from an individual who was in the Vietnam army, detailing clothes, hats, guns, shirts and information on army boots (SK/16/8/3/32, 1983). As discussed before, Frewin would make lists by combining creative inputs from several individuals, among them Keith Denny, *Full Metal Jacket*'s costume designer, who focused on Vietnamese peasant clothing (SK/16/8/3/23, 1984). These props and costumes are reported to have been obtained from Charley Biggs' 'Charley's Militaria' shop (*The New York Times*, 1987: C14). However, Biggs admitted to not having all of the props available (1987: C14) despite his team doing thorough research, so some of the uniforms were purchased by Kubrick's art directors in shops around London that sold second-hand military uniforms (D'Alessandro in Ulivieri, 2016). Obtaining props thus involved a collaboration between Biggs and Kubrick's production design sector, specifically his intermediates – the art directors and Kubrick's assistants. In this way, Kubrick was still absent from the intermediate space, leaving room for the individuals working in it to engage in the creative process without his direct interference. The reason for Kubrick's absence was that his attention was needed elsewhere,

planning other elements of the pre-production such as casting the actors. However, this kind of multi-tasking proved to be stressful for Kubrick.

With the principal day of photography approaching, the stress had started to reflect in Kubrick's communication with the intermediates. Furst's account indicates that Kubrick entered the intermediate space shortly before the filming began. 'The worst aspect is the couple of months before shooting, when he realizes that in eight weeks' time he's going to have to go out… So he starts causing problems, anything so that he can put it back. He'll start disliking everything you do so that he can actually hold it up' (Furst, quoted in Geller, 1990). The myth about Kubrick's tyrannical disposition might originate from the experiences his co-workers had with him at this stage of the filmmaking. According to the stories, Kubrick's demands would begin to intensify towards the end of the pre-production process, affecting the crew in various departments, and would then ease off in the production phase: 'Once we were shooting, it all got easier. Then he had to concentrate on a hundred crew members, and not just me' (Furst, quoted in Geller, 1990). Kubrick's interventions consisting of attempts to control the process of pre-production in its final stages can be seen as hierarchical, while in the production, he transitioned into a more complementary collaboration.

In conclusion, the analysis of *Full Metal Jacket*'s pre-production process demonstrates Kubrick's varying employment of hierarchal and complementary collaboration. In the initial research stage, he would delegate duties between his assistants, but also included himself in the work process. At the planning stage, Kubrick minimised the division between the 'core' and the 'periphery' (Cattani and Ferriani, 2008: 826) by establishing an intermediate space in which the intermediates engaged in the planning. While he was still being informed of the outcomes of the pre-production meetings and did make final decisions on the proposals, it was the intermediates who were involved in the creative process and who searched for solutions to the challenges. It is at the set-building stage, when the crew began to increase in numbers and other sectors (such as the building crew) got involved, that Kubrick became involved directly, by being physically present at the site. During this stage, he combined hierarchical and complementary collaboration. He retained the hierarchal structure of command/work division

through his sector leaders, allowing them to organise the work process of the units and employing the intermediates to supervise it. At the same time, his working practice began to be more complementary: he would involve the crew members (and he himself got involved) in the search for creative solutions to practical challenges; in this process, he would engage them in the exchange of knowledge, experiences and the free flow of creative inputs. These complementary collaboration features became even more evident once production began.

Production: Originality, experimenting and decisions

Kubrick's crew employed many resourceful solutions, which, contrary to the myth surrounding Kubrick, testify to the director's openness to the sectors experimenting in the search for solutions. For example, John Ward, Steadicam operator, disputed the popular image of Kubrick as the all-controller who did not allow room for individual creative inputs from other people: 'Although everybody used to think Stanley was very precise about his filmmaking, he used to experiment more than people realise' (quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). It was Kubrick's enthusiasm for technical innovations that encouraged experimentation on the set and encouraged the crew to solve the challenges that occurred. 'Kubrick was a technology freak who loved gadgets. Christiane says she and her daughter can't enter a computer shop without feeling a little tearful: "He loved all of his gadgets and toys. It was another reason why he didn't like going on holiday – he didn't want to be parted from them,"' Kubrick's widow, Christiane Kubrick, told Chris Hastings (2008). This sub-chapter looks at stories that illustrate Kubrick's openness to technical innovations, probably informing his willingness to experiment. I present situations in which he enforced control over the production process (on the set) but also moments where he was challenged, stepped back and applied other people's creative inputs in the production. The practical stories presented are technically detailed stories that occurred in the camera and sound department.

The Beckton set was demanding on both the actors and the crew and the collective faced many difficulties and challenges in managing it. As already mentioned in *War stories*, Modine describes the difficulties of the set in terms of chemicals in the air, lungs full of smoke and cold (2005). Therefore, understandably, the

creative process did not run smoothly and issues arose, demanding creative solutions for shooting to continue. The creative solutions were a result of various sectors collaborating, contributing their technical knowledge and applying innovations to solve the issues. It needs to be said that not all technical solutions included a technical novelty; for example, the use of a 'tracking' car was a reworked vehicle of Kubrick's that, by being pushed along by the crew, enabled smoother movement in tracking shots. It had already been employed on *Barry Lyndon* (Milsome in Magid, 1987) but experimenting with other vehicles, such as a motorbike (Baxter, 1997), introduced new solutions. I will analyse a few collaborative moments that illustrate a complex collaboration of the special effects crew, construction sector, props and camera sector in coming up with a solution, demonstrating both individual creative inputs and the collective effort/collaboration employed by the crew (and Kubrick) to execute it.

The *Full Metal Jacket* scene in which Private Eightball is shot by the girl sniper was planned by Kubrick to be shot in three days (Modine, 2005), but was so complicated that it took three weeks. Complications and delays arose because every time the bullets were shot, they would get stuck in the buildings behind the soldiers and, due to continuity, needed to be taken out, which took two days each time (Ward in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil,* 2007). Kubrick was very specific about why the scene was so challenging:

> Each time it took the special effects people two days to
> link up each of the charges on the buildings to electric
> cables, which were then plugged into a control box. So it
> took two days each time, ten men working two days, just to
> set up a new shot. We had three thousand charges, three
> thousand explosions going off at the same time, for a shot
> that lasts ten seconds…

> (quoted in Heymann, 1987 in Castle, 2005)

The same scene represented a challenge for the camera sector; in order to solve it, a new technical solution was tried out involving a unique slow-motion technique for filming the scene. This practical story is an example of the existing

technical knowledge of the camera crew (and Kubrick) being upgraded by experimenting with the camera.

When the girl sniper in the film turns around and starts shooting at the soldiers, the flames of the fire 'seem almost to eat into her face as they bleed in from the background' (Milsome, quoted in Magid, 1987). To achieve this, the film was slowed down, and the shutter was set out of synch with the motion of the film, which meant that the film was moving while it was exposing and the girl sniper is moving while the flames appear to be still (Milsome in Magid, 1987). The collaboration between the special effects department controlling the explosions and the proximity of the flames and the camera sector experimenting with the shutter, produced a shot that has become famous enough to make this unique technical solution considered for future analogue film cinematography. Milsome explains how, years later, when *Saving Private Ryan* (1998) was being filmed, the DOP Janusz Kaminski called him to ask how it was done (in DuVall, 2011).

This practical story reveals that experimenting with filming techniques was likely based on Kubrick's fascination with technological innovation. 'Legendary director Stanley Kubrick was known to be obsessed with cameras and pushing the limits of cinematic technology, with much of his technical awareness stemming from his days as a stills photographer,' Lars Rehm writes (2016). However, he was not only enthusiastic about cinematographic technology, but appeared to be interested in new gimmicks in other sectors too. Edward Tise, the sound recordist, described a novelty he brought to the production that impressed Kubrick so much that it even got him a job on *Full Metal Jacket*:

> Stanley had a long relationship with Nagra and [Nagra founder] Stephan Kudelski, and had several Nagra recorders of his own, which I was to use on the movie. But he didn't have a proper mixing console. I had never even used a mixer other than the little three-channel SQN. But the next day I rented a car, drove to Switzerland, met Jacque Sax, and bought a Sonosax mixer. It was one of the first SX-S10 models ever made. And the next day I started on *Full Metal Jacket*.

Kubrick's fascination with the Nagra machine was possibly what lay behind his decision to hire Tise. Alternatively, his willingness to experiment also reveals another perspective.

Despite the myth of Kubrick as 'the auteur who knows how to do everyone's job and is perfect at it', he was not technically/practically proficient in 'everyone's job' (Baxter, 1997: 344). The following technically detailed practical story features a confrontation between Ward and Kubrick regarding technical expertise in measuring the exposure, demonstrating that Kubrick lacked some technical knowledge, and it is at that point that his collaborators needed to intervene or act on their behalf. The story demonstrates that, had his collaborators not been confident in their technical knowledge, a mistake could have been made that would have caused significant complications later when developing the film in the laboratory, making the filmed material on that film stock unusable.

Ward explains the challenge: 'As an example, the film speed we used was 400 ASA. We didn't use the standard 85 filter, because Stanley wanted the washed-out look of Vietnam combat photography. The sun is always shining but there's often thin cloud, so you get the soft look of a wet climate' (quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). When he asked Kubrick for the speed at which he wanted to rate the film, Kubrick said '640 ASA', to which Ward replied: 'So you're over-rating it slightly?' But Kubrick was confident: 'No, that's normal. We're not using the 85 filter so it's two thirds of a stop faster'. Ward protested: 'Hang on, it's two thirds of a stop slower with the 85… and I looked over his shoulder, and Doug Milsome was shaking his head at me, as if to say, "I've had this conversation, and it's no use"' (Ward, quoted in Baxter, 1997: 344). Milsome later shed light on the employed technical solution. Not following Kubrick's instructions, he rated the film at 800 ASA speed 'all the way through' in order to achieve a 'milkier, less solid blacks and grays, which documentary film tends to have' (quoted in Magid, 1987). This explains Kubrick's technical miscalculation; the original Kodak 400T film did not change the speed rate automatically while shooting without a filter (as Kubrick had claimed), as it would have only changed in the opposite direction – if the filter had been put in, consequently lowering the

rate. The camera sector's technical knowledge enabled the correct result, indicating how the cinematography sector had a work process running that Kubrick did not control, precisely due to not having sufficient knowledge in every technical aspect. The significance of this discussion is not to determine 'who was right', but as an illustration of the communication style in this exchange of technical knowledge, the confrontations regarding whose input to choose and the effect such collisions had on the production, on the individual crew members and on collaboration. Actor Kevyn Major Howard recalled 'moments on set when Mr. Milsome and Stanley would discuss albeit bravado about a particular shot' (quoted in MacIntyre, 2007). Milsome wittingly identified how these confrontational discussions affected the length of the shoot, referring to the 'Paralysis – analysis' effect (quoted at *The British Society of Cinematographers* conference, 2016).

As this example demonstrates, based on his perfectionism and insistence on 'being right', which Garrett Brown referred to as 'a very large ego about what he knew about things' (quoted in DuVall, 2011), Kubrick at times himself created obstacles causing complications in the production. His persistence on his vision/understanding often caused collisions with his collaborators. Some would negotiate, some would step back and some would challenge him on his vision, which could result in Kubrick stepping back and embracing the suggested solution, or result in Kubrick insisting on his vision/idea to the point of firing that specific individual. The following practical story presents a collision that ended in the collaborator leaving the production.

Due to a previous collaboration with the Steadicam pioneer Garrett Brown on *The Shining*, Kubrick opted for him again for *Full Metal Jacket*, but Brown declined; instead, Ward was hired to operate the Steadicam and 'ten other cameras which he operated most days' (Ward, quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). The complex set presented difficulties for Ward when filming the scenes with helicopters. He had problems executing the shots because the propeller and dust from the helicopter almost 'knocked him over' (Ward, quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007). After many attempts, Kubrick concluded that he needed a bulkier man who would withstand the wind. He once again contacted Brown, who again turned him down due to prior commitments, but

suggested another operator instead – Jean-Marc Bringuier, and Kubrick chose to follow Brown's advice. But Bringuier was also not able to execute the intense shot without affecting camera movement and suggested that they attach the camera to the sidecar of a motorcycle. After this, the bulldozer smoothed the ground and the shots were filmed. The entire crew watched the results later in rushes and saw that this technique had failed to produce an image that was steady enough for Kubrick. According to Baxter (1997: 347), Kubrick supposedly said: 'The motorcycle goes.' When Bringuier protested, Kubrick added: 'And you can go with it' (Baxter, 1997: 347). This story of a clash of minds indicates that not all experimenting produced positive results. However, the failed attempt in finding a successful practical solution was not necessarily the reason for the dispute. The underlying problem might have been the communication style that Bringuier adopted. After all, in other collaborative moments between Kubrick and his co-workers, Kubrick granted freedom of creative expression – or, at least, the free flow of their creative input.

Kubrick's sound recordist, Tise, was encouraged to express his ideas; in fact, Kubrick even 'expected' him to do so: 'I learned to think about what the actor was doing and what the actor was saying. And if I could possibly influence that, and chose the time well, I could maybe make a few suggestions – either to Stanley or the actors – and I was expected to' (Tise, quoted in Trew, 2013). Tise juxtaposes two somewhat contradictory actions, referring to Kubrick's expectations on the one hand and on the other, indicating that collaborators did not always have the confidence to make suggestions despite Kubrick's encouragement to do so. This was possibly due to Kubrick's occasional angry outburst: 'He had every kind of temperament inside him and sometimes he knew when to use it and sometimes he couldn't help it!' (Vitali, quoted in DuVall, 2012). In order to present an idea to Kubrick during the filming of *Full Metal Jacket*, when the 'responsibilities were getting heavier and heavier' (Vitali, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017), thus contributing to Kubrick's stress, it was crucial for collaborators to find an appropriate time and an appropriate way to communicate the idea to him. The importance of the right communication style (or, better said, withholding any communication in moments when Kubrick insisted on being right) has been shown above in the story about exposure and can also be observed in an incident Tise

describes. In the middle of reshooting a scene from the previous day, Kubrick threw down his earpiece and demanded that Tise set the same parameters that he supposedly had used the previous day. These, Kubrick claimed, had been changed; although Tise disagreed, he remained quiet. For a few more takes, Kubrick insisted that the sound of the speech was different, causing Tise to become frustrated after he had done numerous readjustments to comply with Kubrick's commands. In the end, it turned out that the actor had eaten just before the shoot, affecting the sound of his voice (Modine, 2005). Through this experience, Tise learnt about Kubrick's perfectionism: 'He had sort of a meticulous approach to everything, and he had a very strong idea that, above all else, the dialogue had to be clear' (quoted in Trew, 2013). At the same time, he had his professionalism and knowledge reassured: 'If Stanley had a problem with the sound, often it was not a technical problem but a problem with performance and reading' (Tise, quoted in Trew, 2013). He learnt how to communicate with Kubrick: with care and caution, choosing the correct time and tone so as to retain the creative freedom Kubrick had granted him.

Kubrick's 'army general-like communication' (Trumbull, quoted in *Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil*, 2007) with the crew when facing practical challenges can be explained by his need to trust his collaborators. His openness was dependent on whether he had developed trust in the collaborators and on how the co-workers communicated their ideas to him. Based on his experience, Furst shared this view, admitting that Kubrick could be 'cruel' but also 'fair' and his reactions depended on the worker's approach when making a mistake (quoted in Geller, 1990). Admitting a mistake would be accepted with understanding, but avoiding responsibility for it had a different consequence:

> Stanley and I definitely got on and I think there are a few
> tricks that I learned pretty quickly with Kubrick. If you
> know that you made a mistake and go to Stanley and you
> say, I think I fucked up and I'm going to have to redo, he
> couldn't be an easier director to work for. If he comes
> down and you haven't told him, you've tried to cover it up,
> you're fired. He'll be cruel, absolutely appalling, and he'll
> never trust you again. Even if you try to cover for someone

else, he'll immediately suss it out. He grasps everything.
You can't bullshit him. You can't.

<div align="center">(Furst, quoted in Geller, 1990)</div>

Tise, Furst and Milsome employed a communication technique that was based on not engaging in a potentially escalating confrontation but instead, involved stepping back and waiting until their technical approach (and knowledge) had proven to be accurate. Such moments assured Kubrick of his collaborators' knowledge and resulted in him developing trust in them. Ward pointed out another technique that he employed to collaborate with the director effectively while at the same time keeping his creative autonomy: 'Make him work it out with you and then it worked really well' (quoted in *Stanley and Us*, 1999).

This statement sums up Kubrick's working practice well and demonstrates that Kubrick was very aware of the essence of collaboration for finding a good practical solution to achieve the result he wanted. On the set, he would engage with his co-workers and face the challenges with them in the search for solutions; he would listen to their advice and ideas and relied on their technical and practical knowledge. Kubrick's partner in Harris-Kubrick Productions, James B. Harris, repeatedly referred to his collaborative nature: 'Openness to suggestion was one of Stanley's great attributes. He genuinely thought any idea that was better than his was going to make the picture better' (quoted in Feeney, 2013). With such an attitude, Kubrick engaged in the intermediate space that was created on the set and which he, to a certain extent, was a part of. I say to a certain extent because there were moments in which he returned to the adopting a hierarchal stance. While workers' inputs were often recognised and taken into consideration, there was often dismay among his collaborators when their input was not credited. Harris cited Kubrick:

He'd say, 'Look. The director's going to get credit for everything in the picture, no matter where the idea comes from. If a lighting guy on the catwalk yells down: "Why don't you try it from this angle", and that suggestion is

better than the idea you had, you're going to get the credit
for it anyway. Why not accept it?'

<p align="right">(quoted in Feeney, 2013)</p>

This demonstrates that, when it came to officially recognising collaborators' creative inputs, Kubrick had no qualms in taking the credit.

This attitude angered his collaborators but does not mean Kubrick did not work collaboratively. Rather, he combined complementary collaboration at the production stage (when filming) and hierarchical collaboration in terms of the division of work and decision-making and also, as seen in the previous vignette, at the stage of attribution, where again Kubrick utilised his control. The combination of the two types of collaboration and their intertwining, taking into consideration the practical stories, demonstrates that the creative process in Kubrick's (pre)productions was fluid in nature. It is due to this fluidity, which was often a result of Kubrick's willingness to experiment, that the challenges of the creative environment were solved with collective practical solutions. The pre-production and production stages of *Full Metal Jacket* thus illustrate how the supposed 'train wreck' production (Sokol, 2015), when carefully analysed, is in fact, in Lisa Leone's words, a 'moving train' that requires 'tireless effort in people getting on and off at a process' (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017).

Conclusion

Practical stories has focused on identifying Kubrick's collaborative practice in the pre-production and production stages of his filmmaking. The initial predisposition of his collaborative practice, consisting of both complementary and hierarchical collaboration, was applied to the analysis of the practical stories that recount various examples of collaboration during the pre-production and production of *Full Metal Jacket*. This film was chosen due to its reputation as a challenging production, because of the environment it was shot in and because this film is usually discussed from a textual analysis perspective or in the context of the production industry. The practical stories I have discussed shed new light on specific technical solutions and on individual and collective creative inputs,

but, more importantly, has identified the discourses that led to and resulted from them. These discourses are representative of Kubrick's collaborative practice and demonstrate the complex relationship that links control, collaboration, the role of experimentation in film production, and freedom to express one's creative input. The discourses arose from an examination of the creative environment, created by Kubrick cleverly combining hierarchal and complementary collaboration. Kubrick created an intermediate space that he would at times exclude himself from, leaving his collaborators room to express their creative freedom, and then entered it to make decisions. I have shown how this practice enabled him to effectively collaborate with crew members to find solutions during production. Through this practice, Kubrick built a collaborative system that I have described through exploring the forms of communication and actions that can be detected in the practical stories. I have shown that some crew members felt their input was appreciated and felt empowered through the creative freedom granted by Kubrick's flexibility while others were frustrated by Kubrick's perfectionism and his insistence on being right.

The practical stories are indicators of the individual and collective creative solutions to technically and creatively challenging situations that the crew faced in the pre-production and the production of the film. Individual creative inputs identified in the practical stories contradict the popular interpretation of Kubrick's technical scrutiny as a dictatorship and address his preparedness to experiment as an indicator of Kubrick's openness to innovation, whether it was reflected in new gadgets or new approaches to the solutions. The chapter demonstrated that Kubrick's openness crucially contributed to the team spirit and encouraged his crew to engage in the process with their creative ideas. 'When he was with people, they really felt that they were appreciated. He was very interested in what people had to say,' Harris explained (quoted in DuVall, 2010). However, the negative effects were also addressed. Some collaborators felt that their work was not recognised and experienced conflicts as limitations to their freedom of creative expression. Ward identified the issue: 'He had a vision. The problem is he doesn't always know what the vision is' (quoted in Baxter, 1997: 344). Kubrick's perfectionism and his occurring uncertainty in the appropriate solutions in executing his vision represented a chance for an individual to demonstrate their

competence and gain the director's trust. Forming such working relationships and learning to communicate with the director efficiently enabled the workers to engage in collaboration, satisfying Kubrick's technical standards and, at the same time, demonstrate the importance of their specific skills for the successful production of the film.

To conclude, it was Kubrick's openness to innovation and experimenting, and a combined practice of hierarchal and complementary collaboration, that constructed a collective space for the workers to engage in the search for the creative solutions and creatively collaborate. The practical stories elaborated on this space and the discourses that occurred revealed the collaborative aspect of the director, who realised he relied on his crew's technical competences and knowledge to execute his vision successfully.

Chapter four: Post-production stories

Kubrick had a substantial amount of control in the decision-making in the pre-production and production stages of his filmmaking. His financial power, social capital and negotiating skills enabled him to form collaborations in which he was able to continue to exercise his vision. Although he was open to his workers' input, as I have shown in earlier chapters, it is at the post-production stage when his receptiveness to collaborators, whose knowledge and skills surpassed his, came to the fore. In order to successfully finish his projects, he had to rely on technical departments and processes that he was not always familiar with and therefore, needed to develop trust when putting his product in the making into others' hands. Some of his collaborators have stated that Kubrick never trusted anybody (e.g. in 2014, Malcolm McDowell told Jeff Labrecque that Kubrick was 'that controlling; he wouldn't even trust somebody to take his picture'). However, it is my contention that Kubrick formed a number of collaborative relationships that were based on trust (e.g. with Leon Vitali, Emilio D'Alessandro, Andros Epaminondas, Jan Harlan). At the post-production stage of his filmmaking, the number of external collaborators rose and with that came new conditions that guided the processes: application of special effects; development of the film stock and editing it (sound and picture editing, mixing, colour grading and finalising stages, including the creation of the deliverables). These processes involved new people with different types of knowledge and different facilities. Besides his already established relationships, therefore, new collaborations needed to be formed and, for them to function, Kubrick was obliged to take a step back and hand some control over to his collaborators.

This chapter will discuss the collaborative practices that occurred in post-production. It examines how collaborations were formed, how the nature of the relationships affected these collaborations, the challenges faced by Kubrick, the outcomes and the role of external and internal collaborators in the final stages of Kubrick's filmmaking. It will focus on the importance of Kubrick's ability and willingness to hand over control by demonstrating the crucial role of his growing trust in his post-production collaborators. It will consider various forms of trust that have been identified in sociological research by J. David Lewis and Andrew

Weigert (1985), and Roy J. Lewicki and Barbara Benedict Bunker (in Benedict Bunker and Rubin, 1995). This chapter will address the myth of Kubrick as 'considerable know-how' (Lightman, 1968: 442) and provide a different perspective of Kubrick 'the collaborator' who, at certain stages of post-production, even became dependent on his collaborators and stepped back from control.

I will focus my analysis on specific post-production stages, which I will set as a framework based on theoretical works that specify post-production stages, such as Dominic Case's *Film technology in post production* (2001). In order to examine Kubrick's collaborations with regards to the development of techniques and processes of post-production, I draw on case studies of *Dr. Strangelove*, *2001: A Space Odyssey*, *A Clockwork Orange*, *Barry Lyndon*, *The Shining*, and *Eyes Wide Shut*. *Dr. Strangelove* is used to illustrate how the post-production process begins and to demonstrate how techniques and changes were developed and implemented in Kubrick's later film projects. *2001: A Space Odyssey*'s special effect techniques will be discussed based on testimonies of Douglas Trumbull (in Gray, 2016), Herb A. Lightman's analyses of technical specifications in *American Cinematographer* (1968), Regina Peldszus's research on NASA-Kubrick collaboration (in Ljujić et al., 2015), John Brosnan's *Movie magic* (1977) and Piers Bizony's *2001: Filming the future* (2000). *The Shining* is of relevance to the theme of trust because of the interesting dynamic between already established and new co-workers in post-production and Kubrick's (invisible) involvement. Finally, Kubrick's last film, *Eyes Wide Shut*, will be considered because of its heavy reliance on the laboratory's competence and input due to Kubrick's death occurring before the project's completion. In addition, a new form of trust can be detected in the collaborative relationships that developed during post-production.

Collaborative relationships in post-production are very different to the collaborations that develop in the previous stages of filmmaking. In the post-production process in Kubrick's productions one can see his control over the product fluctuating and also shifting at times. In post-production, trusting his collaborators was essential as this was a stage where the extent of Kubrick's knowledge varied, so that he was obliged to relinquish control over the processes. The collaborative relationships he built (and sustained) therefore played a decisive

role in the successful completion of the project. As such, the analysis of these collaborations will provide insight into what happened when Kubrick had to hand over control to several external and internal collaborators and how this reflected on his collaborative practice.

Trust in developing the material: The laboratories

When the film stock has been shot, whether it is test shots, dailies or the finished film, the film is transferred to a laboratory where it is developed, checked for quality of the print and then sent back to the film director. Laboratories are essential technical institutions that bring the filmed material on a negative. They are involved in the pre-production, production and later in post-production when it comes to grading, special effects and other corrections to the film negative, before the film's release. They are also responsible for the creation of deliverables and copies, and creating 'screens' (the prints for cinematic release), archiving material and restoration. Because of the crucial role of laboratories in bringing the film through its final stages, the quality of the produced material was crucial and therefore, Kubrick was very meticulous about his choice of laboratories.

Before he started collaborating with Rank Laboratories, later renamed Deluxe Laboratories, Kubrick most often opted for a different laboratory for each new film project (D'Alessandro in Ulivieri, 2016). The reason for this was, perhaps, that, as director, Kubrick was always pursuing higher quality in the developed material; however, searching for the right laboratory each time involved extra work. Kubrick's assistant, Emilio D'Alessandro, explained that Kubrick had a habit of developing test shots before the shooting had started at a number of different laboratories, recalling being instructed to deliver reels to Humphries, Technicolor and Rank (in Ulivieri, 2016). The cross-checking would then determine which of the laboratories Kubrick would choose.

However, the reason for cross-checking the laboratories was possibly not simply down to his perfectionism but due to a number of incidents that occurred in the laboratory process. For example, D'Alessandro recalled Kubrick 'not being happy' with Humphries' development of the dailies (quoted in Ulivieri, 2016: 218) and Mike Kaplan detailed an incident of a negative being scratched during the

shooting of *Barry Lyndon*. That laboratory had been 'effectively processing the material for over a year' until then (Kaplan, 2012). Kubrick commented that 'the laboratory is quite capable of making dreadful mistakes' (Kubrick, quoted in Weintraub, 1972) and promptly switched to collaborating with Rank Laboratories, to Humphries' great disappointment: 'The technicians were devastated as Stanley removed the negative to Rank via a convoy of vehicles, followed by Humphries' managing director on foot, trying to rescue the transfer. There was no sanctioning an error of this magnitude' (Kaplan, 2012).

Two inferences with regards to collaboration and control can be made based on Kubrick's decision to change laboratory: he expected nothing less than excellence from his collaborators when it came to technical processes and this supports the myth of the controlling director as extending to his use of laboratories. The incident also shows that Kubrick knew when and how to take back control over his product. Colin Flight, the operations and engineering manager at Rank, firmly believed that it was because Kubrick possessed extreme technical proficiency himself: 'Stan was a master. He knew film' (personal interview, 2018), which Kubrick often demonstrated when he was describing the technical issues that could occur in the laboratory and that could affect the negative, specifying that 'printing machines can make the print too dark, too light or the wrong colours' (quoted in Weintraub, 1972).

Kubrick's technical proficiency dictated his choices when it came to external collaborators and he had no hesitation in shifting between them if needed. *A Clockwork Orange* was developed at Technicolor Laboratories, which were under contract with Warner Bros. and, therefore, Kubrick was obliged to use their services (personal interview with Flight, 2018). In his later films, Kubrick went against Warner Bros.' demands, shifted to Eastman Laboratories for *Barry Lyndon* and, for his next film, transferred to Rank, with whom he collaborated until his death, ending his lifelong search for the perfect laboratory. Along the way, he developed some close collaborative relationships, detailed later in the chapter, which had two common characteristics that were essential for Kubrick to choose to collaborate further: the extensive technical knowledge of his collaborator and the trust that built as Kubrick saw evidence of this technical

prowess. Lewicki and Benedict Bunker define this form of trust as 'knowledge-based trust' (in Benedict Bunker and Rubin, 1995: 142). In Lewicki and Benedict Bunker's notion of knowledge-based trust, the action of trusting requires having sufficient information about one's potential collaborators that the nature of the collaboration can be predicted (1995). In my analysis of collaboration, knowledge-based trust is based on the technical knowledge a person possesses. Combining Lewicki and Benedict Bunker's knowledge-based trust (1995) with J. David Lewis and Andrew Weigert's phenomenon of 'cognition-based trust' (1985: 969) creates a framework for the analysis of the collaborative relationships that is more specific to Kubrick. Cognition-based trust (which I also refer to as cognitive trust) results from a conscious decision 'whom we will trust in which respects and under which circumstances, and we base the choice on what we take to be "good reasons", constituting evidence of trustworthiness' (Lewis and Wiegert, 1985: 970). The evidence Kubrick required would, therefore, be reflected in the demonstrated technical competence of his collaborators. However, in practice, trust is 'a mix of feeling and rational thinking' and therefore necessarily involves an emotional component, which Lewis and Wiegert identify as 'affective trust' (1985: 972). Cognition-based and affective trust generally coexist, and eliminating either one would result in relationships that are not socially functional:

> Taken to extremes, if all cognitive content were removed
> from emotional trust, we would be left with blind faith or
> fixed hope, the true believer or the pious faithful. On the
> other hand, if all emotional content were removed from
> cognitive trust, we would be left with nothing more than a
> coldblooded prediction or rationally calculated risk: the
> ultimate war game in which the only logic is self-interest
> and kill ratios.

> (Lewis and Wiegert, 1985: 972)

Collaborative relationships based on only one form of trust would not have enabled Kubrick to collectively create and collaborate successfully. Considering his social capital, his social skills and a number of established continuous trusting

relationships, it is possible to argue that Kubrick's collaborations combined emotional intelligence and rational thinking, which reflects the various degrees of trust in his collaborative relationships that will be discussed further in the chapter. 'You'd have a structure which you'd work within – certain people he'd work with, because he only liked certain people' Flight explained (personal interview, 2018).

At Rank, Kubrick collaborated closely with Colin Flight and Chester Eyre, the director of operations and Kubrick's contact with the lab. Flight started working with Kubrick on *Full Metal Jacket* and recalled that Kubrick used to call him up in the laboratory: 'Stanley's here, we want to ask you some questions on *Full Metal Jacket* on this, the colours, and this and this… And I talked to him' (personal interview with Flight, 2018). Flight's technical confidence seems to have impressed Kubrick, because he would always require advice that was prefaced by a scientific explanation:

> He wouldn't accept what you're saying straight off. He
> trusted you, but you needed to argue scientifically what it
> was he was seeing and how he got to that point, because
> he would not pretend to know and he would expect you
> not to pretend to know. If you didn't know, you'd have to
> say, or you'd have to find a resource that was able to help
> you out.
>
> (personal interview with Flight, 2018)

The trust element in Flight's relationship with Kubrick developed during the making of *Full Metal Jacket* and continued to grow on *Eyes Wide Shut*; they regularly exchanged phone calls in which Kubrick would ask for advice: 'He said, "Well, I've got this and this. What do you think?" I said, "I'll do this." He said, "Okay, come. If you say that, it's good." It was fantastic. Really, it was great because he trusts me' (personal interview with Flight, 2018). Flight was similarly impressed with Kubrick's understanding of the issues that could occur in the laboratory and the fact that he took advice on how to avoid them.

Kubrick's reliance on the knowledge of his collaborators and willingness to take advice grew considerably in the later stages of filmmaking, which involved processes he was less knowledgeable about. The conclusion is that, contrary to the belief that Kubrick would invariably impose his way of doing things, he would compromise when the risks were explained to him. After seeing the developed film, instead of criticising the colours that were brought out, Kubrick understood what the laboratory people were telling him when advising 'not to push it too far' and took their advice (personal interview with Flight, 2018). This specific situation applied to *Eyes Wide Shut* because of the specific technique used in developing the film.

Kubrick decided to force-develop the negative of *Eyes Wide Shut*. Force developing, or 'pushing in', is achieved when the negative is left in the developer for a more extended period than normally, and it is used to compensate for low lighting of the negative (*Richard photo lab*, 2018), which Kubrick used while shooting *Eyes Wide Shut*. The process creates exaggerated highlights, which Kubrick desired and, as Larry Smith, DOP on *Eyes Wide Shut*, explained, they 'eventually decided to force-develop everything, even the day exteriors, to keep the look consistent' (quoted in Pizzello, 1999). Because of the high risk of too much grain, it was a challenging experiment for the laboratory. 'Lab people always worry when things are done in a non-standard manner, and at first, we were all surprised that he wanted to do it,' (Smith, quoted in Pizzello, 1999). But Rank took the challenge with enthusiasm, also due to the economic benefit, Flight recalled: 'Which for us was good because we charged a fortune for it, because it affected the overall processes' (personal interview, 2018). Smith's recognition of Rank's effort justifies their charge: 'I think Deluxe did an incredibly consistent job day in and day out. They put aside a bath just for us, and they always put our stuff through first – that was a special privilege they extended to Stanley. It was a seven-day-a-week job to make sure that what we were getting was consistent, and I give all the credit to the guys who handled that' (quoted in Pizzello, 1999).

Such trust in his collaborators handling his product is rarely discussed in regard to Kubrick's filmmaking practice, but in fact played a huge role. Kubrick relied on the lab's technical knowledge and expertise, but also knew how to communicate

his requirements effectively to encourage his collaborators. 'He always managed to draw more out of you than you thought was there. I began working more closely with Stanley on *Full Metal Jacket*, and he showed me that there was nothing that couldn't be achieved if you set your mind to it,' (Eyre, quoted in Magid, 1999).

Having worked with Chester Eyre before, Kubrick had developed trust in his abilities and trusted Eyre's supervision of the 'push in' process used on the *Eyes Wide Shut* negative. The success of the push in technique is therefore attributed to the lab; however, had Kubrick not had a trusting relationship with Flight and Eyre, he could not have decided for it to go ahead. Because of the dangers of damage caused to the negative, Kubrick needed to be absolutely confident in the lab and rely on their knowledge to produce a quality result. It was in the laboratory processing of the film that Kubrick had little control due to not having expertise in this highly technical process. He was, therefore, compelled to develop trusting collaborative relationships, which after a few changes of laboratory facilities, he established with individual employees in Rank Laboratories. He did so by continually seeking confirmation of their technical knowledge through on-going contact. At the same time, Flight alludes to Kubrick's need to maintain control – he wanted them to work together 'all the time', and if they were to 'go somewhere' Kubrick would be interrogating them why (personal interview, 2018).

Kubrick exercised his control in terms of choosing the laboratory to work with (and constantly testing the quality by developing test shots and dailies at different facilities). While he had been provided with the best options to do so, such as Kodak supplying him with film stock that had been already out from sale (Smith in Pizzello, 1999), it was trusting enough to put the film in someone else's hands that made him hand over the control. Perhaps because of being subjected to such circumstances and not having to comply with them to achieve the result that Kubrick then wanted to regain control when it came to filmmaking processes he was conversant with, which in post-production was the editing process.

Editing film

Kubrick's technical knowledge about the editing stage of production was strong, which enabled him, at times successfully and at times not, to exercise his control

over the editing process. Kubrick once said: 'Nothing is cut without me. I'm there every second, and for all practical purposes I cut my own film; I mark every frame, select each segment, and have everything done exactly the way I want it. Writing, shooting, and editing are what you have to do to make a film' (quoted in Gelmis, 1970 in Phillips, 2001: 99).

According to the director himself and specific collaborators in the editing room, Kubrick was present and did traditional slicing and gluing of the negative together with his editor (and assistants). Bill Butler, the editor of *A Clockwork Orange*, described his surprise when seeing that Kubrick's practice was different from what he was used to:

> I thought that I was going to be left alone to put it
> together, which is a normal procedure. The director shoots
> it, the editor assembles it. Then you have your first cut,
> you get input notes from the director, you fine cut that,
> and then you work with the director. Of course, with
> Stanley it was a different story, it didn't happen.
>
> (quoted in Lauten, 2001)

While many stories from his collaborators confirm the mythology of the director who entirely controlled the editing, I will also demonstrate that there were a number of collaborations where Kubrick did not control the process. This was usually either as a result of a collaborator gaining Kubrick's trust through demonstrating a sufficient level of technical expertise and knowledge or a collaborator proved to have more knowledge on a specific matter than Kubrick (e.g. special effects). In both cases, the collaborators were granted creative freedom. Alternatively, a collaborator's personality meant that he was able challenge Kubrick's authority. All of these elements affected the nature of Kubrick's collaborative relationships and, when analysed, assist in identifying certain patterns in his collaborative practice.

Anthony Harvey collaborated as the editor with Kubrick twice, on *Lolita* and *Dr. Strangelove*. Harvey explained that he had been responsible for the initial first stage assembly, the rough cut of *Dr. Strangelove*: 'When the editor normally

shows the first cut to the director, it never, never seems to be what you thought it might have been in the script. Moreover, in this particular case, I remember we did not think it was any good at all' (quoted in Kenny, 2009). They did a complete re-cut. 'So we just took the whole film to pieces' and joined the sequences in different orders, 'back and forth', which was the reason why the process lasted three months and had to be repeated when the reel with the edit was lost (Harvey, quoted in Kenny, 2009).

Due to Kubrick's (alleged) persistent presence in the editing room, Harvey's work was constantly subject to Kubrick's criticism and conflicts developed regularly, mainly because Harvey insisted that 'the stuff' he had cut 'be on the movie' (Harvey, quoted in Vreeland, 2014). Kubrick very possibly felt that his directorial power was being challenged and, not being used to such a response – and not wanting to step back – he told Harvey to 'hurry up and direct, then you won't be so annoying in the cutting rooms' (Harvey, quoted in Vreeland, 2014). Such incidences indicate that Kubrick did not like being challenged but at the same time, was aware that the collaborative relationships had to run as smoothly as possible, which also meant that his co-workers needed to be appreciated and able to exercise freedom in the creative inputs. In fact, Kubrick did allow input and often even left the co-worker to take the initiative when working on material in the editing room.

Ray Lovejoy, an assistant editor to Harvey on *Dr. Strangelove*, was left to edit the second unit shots of the scenery from the sky:

> Stanley and I discussed how we could make this all work
> and came up with this system. We would go through the
> film meticulously, or at least I went through the film
> meticulously, cutting out a frame from every piece of
> perspective film which we then mounted on a card,
> punched out card, put this piece of film in, rather like a
> slide. […] I would have collated all of these so that we
> had plates perspectively for left window, plates
> perspectively for right window, plates perspectively for
> front.

(Lovejoy, quoted in *Inside: 'Dr. Strangelove or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb'*, 2000)

Lovejoy specified the work done collectively with Kubrick and the work he did individually. It can be concluded that Kubrick did supervise the process, but still left his assistant editor to edit a scene ('collate the plates'), which illustrates the complex relationship between Kubrick's need to be in control and the trust he placed in his collaborators. There also appears to be an element of Kubrick 'playing favourites' and not obeying traditional lines of command – given that Lovejoy would typically assist Harvey in the editing process – an arrangement that Kubrick may have disrupted with his power play.

After his work on *Dr. Strangelove* in 1963, Lovejoy was recommended for a raise. 'Outstanding work and more than expected from him,' Victor Lyndon, the associate producer, wrote (SK/11/3/5, 1963) and Kubrick agreed to promote Lovejoy to the position of the editor in his next films, *2001: A Space Odyssey* and later *The Shining*. Their long-term collaboration was a result of good cooperation in the cutting room and this was developed through the process of training.

> Stanley would be sitting at the Moviola here, I would be here doing the bench, feeding him the film. He would be looking, he would be selecting, marking, being run through the Moviola. Pencil marks, back to me to cut, paste on a joiner, or join on the joiner, build it up through the spause…

(Lovejoy, quoted in *Inside: 'Dr. Strangelove or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb'*, 2000).

Such collective editing work ensured that Kubrick could exercise control and, at the same time, mentor Lovejoy, further developing his knowledge and, through this, gaining Kubrick's trust. Positioning Lovejoy as a student that he could mentor and train 'correctly' allowed Kubrick to 'shape' Lovejoy possibly into someone he could work with, setting rules and conditions that a more experienced editor might not have agreed to.

One can argue that the specific form of trust which involved Kubrick imposing his ideas on less experienced workers, influenced the amount of creative freedom given to them. Martin Hunter who first worked as an assistant sound editor on *The Shining*, continued to work as Kubrick's research assistant and photographer and also edited *Full Metal Jacket*. Considering their repeated collaborations, e.g. Hunter's promotion to the position of editor, had to be the result of Kubrick's control-based trust; it does not appear that Hunter had been given any freedom in his work. Flight describes the Kubrick-Hunter collaboration thereby fuelling the myth of Kubrick's supremacy in the editing room: 'The editor, Martin Hunter, on *Full Metal Jacket*, certainly with us, he was doing the editing as it happens but he only did what he was told to do, because Stanley edited it as well because he wanted to do everything. He wouldn't let anybody - he wouldn't necessarily trust people to do it' (personal interview, 2018). Thus, control-based trust in his less experienced/skilled people did not result in creative freedom. In the following story, Bill Butler, the editor of *A Clockwork Orange*, had to *make* the opportunity for himself and his boldness gained him recognition. Despite Kubrick's continuous presence in the editing room, Butler took the initiative, although in secret: 'Although Stanley was there all the time, I would make my adjustments to his marks after moving to the bench from the Steenbeck, and if he wanted extra frames and I disagreed, I would make a cut three frames back on the existing film so he could see the join' (quoted in Lauten, 2001). Taking this kind of initiative was probably fuelled by Butler's determination to be recognised for his creative input: 'I would say there should be a close-up here and a long-shot there, and it would materialize maybe weeks down the road - but not right away, no way' (quoted in Lauten, 2001). Butler's account, while supporting the myth of the controlling tyrant, also shows Kubrick's willingness to consider his co-workers' ideas, all be it reluctantly. Butler's account of a discussion between him and Kubrick in the cutting room further illustrates this:

> When the boys were leaving the bar, one the patron's eye-
> lines was moving the wrong way, and I told Stanley I
> thought it looked ugly. We re-cut some more, and he asked
> me again what I felt. I said again, 'I don't like it, but if you
> want it that way, okay.' His reply was, 'That's no fucking

answer.' Eventually, Stanley took both eye-lines out of the
film and played the exit in the master.

(quoted in Lauten, 2001)

Despite his initial insistence on the shot, Kubrick took Butler's view into account and 'eventually' decided to take his advice. As Butler said, the director would not immediately accept an idea. If the idea or proposition was well argued, Kubrick would consider it. Butler's remark on visual aesthetics was persuasive enough for Kubrick to reconsider and agree to a solution that he felt was right.

This technical story illustrates another form of trust practised by Kubrick. Besides trusting technical knowledge as demonstrated in the laboratory stories and the trust he placed in the ideas of his less experienced co-workers (for example, in *Dr. Strangelove*), Kubrick also (although reluctantly) stepped back and reconsidered a solution put forward by a collaborator. For Kubrick to consider his collaborator's input, however, the collaborator had to be prepared to challenge the director, which Butler appeared to do successfully. Such outcomes occurred in the *War stories* too, when challenges ended in compromise or even capitulation. Successful challenges resulted in recognition of creative input, but were rare and came with a cost as well. Many collaborators such as Martin Hunter, preferred to avoid conflicts, allowing the director control over their working process, while others, like Butler, succeeded in convincing Kubrick to take their advice. But such collaborations were likely to end in dissatisfaction: frustration for the workers unable to express their creative freedom and frustration for Kubrick, forced into a compromise. Butler only collaborated with Kubrick once and Kubrick's decision not to collaborate further might have been based on the fact that he did not like to be challenged. On the other hand it could have been that he was simply not satisfied with Butler's technical execution; this is somewhat contradicted by Butler's claim that he learnt nothing new from Kubrick, editing-wise (in Lauten, 2001).

There is a sense in which Kubrick's sense of his own abilities perhaps influenced the ways in which he trusted others. For example, Butler's statement echoes the earlier discussion about the extent of Kubrick's editing knowledge and that

decisions about new collaborators were primarily based on trust in their technical skills that Kubrick, perhaps, felt he lacked. It follows that Kubrick likely shaped the way he exercised his trust (the forms of trust) to specific technical situations and specific collaborative relationships. For example, when it came to repeating collaborations or collaborations based on work promotion (and thus already familiar workers), Kubrick relied on affective trust, too. The importance of trust in the editing room in relation to technical abilities and emotional engagement will be analysed by looking at the collaboration between Kubrick, Lovejoy and the editing assistants during *The Shining*.

The Shining's editing crew included Lovejoy and his assistants Gordon Stainforth (second assistant), Steve Pickard, Gill Smith (first assistant), Adam Unger, George Akers and grader Eddie Gordon. Lovejoy had suffered an injury to his hand and his first assistant, Gill Smith, took over the role of editor. Stainforth was at the time editing Vivian Kubrick's documentary *Making The Shining* and, at the same time, assisting Lovejoy with 're-filing trims, labelling boxes, and reconstituting sync rolls for Stanley to watch on the Steenbeck,' and one time got the chance to assist in editing the film too (Stainforth, quoted in Martinez, 2001). Kubrick cognitively decided to take another editor to assist the process after Stainforth passed Kubrick's trial weekend: 'And on Monday was told I would be cutting the rest of the picture with him!' (quoted in Martinez, 2001). The newly established collaboration in the editing room was still carefully supervised by Lovejoy, who instructed his two assistants until Kubrick would arrive and take over the shift, editing together with Stainforth (Stainforth in Martinez, 2001). Following this schedule, Stainforth contributed to finishing 'the last 30 minutes of the picture with Stanley' (quoted in Martinez, 2001).

Lovejoy's injury disrupted the Kubrick-Lovejoy collaborative relationship, but through communication and the trust Kubrick had developed with Lovejoy, a new working relationship was able to develop with Stainforth. This new relationship was later transferred into the sound department, and its crucial role will be discussed later in the chapter when the focus of the discussion turns to the sound and music editing that follows once the picture editing is completed.

The analysis of the picture-editing stage has demonstrated Kubrick's intense involvement in the process and his continuous presence in the cutting room, where his editors and assistant were used as conduits for exercising his control over the process. However, Kubrick also formed close relationships with his editors, based on his confidence in their technical abilities, confidence that the execution of the work would meet his standards and based on the affective connection that developed in these collaborative relationships. In such cases, Kubrick would also allow his instructions to be challenged and would rethink some of his ideas. He also worked with editors who exercised little self-initiative and, in this way, Kubrick stayed in control of the process and enforced his vision. It can, therefore, be said that much depended on the character traits of his collaborators and the nature of the relationship that had been established, based on the individual working practice that developed between Kubrick and the collaborator. Of course, the defining factor in these enduring collaborations might have been a shared vision.

I have argued that when it came to the post-production stage of special effects, corrections and the laboratory work that was needed to create them, Kubrick was not an expert and required collaborators who were. As he sought new external collaborators, he again strived to find collaborators whose technical knowledge and skills he could rely on. The next part of the chapter will address the work done on the edited material: the application of the special and visual effects and creation of the graphics and colour grading (corrections). I will analyse the processes of this stage of post-production and the collaborative work involved in the making of *2001: A Space Odyssey*, which I consider to be a perfect case study of the manual application of special effects, and *Eyes Wide Shut*, which involved many external collaborators, some of whom worked on post-production corrections after Kubrick's death.

Help with special/visual effects, grading and corrections

Special effects are produced 'on set' and are divided into two categories, optical and mechanical, whereas visual effects are created later with the help of a computer (*Nuts Computer Graphics*, 2018). The visual effects and corrections in *Eyes Wide Shut* were digitally added post-production, but *2001*'s special effects

were a combination of optical and mechanical effects created at the production stage. This sub-chapter focuses on the application of the optical effects and corrections in the two films from two different periods, analogue and digital, and analyses Kubrick's involvement, control over the process and trust in his collaborators. Kubrick was highly involved in the post-production stage of *2001* but because it required specialised knowledge in special effects, he had to place knowledge-based trust in others; this often turned into affective trust as well. By the time of *Eyes Wide Shut,* post-production had gone digital and the visual effects as corrections were applied after Kubrick's death. In this regard, another form of trust can be identified, namely, the collaborators' trust in Kubrick. Through describing the process of special/visual effects and corrections applied to the two films, I show how Kubrick oscillated between trust and control in both the analogue and digital era, and how the different periods (and, thus, different technical knowledge employed) affected the nature of his collaborations.

While he was proficient in many of the technical aspects of filmmaking, when it came to creating special effects, Kubrick needed to expand the circle of his external collaborators to highly skilled people: experts in animation, laboratory people (printing the negative for overlaying, matte painting), modellers (miniatures), and consultants on space imagery and technology (NASA). The planning and execution was characterised by intense collaboration across sectors in the production and pre-production crew (modellers), which meant Kubrick's attention was divided between the many collaborators involved. This then inevitably required him to entrust aspects of the creative process to them, without him having to be physically present. The development of special effects for *2001: A Space Odyssey* involved a range of experimental and innovative techniques, including the slit-scan, an upgraded front projection, adapted Rostrum camera with a moving head and attached table to allow movement to create animation effects). A large number of people were involved in the process, infamously, a team of NASA scientists. Information on the creation of special effects for *2001: A Space Odyssey* is too vast[11] to address completely, so I will identify only some

---

[11] E.g. the documentary *2001: The making of a myth* (Paul Joyce, 2001), Jerome Agel's book on techncial specifics *The making of Kubrick's 2001* (1970), 'Speculative systems: Kubrick's interaction with the Aerospace industry during the production of 2001' (Peldszus, in Ljujić et al.,

of the technical solutions through the lens of collaborations. I use this case to support my argument that Kubrick relied increasingly on internal and external collaborators who had the expertise he did not have and to highlight the importance of trust.

Most of the special effects for *2001: A Space Odyssey* were applied during the shoot because animations and miniatures had to be used then and there (personal interview with Hannan, 2016). It is precisely this combination of animation and special effects taking place during the production phase that demonstrates how the stages intertwine, leading to many processes running simultaneously. Kubrick himself stated that the complexity of the process was a challenge:

> It was a novel thing for me to have such a complicated information-handling operation going, but it was absolutely essential for keeping track of the thousands of technical details involved. It took an incredible number of diagrams, flow-charts and other data to keep everything organized and to be able to retrieve information that somebody might need about something someone else had done seven months earlier. We had to be able to tell which stage each scene was in at any given moment – and the system worked.

> (Kubrick, quoted in Lightman, 1968: 442)

The success of this process was due to rigorous organisation and intense collaboration within and between departments, as reflected in the co-workers' stories about it. Ivor Powell, the publicity assistant at Columbia Pictures, provided insight into the intensity of the work in a note to his superior, Roger Caras: 'Working long, long hours with Con Pederson and Ray Lovejoy as a coordinator and organizator of the unexpectedly gargantuan special effects' (SK/12/8/3/50, 1967).

2015). Piers Bizony's *2001: Filming the future* (2000), Stephanie Schwam's *The Making of 2001, A Space Odyssey* (2000).

Kubrick explained that a unique system was designed in order to keep the organisation flowing smoothly. The planned 205 special effects scenes required approximately '10 major steps to complete', clarifying a 'major step as one in which the scene is handled by another technician or department', forming several smaller teams who would then execute them (Kubrick, quoted in Lightman, 1968: 442). With this, Kubrick again confirmed his tendency to work in smaller crews and his consistent practice of assigning more than one role to a worker. Bruce Logan, the animation artist, was not only creating models but was also filming them and later at night, watching the rushes with Kubrick (Logan, 2016). Douglas Trumbull, the special effects supervisor, similarly worked in many departments. In the following account he talks about the challenges that characterised their collaboration: 'So Stanley would present me with a bigger problem, then a bigger one. I started moving up. At the end, I was one of the four top people on the movie' (Trumbull, quoted in Gray, 2016). Bizony also points out that 'there is scarcely an aspect of the film's visual construction which didn't involve him at some point, from painting the star fields to detailing models' (2000: 112). It is therefore likely that Kubrick was satisfied with Trumbull's technical knowledge and inclination to innovation. Kubrick demonstrated his cognitive trust in Trumbull's abilities by promoting him to a more active role in creative decision-making and in instructing the execution through various departments (developing affective trust). Collaborations also developed between the animation artists, camera sector and the laboratory in creating the space background, with models of the spaceships and planets.

The production crew of animation artists and special effects supervisors collaterally collaborated with the laboratory. For example, in creating outer space with the planets, first a master shot of space was filmed (using a black backing board on which the animation artists, a team of students, drew the stars using an airbrush technique) and then developed in the Technicolor laboratory (Bizony, 2000). Then a separate layer of a developed negative of a shot of a miniature (e.g. the moon) would be put on the top of the first one, layering the negative often with 'multiple images' (Trumbull, quoted in Lightman, 1968: 418). In this way, two processes, production and post-production laboratory work, were running in parallel; what was shot in the production had to be reworked in the laboratory and

then again brought into the production. The process was, therefore, time-consuming, not only because of the repeating interaction between the laboratory and the production crew, but also due to the corrections that needed to be done to the material in the making. For example, there were issues with 'greying of the blacks' when the number of layers grew (Trumbull, quoted in Lightman, 1968: 418), again involving the laboratory making new optical prints and the process of collaboration repeating all over.

Trumbull and other special effects supervisors, Con Pederson, Wally Veevers and Martin Goldsmith, supervised the working process on the set: the optical special effects were filmed by smaller units that included many camera assistants (Peter Hannan, Bruce Logan, Dennis Hall, Ted Gerald and John Alcott) who worked on the shoots on separate stages in the studio, often doing night shifts (SK/12/3/2/1, 1965-1967). These special effects shoots were mainly done in groups of three, sometimes including the cinematographer Geoffrey Unsworth, but sometimes only the camera assistants (SK/12/3/2/1, 1965-1967). This is an example of Kubrick placing both cognitive and affective trust in the assistants performing well without supervision. There were drawbacks, however, when a job was not executed to Kubrick's exacting standards, Kubrick did not hold back the criticism. His memo to the camera assistants who were shooting the Jupiter scenes exemplifies his reaction when he felt his trust violated: 'You cowardly bastards ran away last night without facing the music on the mask and other ancillary nightmares connected with the Jupiter shot. Please brace yourselves for this, figure out what to do next and I'll be calling you later in the morning. Thanks. Stanley' (Logan, 2016). 'A feeling of Stanley's directorial style,' Logan commented when publishing the note in 2016, relating to the existing mythology on Kubrick. The language Kubrick used in the note is that of a schoolmaster telling off his students and it certainly lends support to the view that Kubrick's dictatorial style of communication left little space for a two-way interaction. It also suggests the fragility of his trust in these 'below-the-line' collaborative relationships (Caldwell, 2008: 38). Kubrick's behaviour is explained by Lewis and Wiegert, whereby trusting behaviour manifests 'as if the uncertain future actions of others were indeed certain in circumstances', but when violated 'these expectations result in negative consequences for those involved' (1985: 971).

A reoccurring characteristic is Kubrick's ability to trust his collaborators with their work (on *his* project) and taking the decision to do so. While not true in all cases, collaborations on *2001* suggest that Kubrick placed more trust in collaborators who were positioned higher up in the hierarchy. In this regard, Lewis and Wiegert argue that 'trust in identity is essential for communication and is a constitutive bond of society' (1985: 974). Herb A. Lightman quoted Kubrick 'especially lauding' the screenplay co-author Arthur C. Clarke, Geoffrey Unsworth and John Alcott, the production designers Tony Masters, Harry Lange and Ernie Archer and giving 'extended lavish praise' to the special effects supervisors (1968: 447). This echoes Wally Veevers' account of the special effects on this film in John Brosnan's *Movie magic* (1977). To build effective communication and a 'trusting constitutive bond of society' (Lewis and Wiegert, 1985: 974), Kubrick surrounded himself with a smaller circle of collaborators (the sector leaders and personal assistants). This enabled him to balance control and trust, a necessary technique if he wanted keep the film production running and avoid the dangers of disorganisation: 'With such a big staff, the problem is for people to figure out what they should *not* come to see you about. You invariably find your time taken up with questions that aren't important and could easily have easily been disposed of without your opinion' (Kubrick, quoted in Bernstein, 1966 in Phillips, 2001: 39).

The arrival of digital technology challenged Kubrick's practice of trust because he had to expand the circle of close collaborators. Kubrick was enthusiastic about the new knowledge and experimental techniques that digital technology brought, but it also meant an increase in the number of external collaborators, the need to develop new collaborations and new forms of collaborative relationships.

The use of digital technology in the application of visual effects became widespread in the 1990s, but Kubrick's *Eyes Wide Shut* took limited advantage of it, with some exceptions that can be found in his editing guidelines, such as 'flashbacks should have some form of visual fx to separate from reality' (SK/17/5/13, 1998). However, not including any special effects does not mean Kubrick did not experiment. In fact, he began experimenting with CGI (computer generated imagery) at the time of *Full Metal Jacket* in preparation for a project he

had planned but then abandoned and was later created by Steven Spielberg – *A.I. Artificial Intelligence*. 'He was trying stuff out, because special effects were very limited then,' Flight recalled and explained that they were achieved by specific alterations on machinery for work on special effects (personal interview, 2018). Collaborating with the laboratory in creating special effects was then taken over by digital technology, but it was still in its infancy, which, according to James Naremore, resulted in Kubrick's test shots of the robot being 'unworkable' (2005: 256). But after Spielberg's *Jurassic Park* was released in 1993, Kubrick believed the quality of CGI had reached levels that were good enough for him to continue planning *A.I. Artificial Intelligence* (personal interview with Flight, 2018). Paddy Eason, the supervising digital compositor, also said that the shots he received for scanning during the production of *Eyes Wide Shut* were accompanied by incredibly specific information on installation, 'perhaps more detailed than anywhere else – if planning CGI – notes, sketches, measures', which led Eason to speculate that this was Kubrick's way of 'testing the ground' for *A.I. Artificial Intelligence* (Eason, quoted in Duvall, 2012).

This example illustrates Kubrick's willingness to experiment with digital special effects as a means of creative expression (he was striving to achieve realistic CGI effects for *A.I.*), but also taking advantage of the modernised technique in the post-production process of corrections. In this section I examine the parts of the corrections process that Kubrick was skilled at and was able to control and the aspects he was not so skilled at, and therefore needed the interventions of his collaborators. I identify the most obvious stages at which Kubrick relied on his collaborators' technical expertise and trusted that their inputs would lead to the successful completion of his product. In these moments, Kubrick as director was forced to relinquish control.

When it came to estimating colour levels and other colour specifications, Kubrick was very knowledgeable, probably due to his photography background, developing his photographs when working for the *Look* magazine in the mid 1940s (LoBrutto, 1999; Baxter, 1997; Hughes, 2000; Walker et al., 1999; Mather, 2013). At the post-production stage of a project, Kubrick would send his (picture)

edited films to the laboratories for them to adjust the colours/colour grading.[12] He would give specific instructions in the form of a grading shot list with details on grading levels of individual shots (SK/15/4/3, 1980). His documentation of the correction is so detailed, Flight explained, because Kubrick was very concerned with the film's colour reproduction (personal interview, 2018). Chester Eyre recounts how Kubrick would include the lab people in his vision by 'striving with you to obtain that colour':

> He would look at what had been shot the previous day, mentally adjust the colours, write the specifications on the camera sheets he gave to us, and then request certain colour combinations that he'd devised with Larry Smith on the set. Normally, it's left to the laboratory to assess the colour of the negative. A filmmaker might ask us to print something a certain way – say, dark and red – but Stanley was asking for specific combinations of colours.
>
> (Eyre, quoted in Pizello, 1999)

Kubrick's role in grading was hands on and he would clearly state what he wanted. It can be tempting to say that he was in control of the process, but that is not entirely true. The results were dependent on the laboratory; situations occurred when the laboratory had to apply corrections due to Kubrick's insistence on a particular technical practice that would then prove flawed. Flight explained that for *Full Metal Jacket* and *Eyes Wide Shut* the laboratory needed to 'side grade every frame to match colour' because Kubrick did not shoot on academy format, which resulted in some curves and empty spaces due to his use of spherical lenses (personal interview, 2018).

Such incidents indicate Kubrick's lack of expertise in certain processes. Corrections to the edited version of *Eyes Wide Shut* were not only necessary to meet Kubrick's perfectionist standards, but sometimes in order to repair errors of judgement on his part. Some corrections were due to damage to the film, e.g. 'removing scratches' (SK/17/5/13, 1998), while some were as a consequence of

---

[12] More in *Film technology in post production* (Case, 2001).

Kubrick's Avid editing technique on *Eyes Wide Shut*. Paddy Eason recalled noticing a series of invisible cuts in the film, some dead space in the dialogue (a pause), which had just been chopped out (perhaps only a frame long). But the jumps were visible and these shots needed to be corrected, which they did by scanning them, removing the frames digitally, putting them back on the film and finally, cutting them back into the original film (in DuVall, 2012). These corrections were made after Kubrick's death, however, and it was a challenge to complete them. 'They were absolutely paranoid that we would do anything that would change any single frame of his cut,' Eason explained (quoted in DuVall, 2012), referring to Kubrick's editor (Nigel Galt) and assistant editor Melanie Viner-Cuneo. The editorial department offered to do only minimal dissolves and fades in order to save the empty spaces, because the main intention was to do the last corrections as 'he would have done them' (personal interview with Flight, 2018).

According to Flight and Harlan, *Eyes Wide Shut*'s editing was finished before Kubrick's death, only some of the colour corrections and filling of the edges of the frames (as in *Full Metal Jacket*) were done by the laboratory people, in close collaboration with Kubrick's editing team who were 'most familiar with Kubrick's style' (personal interview, 2018). When it came to the post-mortem changes made to his cut, emphasis on protecting Kubrick's legacy and staying true to his style can easily be identified. But the Avid story also suggests another conclusion – that Kubrick's lack of technical expertise in Avid might have caused problems that some were unwilling to acknowledge. This possibility relates to another form of trust that is in keeping with the mythology around Kubrick – the trust Kubrick's collaborators had in him and in his perfectionist approach to making films. Tom Cruise referred to his films as '13 perfect visions' (quoted in Ebert, 1999), suggesting that he also bought into the myth of Kubrick as the infallible filmmaker. Therefore, the 'paranoia' that close collaborators were said to display (Eason, quoted in DuVall, 2012), might not have been simply based on keeping the film 'Kubrick's', but may have also been about protecting the myth, avoiding any suggestion that the director might be different to the image audience/fans of his films had of him.

Accounts of the picture-editing stage (with the special effects and corrections) show that collaboration between departments played a crucial role in the success of the process. During the editing stage (putting the shots in sequences and sequences into a feature) Kubrick was able to stay in control of the process in two ways. Firstly, he was most often physically present and did the editing himself. Secondly, the collaborative relationships were often characterised by control-based trust. Kubrick would choose editors and assistants who he believed would follow his vision and instructions. He would employ workers who he was able to 'mould' to his liking, which was possible when the chosen editors did not have much experience and were therefore unlikely to take initiatives. However, he would opt for new collaborators as well, and this choice could challenge Kubrick's control over the process. If the editor proved to have enough technical knowledge or, as in Butler's case, a clear vision of the aesthetics, the collaborations were often conflictual, because Kubrick's authority was challenged. This said, Kubrick did not blindly insist on controlling the decision-making if he considered the collaborators' proposals persuasive, which involved collaborators providing a technical justification. This did occur and would sometimes lead to the development of affective trust, but most often it ended in a 'one-time-only' collaboration.

When it came to colour corrections and special effects, by contrast, Kubrick's knowledge had its limitations and so external collaborators who were invited to join the process, needed to be trusted. These relationships were built on knowledge-based trust. The collaborations with the laboratories at the special effects stage demonstrate Kubrick's reliance on their technical expertise. If the collaborators succeeded in gaining Kubrick's trust, they would develop into fruitful co-dependent collaborations, as was the case with Kubrick and Trumbull, who had Kubrick's trust to the extent of being put in charge of filming the special effects (and thus controlling the camera assistants). Such collaborators were given greater creative freedom, too. In these cases, Kubrick had no issue with publicly attributing collaborative authorship, as he did with the special effects supervisors.

However, with the arrival of digital technology, Kubrick's dependence on external collaborators increased. *Eyes Wide Shut* was edited digitally and needed to be

corrected in places, which, after Kubrick's death, proved to be a challenge. Kubrick's closest collaborators exhibited their trust in Kubrick's perfectionist knowledge by in turn asserting their control. By controlling the alterations/corrections to his final cut so that the final product would be 'as he would have wanted it' (personal interview with Flight, 2018), they demonstrated their trust in his ultimate authority, thereby continuing the legacy.

Next, I will discuss Kubrick's involvement in sound editing – specifically, music editing. I will discuss how decisions were made and how Kubrick, when it came to creating music, both controlled the process and placed his trust in others, shaping his collaborations with another set of external collaborators, the music creators/composers.

Editing sound: Music

The process of editing sound involves collecting the sounds and sound mixing. In turn, this might include mixing ambient sounds, dubbing, sound effects/foley and music (Deb, 2018). Kubrick's supervision of the process of applying sound to the picture was extremely 'hands-on'; he exercised control by spending 'every hour of the day and some days late into the night' in the dubbing theatre, for example (Stainforth, 2015).

Of all these elements, however, it was music that Kubrick saw as most crucial in his storytelling: 'I think music is one of the most effective ways of preparing an audience and reinforcing points that you wish to impose on it. The correct use of music, and this includes the non-use of music, is one of the great weapons that the filmmaker has at his disposal' (Kubrick, 1961, quoted in Ginna, 1999). His search for the 'correct' music intensified his control over the process and shaped the collaborations accordingly. The picture corrections and the development of the visual/special effects represent the stages where Kubrick's lack of knowledge often forced him to compromise and where he needed to trust his collaborators to execute his vision. However, at the stage of music editing, he went back to control-based trust, employing individuals that he could shape to do his bidding. This sub-chapter focuses on collaborations at the music-editing stage of post-

production in Kubrick's films with examples of such relationships, illustrating the complex tension between control and trust that characterised them.

While Kubrick relied on other people in the picture post-production, when it came to sound editing he was more confident in his decision-making. This can be attributed to his editing skills and, therefore, also the knowledge that connects the sound with picture editing, but also because, according to his collaborating composer on *Eyes Wide Shut*, Jocelyn Pook, 'He was very musically literate' (quoted in Johnson, 1998). He is known for editing the picture while listening to music (Gengaro, 2014; Naremore, 2007) and the practice was publicised through stories about the idea behind the infamous use of Johann Strauss and György Ligeti's music in *2001*. Behind such accounts is also the theme whereby Kubrick would insist on his vision being executed his way. His need for artistic control and control over decision-making at the sound-editing stage led to him ending collaborations that threatened his authority.

There are many accounts of how the score for *2001* came about. Tony Lawson, the editor of *Barry Lyndon*, claimed that the idea came from the projection room (in Benson, 2018). Kubrick's assistants would fall asleep while watching the dailies because the scenes with special effects had as yet no sound, as was discussed in the analysis of visual/special effects earlier in the chapter. To keep them awake, the projectionist used the boxes of music and, when Kubrick had seen the combination work, then the choice was made. Kubrick's personal assistant, Andrew Birkin, explained that it was Kubrick who had heard the music on a television documentary about World War I and decided on it (Burlingame, 2012). Another variation is that Kubrick's wife, Christiane, suggested Ligeti after hearing his music on the radio (Ross, 2013). And finally, her brother, Jan Harlan, recalled it being his suggestion that influenced Kubrick's choice (in Fitzpatrick, 2015; in Cipriani, 2014). Kubrick gives his own account of the events: 'When I had completed the editing of *2001: A Space Odyssey*, I had laid in temporary music tracks for almost all of the music which was eventually used in the film. Then, in the normal way, I engaged the services of a distinguished film composer to write the score' (quoted in Ciment, 1983: 177).

The chosen composer was Alex North, who had already collaborated with Kubrick on *Spartacus*. Choosing him for *2001* was supposedly MGM's directive to which Kubrick 'reluctantly' agreed (Benson, 2018). Perhaps Kubrick dismissed the collaboration precisely because he saw it as a choice imposed on him, undermining his vision. Despite the producer's decision, after North presented him his finished work, Kubrick decided not to use it.

> Although he and I went over the picture very carefully, and he listened to these temporary tracks (Strauss, Ligeti, Khatchaturian) and agreed that they worked fine and would serve as a guide to the musical objectives of each sequence he, nevertheless, wrote and recorded a score which could not have been more alien to the music we had listened to, and much more serious than that, a score which, in my opinion, was completely inadequate for the film.

> (Kubrick, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 177)

Kubrick justified his decision as a creative choice, but it is possible that he was simply frustrated by the challenge to his artistic freedom and control over the film. At Kubrick's first meeting with North, the composer supposedly expressed his scepticism on incorporating his music with such famous pieces of music, claiming there would be more consistency if all music originated from one composer (Benson, 2018; Bizony, 2000). Perhaps Kubrick was unwilling to back down because North did not carry out what had been agreed with regards to incorporating the existing pieces of music Kubrick had already overlaid. The fact that Kubrick and North had collaborated before signals that a certain degree of trust existed, but this was broken when North did not follow Kubrick's instructions, resulting in what Lewis and Wiegert refer to as the negative consequences for the violator of trust (1985). Therefore, this can be described as another example of control-based trust through which Kubrick, as already demonstrated in some collaborations with his editors, tried to control their work. As North objected, Kubrick ended the collaboration but in an indirect way, which left North bitter, as North's daughter-in-law Abby North describes:

As lore goes, Alex had no idea his score had been tossed
until he showed up to a screening of the film. And he was
not at all pleased when he learned of the fate of his work.
Alex believed, up until his dying day, that his score was
the ideal accompaniment to Kubrick's images. He believed
his talents had been grossly undervalued.

(2012)

Kubrick's and North's stories provide two versions of a truth. The outcome
certainly contributes to the myth that Kubrick often disregarded his
collaborators' creative input. This kind of scenario, in which Kubrick appears to
'trust' someone upon hiring them only to then restrict their input, or even sack
and replace them, also occurred in the making of *The Shining*.

Rachel Elkind and Wendy Carlos began collaborating with Kubrick on *A
Clockwork Orange*. According to Elkind's description of their first meeting, it
appears that Kubrick had already displayed his controlling way of working at the
beginning of their collaboration: 'When we got there he had already cut in some
of our music into *A Clockwork Orange*. With *The Shining* it was a very different
experience' (quoted in *TV Store Online*, 2014). Elkind stated that they were 'not
being able to create as artists,' and referred to the experience as being central to
ending her career in film music (Elkind, quoted in *TV Store Online*, 2014). Like
North, Elkind and Carlos were only told that Kubrick would not be using their
score at the end of the picture editing stage: 'He never told us directly. We only
heard that it just wasn't what he wanted for the film. Stanley's idea of music was
to use needle drops. What Wendy and I had wanted to do for the film was to give
it a very textual feeling, something that was very Takamatsu like' (Elkind, quoted
in *TV Store Online*, 2014). To execute his vision, Kubrick placed his editing
assistant, Gordon Stainforth, in the role.

Stainforth was perhaps asked to edit the music because of the close working
relationship already established with Kubrick while editing, with Kubrick
returning to his tested practice of employing a worker he trusted. Stainforth
claimed that he was entrusted with this job on his own: 'I did it all absolutely on

my own, with no assistant.' Kubrick clearly oversaw the project as Stainforth refers to his involvement 'The only other person involved was Stanley himself, who would probably have spent more time with me on it if he hadn't been so busy dubbing the picture – I did most of the music laying/editing while they were doing the pre-mixes' (quoted in Martinez, 2001). However, Kubrick also placed a great deal of trust in Stainforth, leaving him to exercise his creative freedom. Stainforth described some occasions when he was able to express his own creativity without consulting with Kubrick beforehand, an example being the overlay of 'bouncy bits of the Bartok' in a transition scene in the film (quoted in Martinez, 2001).

However, because of Kubrick's tyrannical reputation, Stainforth also doubted his initiative, fearing that he 'might have gone over the top with it' (quoted in Martinez, 2001). In the event, on this occasion, Kubrick demonstrated his openness to other collaborators' creative ideas and solutions:

> Then I took the tracks over to the dubbing theatre and actually met Stanley just outside. He was initially appalled when I said 'I'd laid music over that scene' – 'oh we can't have music there' – but I just begged him to listen to it. I'd deliberately laid it on a separate track as a so-called optional extra. I remember saying very simply something like 'please just listen to it, because I'm sure you'll like it.' And he did, and he did!

> (Stainforth, quoted in Martinez, 2001)

Given Kubrick's reputation, Stainforth took a huge risk in following his creative instincts. However, Kubrick liked the result and this probably encouraged Stainforth to continue to express his creative ideas.

At the same time, Stainforth also paid attention to a more sensitive matter: he tried to avoid cutting the music because he believed it fit the scene exactly the way Carlos and Elkind had composed it: 'My music charts show that I did actually take some liberties here, but the one thing I will never do is mess with the original "phrasing" of the music. It has to work with the film or it'll never work. What you can never do is change the whole phrasing of the music' (Stainforth, quoted in

173

Martinez, 2001). Stainforth's attempt to retain the integrity of his predecessors' input demonstrates his ethical sensitivity towards the input of others. This recognition of a fellow collaborator can also be seen as paying tribute to the artist. Perhaps Stainforth secretly disapproved of the way in which Kubrick had disregarded the composers' autonomy.

These two examples suggest that collaborators who were not prepared to accept alterations to their work risked losing their creative autonomy entirely. However, they also illustrate the extent to which film production is of necessity collaborative. Therefore, the problem perhaps was not Kubrick's approach but the artists' expectation that their work would be accepted entirely as it was created. Elkind could not accept the alteration of her creative input for the benefit of the end product and was therefore disappointed in her collaboration with Kubrick. Kubrick's decision to hire Carlos and Elkind for the second time was based on the belief that he could control their work from the beginning. However, when Kubrick realised the differences in their vision of the music in the film, he decided to take control of it and refashion it to fit with his vision.

On the other hand, he granted Stainforth the creative freedom to work on his own and to create a new product from material that he was not satisfied with. This was probably because as his student, Kubrick felt he had more control over Stainforth and could therefore more easily strike the right balance between control and trust. Tony Lawson offers an alternative explanation when describing Kubrick's approach to editing *Barry Lyndon* with him: 'Stanley didn't know what he wanted – his search was for knowledge through discovery. He finds out what he wants by eliminating what he doesn't want' (quoted in Crittenden, 2018: 170).

Lawson's emphasis on Kubrick's willingness to experiment rather than on his need to control creative input is the reason Jocelyn Pook gives for why Kubrick was interested in collaborating with her on *Eyes Wide Shut*: 'Stanley used to ask me, "What is this music?" I think he liked that it was experimental and he couldn't put his finger on it' (quoted in Hobbs, 2018). Perhaps it is the appreciation that Kubrick had for her musical skills and knowledge that shaped their collaborative relationship. Pook tells an anecdote that dates to the beginning of the collaboration, which illustrates Kubrick's trust into her knowledge and

174

abilities: 'He looked at me right in the eyes and said "Let's make sex music!" I thought to myself, what the hell is sex music? Is it Barry White? Stanley didn't really care to elaborate, he just trusted me to answer the question' (quoted in Hobbs, 2018).

An alternative reading of what Pook referred to as 'trust' (in Hobbs, 2018) might be that Kubrick was in fact testing her abilities. Supporting this argument is the fact that, before she had started composing, Pook referred to the 'film remaining pretty much a closed book'; having not seen any filmed material, she was given (and took) creative initiative: 'Up to now I've just done sketches, blind, and since the meeting there's just been phone calls. It's been very loose and I haven't really found out what he wants yet' (Pook, quoted in Johnson, 1998). This does not mean, however, that Kubrick had no input in the development of the ideas: 'He had so much confidence in me, he was very kind and fatherly. If I got something wrong, he was patient and supportive. I had this quartet that I played with in churches and he would speak to me for hours about them, asking me every little detail about the most trivial things' (Pook, quoted in Hobbs, 2018). In this way, Kubrick can be seen as testing Pook's knowledge again and again, seeking to affirm the trust he placed in her. Considering Pook was a young composer and new to the film business, Kubrick needed to be confident not only in her knowledge but in her ability to deliver. His assistance in the development of ideas is a characteristic of Kubrick's student-mentor relationships, a way to lead his collaborator through the creating process, thereby still exercising control but in a less obvious way than, for example, being always present in the room. Just as Kubrick tested her knowledge, Pook needed him to reaffirm his trust in her. Flight told the same story: 'He only wanted people around him who were knowledgeable. He needed you to be a film person, first and foremost, to truly understand the aspect, because he would ask you a question, it was very complex. And straight away he would just say, "What about that?" You'd think, "Oh-" and if you didn't answer him correctly he wouldn't trust you' (personal interview, 2018).

It can be concluded that Kubrick's collaborative relationships were defined by the form of trust Kubrick developed with the individual. Most often, the trust was

based on the knowledge the collaborators displayed (knowledge that had to be proven again and again). This enabled Kubrick to place trust in people who were more knowledgeable in those areas he was not proficient in. With collaborators who were new to the working position (or the industry), Kubrick employed control-based trust, which often took the form of a student-mentor relationship. This allowed Kubrick to mould his co-worker, thereby ensuring that the work was executed to his standards. Both types of trust had the potential to develop into relationships that were based on affective trust; within these relationships, Kubrick was able to relinquish some control and a working environment was formed in which these collaborators were able to exercise their creative freedom.

Conclusion

Post-production stories have focused on a variety of collaborations in Kubrick's post-production process. The analysis has challenged the myth that Kubrick was always totally in control of all stages of his filmmaking. Instead, post-production is shown to be a stage in which Kubrick can be seen as actively developing and maintaining a complex framework of trust in his collaborators. This trust could be cognition-based (knowledge-based, control-based) and affective; the collaborative relationships that developed were characterised by on-going negotiations between trust and control.

Kubrick's collaborative relationships, especially evident in the picture and music-editing processes, illustrate Kubrick's use of control-based trust. This form was analysed in Kubrick's collaborations with Lovejoy and Hunter and is the form of trust that is most often correlated to the mythology surrounding Kubrick. Control was exercised with new co-workers (e.g. Pook) and workers who had been Kubrick's mentees, who were thus 'taught' to work within a system that Kubrick was able to trust (as he had implemented it). This is also the stage where Kubrick had the most control. When his authority was questioned or challenged, Kubrick would often end the collaboration (e.g. North).

While Kubrick was knowledgeable about some aspects of post-production such as colour estimation, he was less knowledgeable in others, and therefore had to rely on external collaborators' knowledge and skills to execute his vision. This then

required cognition-based or knowledge-based trust. Once Kubrick had sufficient evidence of their knowledge and their ability to deliver, he was able to develop affective trust and it is this form of trust that enabled long-term collaborations to be formed, as evidenced by the repeated collaborations with certain people. Contrary to the popular belief that he controlled every aspect of the process, I have shown that he often handed over decision-making to his workers. He trusted his assistants Andros Epaminondas and Emilio D'Alessandro to check the dailies, for example. 'If Andros thought the takes were good Stanley didn't even look at them. However if Andros thought there was a problem, for example something slightly out of focus, Stanley double-checked and decided whether or not it was necessary to shoot the scene again,' said D'Alessandro (quoted in Ulivieri, 2016: 210). In such cases, his collaborators were able to exercise creative freedom to a considerable degree.

Kubrick was generally less in control in post-production and became more dependent on external collaborators. Examples in my analysis are the development of special/visual effects in *2001*, the experimentation with digital special effects (CGI effects) and the application of correction techniques in the process of corrections to the edited film. In these examples, external collaborators at times needed to intervene to find solutions or even to redress mistakes, as was the case in the editing of *Eyes Wide Shut*. At these stages, Kubrick would rely on other people's knowledge and consequentially was less controlling, more willing to tacitly acknowledge the collaborators' crucial involvement in the process, thereby also implicitly affirming a view of post-production as intrinsically collaborative.

Chapter five: Promotion stories

Previous chapters have demonstrated the collaborative nature of Kubrick's filmmaking in the pre-production, production and post-production stages and have established that Kubrick relied on members of his crew to complete his projects. While he is known for his intense involvement in all parts of his filmmaking process, the final stages in filmmaking, distribution and advertising, are a perfect illustration of the significance of collaboration. An examination of these two stages represents the greatest challenge to the mythology of Kubrick as a director able to control the entire filmmaking and always having the last say. Instead, when it came to releasing his films, Kubrick often had to comply with external conditions.

There is a widespread belief that Kubrick supervised all the stages of his production. For example, Richard Daniels writes that he was '[W]ell known for having final say and how the film was marketed,' and claims that the materials from Stanley Kubrick Archive confirm this (in Ljujić et al., 2015: 82). However, this belief is challenged by academics who have chronicled the difficulties Kubrick faced when attempting to control the distribution and marketing of his films. Accounts of Kubrick's career by Peter Krämer (2011), John Baxter (1997) and Vincent LoBrutto (1999) all detail these difficulties and how Kubrick dealt with them. Krämer (2011) gives detailed attention to Kubrick's issues with distributing and marketing *A Clockwork Orange*. He draws on a vast body of evidence about the marketing and distribution of his films. His work, therefore, underpins this chapter while also creating space for a new interpretation of and fresh perspective on the evidence. While these studies adopt an auteur perspective, presenting stories that are about Kubrick's fight against disabling conditions, I propose a narrative that intertwines the themes of collaboration and control and argue that it is his reluctance to collaborate at this stage that may have caused the loss of control that ensued**.** Despite Kubrick's ability overall to maintain control over the filmmaking process, successful distribution and advertising campaigns rely on external factors such as the state of the industry, other individuals and companies. Collaboration in this respect is not only necessary but inevitable.

Hence, Kubrick had to delegate decision-making to his collaborators and risk losing the control he was used to.

This chapter will address the issues that Kubrick faced in the final phase of filmmaking and discuss the decisions that were made in order to finalise his projects. I will show that despite his efforts to dominate the decision-making, the famous auteur director did not maintain complete control over the advertising process. Indeed, in the case of *A Clockwork Orange*, he had lost control of both the promotion of the film and of how it was received. The marketing of the film, namely, the promotion campaign, is analysed in detail in relation to Kubrick's loss of control over the project. I will juxtapose archival data, testimonies of people involved in the promotion process and analysis of promotional products. I also adopt a critical stance on the film industry and trade press, in response to Keith M. Johnston's call (2013). To critically analyse the way in which *A Clockwork Orange* was advertised, I draw on Janet Staiger's account of the industry and of the social and regulatory discourses that informed the creative environment at the time (1990). Due to censorship of the film, audience reception and it then being withdrawn from the UK film market, *A Clockwork Orange* has become a myth. The myth emerged from the discourse environment of the time and affected the advertising campaign. Because some of these discourses are still in evidence today, the advertising process of *A Clockwork Orange* can be seen as emblematic of the battle between the directors and external forces for authority and creative autonomy over their films.

The initial issues with *A Clockwork Orange*

A Clockwork Orange was produced by Warner Bros, a production company that Kubrick had not collaborated with before. A 'three-film contract' was signed, as Julian Senior, Warner Bros.'s publicity director, explained to Michel Ciment (1980 in 1983: 223). The leadership of the company had changed at that time and newly appointed John Calley, Ted Ashley and Frank Wells[13] would strive to give the directors the creative freedom that they needed: 'This was the spirit of the new triumvirate at the beginning of the 70s: to give the director the right to the final

---

[13] Wells was a Vice President of West Coast for Warner Bros. in 1969 (Reeves, 1994).

cut and the possibility, should the occasion arise, of having a say in publicity, sales and distribution,' (Senior, 1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 223).[14] For Kubrick, this deal opened the door to a high-ranking production company that would allow him the creative freedom he wanted. However, the phrase 'should the occasion arise' (Senior, 1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 223) is rarely given any attention and yet this *caveat* is central to the debate about Kubrick's creative freedom and decision-making when it came to the distribution and advertising phase. Not only was Kubrick compelled to collaborate, but he depended on the decisions and actions of others to release and promote his film.

The collaborators who take over the distribution and marketing of a film can be classified as internal and external and, at times, both. The categorisation is complicated, however. For example, Julian Senior was an inside collaborator with regards to Warner Bros. and an external collaborator in relation to Kubrick. One could argue that Warner Bros. and Kubrick were working towards the same goal, namely a (financially) successful production and release of the film. However, the fact is that they collaborated under a contract, which by default is a signed agreement on conditions and options in the production of a film, thus involving compromises, such as the availability of funds for a particular process undertaken. Alternatively, their collaboration can be seen as internal as they worked as a team.

There is no definitive interpretation, nor is this essential for this research. What matters is the *nature* of the collaboration, which in the case can be viewed as a framework of hierarchal control in which participants have to find a way to collaborate. The roles are clearly divided. The production company is the main financier and, therefore, the main decision maker. Although Kubrick's deal with Warner Bros. was seen as unique, in that it granted him a substantial amount of freedom, Warner Bros. still made the final decisions. So, if Kubrick wanted his film to be released, he had to hand some control over to his collaborators. Control went to the publicity director and other publicity workers with whom he worked closely in planning and executing the promotion; however, the final call was always the producer's. In this sense, Kubrick can be seen as a 'subordinate'

---

[14] More details on the spirit of the 70s can be found in *The new Hollywood: From Bonnie and Clyde to Star Wars* (Krämer, 2006), *The Hollywood renaissance: Revisiting American cinema's most celebrated era* (Krämer and Tzioumakis, 2018).

collaborator, subjected to a range of restrictions and limitations. On the other hand, the same can be said for Warner Bros, since they depended on other bodies of authority, namely the industry's regulatory institutions such as the British Board of Film Classification (BBFC) and Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA). These were the institutions who granted permission for the film (and the screenplay) to be released and determined the conditions that needed to be met for this to happen. In this chapter I show how Kubrick's loss of control over the filmmaking process through his collaborations with external and internal co-workers impacted on the controversies around the film's release and reception.

Issues on rating

While distribution of a film begins after a film is completed, publicity begins before and during the filming and continues after the production has finished. With *A Clockwork Orange*, the publicity had such an impact that the film was being advertised even before it was released, due to the moral disquiet caused by the film's content.

The controversy began with the screenplay. The screenplay's initial writer, Terry Southern, had submitted it to a British film censor, who rejected it due to its controversial content. Kubrick then wrote his own *A Clockwork Orange* screenplay but Warner Bros. had realised that the finished film would receive an X-rating and did not want to invest more than $2,000, 000 into the production (Baxter, 1997). This affected the film's budget, limiting the pre-production and production of the film in terms of resources. After the film was finished, Warner Bros.' prediction turned out to be accurate and the rating of the film by the MPAA and BBFC strongly affected the process of the film's release in the UK and the US.

The BBFC and MPAA are regulating bodies that enable authorities to censor films to be released and distributed. Mark Kermode depicts BBFC as an 'organisation which views the provision of information as being of paramount importance, and which strives to strike a balance between the structures of UK law, and the still controversial principles of "harm", and the freedom of expression now legally enshrined in the Human Rights Act' (in foreword in

Lamberti, 2012: ix). Both BBFC and MPAA grant rating certificates that regulate the types of audiences that are allowed to see a specific film. They set a suitable age for the audience in regards to the film's content.[15]

Due to the social and cultural climate at the end of the sixties, the MPAA's new president Jack Valenti began to encourage greater creative freedom for filmmakers (Bernstein, 2000). Films that explicitly portrayed sex and violence started to emerge, e.g. *The Dirty Dozen* (1967), *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967) and *Midnight Cowboy* (1969). MPAA ended up raising the age limit from 16 to 17 in the R and X-ratings. The raise was Valenti's answer to the public's reaction to film violence after the murder of Martin Luther King and, at the same time, his attempt to protect the filmmakers' creative freedom.

In 1970, BBFC reacted to the increasing amount of films depicting violence and containing sexually explicit content by changing their initial classification of X-rated films as 'suitable for those aged 16 and over' (BBFC, 2018). The age limit was raised to '18 and over' due to the 'psychologically damaging effect on young people' that such films had (BBFC, 2018). Edward Lamberti identifies this decision as BBFC's response to MPAA raising the age limit (2012). While both regulatory bodies attempted to juggle between granting the directors their creative freedom and keeping the public 'safe from psychological damage' (BBFC, 2018), it was in MPAA's system that inconsistencies were first exposed, which crucially affected the promotion of *A Clockwork Orange* in the US (Lamberti, 2012).

MPAA's X-rating was problematic because it was not copyrighted but self-regulatory. Stephen Farber, a film critic and the president of the Los Angeles Film Critics Association, discusses this issue in his book *The movie rating game* (1972), which he wrote after his short apprenticeship at MPAA. He published confidential documents that unveiled the 'corruptive actions of the board' and addressed the controversy around the fairness and legality of the rating system's operations. He saw the initial problem as being a discrepancy between the original idea and the operational function of the rating system. MPAA's system of self-regulation was designed to function as an advisory system:

---

[15] More on ratings can be found in Lamberti (2012) and BBFC's official page.

The idea was that movies were just going to be classified in regard to their suitability for children. Presumably, nothing was going to be off-limits for filmmakers. It was just going to be an advisory system for parents and families. In theory, that was a sound idea that other countries were also trying at the time. But as soon as it started going into practice, there were a lot of problems not necessarily clear from the theory. People started getting involved in the censorship of movies again, cutting them to get a different rating, so the board got involved in censorious decisions that had been happening under the old system.

(Farber, quoted in Kohn, 2012)

Farber further explained how the involvement of other people affected the censorship process and defined the actions undertaken in order to avoid X-rating:

The board actually has several secret duties in addition to classifying films. As in the days of industry censors Will Hays and Joe Breen, board members participate in re-editing films and even in reshaping scripts. In other words, the board circumscribes the rights of adults as well as those of minors; it restricts the creative freedom of filmmakers, and the adult audience's freedom to see what it chooses.

(Farber and Changas, 1972: 1)

Although Farber's presentation of the MPAA's practice is subjective, his account of the 'revealed secret duties' can be applied to the censorship controversy that plagued *A Clockwork Orange*.

MPAA's policy affected the distribution and promotion of *A Clockwork Orange*. MPAA's initial decision to X-rate pornographic films led to the exhibiting and advertising of many X-rated films in 1972 being denied. *A Clockwork Orange* was included in this category and, consequentially, was not allowed to be

advertised in *The New Yorker* (Krämer, 2011). After many issues with so-called exploitation films (hard-core pornographic films fell into the same category as other X-rated films), MPAA later introduced a new policy, allowing re-edits, to create a distinction between the 'well-regarded' and 'pornographic' films (Blitz, 2014). I will discuss this policy later when I address the moment this option was given to Kubrick.

Before its release in the US on 20 December 1971 in New York (McDougal, 2003) and the UK (13 January 1972), *A Clockwork Orange* was rated 'X' in both countries (Krämer, 2011). The initial reactions after the release were positive. Film critic Margaret Hinxman declared the film a masterpiece and film critic Alexander Walker named it his favourite film of the year (Lamberti, 2012). However, about a year after, controversies about the film's content began to arise, resulting in the public's negative reaction to the sexual and violent content of the film. Krämer (2011) and Christian Bugge (n.d.) discuss the reactions of the critics, which reflected the political and moral attitudes guiding society at the time (ironically, in opposition to the creative freedom movement in the sixties). I will refer here to those that are central to my argument.

Perhaps the most negative response was Pauline Kael's review of *A Clockwork Orange* in *The New Yorker* (1972). On 1 January she wrote: 'We become clockwork oranges if we accept all this pop culture without asking what's in it. How can people go on talking about the dazzling brilliance of movies and not notice that the directors are sucking up to the thugs in the audience?' (Kael, 1972). Less than a month later, London's *The Evening News* published another negative review. 'The film stimulates for two and a half hours an appetite for sadistic violence with the instantaneous communication which the visual arts uniquely offer... I believe that when "A Clockwork Orange" is generally released, it will lead to a Clockwork cult which will magnify teenage violence' (Bugge, n.d.). This occurred at a time when 'copycat' crimes had begun to emerge in the UK and the US following the release of the film (Krämer, 2011; Darlington, 2016; Kolker, in McDougal, 2003; Lamberti, 2012). The press focused on crimes based on the violent scenes from the film, such as the beating of a tramp in two cities in the UK (Oxford, Manchester) and the US (Lamberti, 2012). However, Krämer notes that

the occurrence of these crimes in the US did not significantly influence public response to the film (2011). The uproar started after MPAA began to implement changes in order to continue screening the film. Warner Bros.' promotion coordinator, Mike Kaplan,[16] informed Kubrick of the results of a meeting of New York film critics (1972); he forwarded Kubrick their demand for a 'drastic revision or abolition of the motion picture association of America's rating system and urged MPAA' (SK/13/8/5/9, 1972).

The new rating system gave the film producers and the directors an option to settle for an R-rating (restricted viewing) on the condition that a few scenes of violence were cut from the X-rated version of their film (Friedman, 1973). Stephen Farber and Estelle Changas refer to these rules as 'ludicrous' and 'inflexible', claiming that after Aaron Stern had taken over the office in 1971, the re-editing of the director's final cuts considerably increased (1972). Finally, *A Clockwork Orange* was withdrawn from the cinemas for 60 days in order to re-edit it. At this point, I wish to draw attention to the effect that this action had and what the reasons behind the choices made might have been.

Stuart Y. McDougal (2003), Peter Krämer (2011) and Chip Rossen (1973) observe that only two scenes, altogether 30 seconds of the film, were re-edited (the threesome scene and the rape scene), enough for the MPAA to change the rating to R and to continue screening the film in cinemas. Again, I refer back to Farber's account of MPAA's working policy (1972). MPAA's offer to Kubrick and Warner Bros. was based on 'several pages of X elements', Rossen claims, and queries as to why only a minor re-edit of the film was enough for the MPAA board to pass an R-rating (1973: 57). *Variety* asked the same question, but also speculated: 'Did Kubrick agree to the changes now to open up as many bookings as possible, thus compromising himself in the view of many film buffs, or did the MPAA considerably soften its requests for changes this time from what it was demanding pre-release? Much trade opinion opts for the latter' (Baxter, 1997: 272). So, what did Kubrick do?

---

[16] Mike Kaplan was the Vice President of Polaris Productions (Kubrick's production company) between 1968 and 1971 and an internal marketing executive for Warner Bros. Los Angeles and London between 1971 and 1973 (*Prabook*, 2018).

Considering the 'secret duties' of the MPAA (Farber and Changas, 1972), it is very likely that a deal between Warner Bros. (including Kubrick) and the board (Jack Valenti, Aaron Stern) had been made. As I have not found explicit evidence in the Stanley Kubrick Archive, and as Farber does not state precisely *how* that had happened, this remains a speculation. But considering Farber's description of Stern's working techniques, it is very likely to be true: 'Even before Stern's promotion, he told the board that he hoped to be involved in more and more private consultations with filmmakers while they were writing their scripts, shooting and editing their films' (Farber and Changas, 1972). In a letter to his executive of international operations, Dick Ma,[17] Kubrick expressed his compliance with the rules for further distribution and confirmed his part in the final re-edit of *A Clockwork Orange*. 'Dear Dick,' Kubrick wrote in 1972, 'I have no objection to using the "R" version wherever it will be of help to you' (SK/13/8/5/9).

The decisions, compliance and 'secret' deals enabled the film's distribution and screening in the US. Kubrick's agreement with the changes also raises questions about the true nature of the rating attribution process. Farber and Changas believe that 'despite these attempts at intimidation, filmmakers could have more power than they think' and that the reason for the survival of MPAA's rating system was the support of the creative community (1972). I agree with this. However, 'the creative community' (Farber and Changas, 1972) does not only refer to the director's creative freedom but to the commerciality of filmmaking, which recognises a film's success in terms of its financial success. Although it is possible that Kubrick was not that interested in this form of success, I argue that two factors indicate that in the case of *A Clockwork Orange*, its financial success *was* important. Firstly, Kubrick is known for scrutinising his production funds; secondly, it is not his final decision, but the producer's, who, after all, is the main financier. This underscores the debate around creative freedom in filmmaking, which discuss further in the context of Kubrick's marketing techniques.

---

[17] Dick Ma was an assistant manager in the Warner Bros Pictures office in Hong Kong, later being in charge of the New York and Burbank office, and became an executive vice president of international operations (Goodridge, 2001).

What the discussion above demonstrates is that *A Clockwork Orange*'s rating attribution process was not a one-way street (i.e. Kubrick complying with all MPAA's conditions), but a collaboration between Warner Bros. (Kubrick) and MPAA (i.e. the suspected deal). It resulted in the circulation of two edited versions of the film (R and X) in the US which swelled the box office coffers and quelled public controversy (McDougal, 2003; Krämer, 2011). However, the situation was different in the UK. BBFC had issued *A Clockwork Orange* an 'X-rating uncut', justifying their decision by pointing out that the film was 'less explicit than the novel' (Lamberti, 2012: 90). After nine months of playing only in one cinema in London, the public uproar began in the UK, too.

A Christian organisation, The Festival of Light, which Krämer refers to as one of the 'moral crusaders' (2015), began campaigning for the ban of the film. In the upcoming year, other campaigns emerged at local level. The local authorities of Hastings, Worcestershire, Leeds, Blackpool, Brighton and Ruthin claimed the film unfit for presentation, but BBFC continued to defend the film's rating. Lamberti notes that BBFC's Secretary, Stephen Murphy, wrote a letter to the Irish Film Censor's Office, explaining that such public reactions were the work of the press and that he believed 'it was nonsense' (2012: 92). However, the dismay only increased as copycat crimes continued in the UK in 1973, causing moral panic and further controversy. Despite this, BBFC did not demand a change of the rating or a re-edit of the film and the controversies continued to the extent that, in 1973, Kubrick's family began to receive death threats and had protesters come to their home. Kubrick's wife, Christiane, told Chris Hastings: 'I was terrified. The threats were so detailed, and I was worried for the children' (2008).

There are contradictory accounts of what followed. Christiane Kubrick recalls the initiative to resolving the dangerous situation that had developed:

> We phoned the police and they advised us to leave the country. But we didn't want to do that, and as a family we were imploding with worry. So Stanley rang Warner Brothers and said, 'Look, I don't know what to do. Can I withdraw the film?' And they were wonderful and said

yes. Of course, that worked straight away. The threats

stopped. Then again, I guess that was the point.

(2008)

The idea of Kubrick acting on his own accord is prevalent. For example, Joseph Darlington notes that 'Kubrick himself stepped in to convince Warner Bros. to withdraw the film from UK cinemas after his family received a series of death threats,' (2016: 123). Jan Harlan described this decision as Warner Bros.' favour to Kubrick: 'Strictly, in legal terms, Stanley had no rights, but they agreed to do this, at great expense to themselves. It was much more than a matter of contracts, he and they had an excellent relationship, and Warner Brothers simply complied with his request' (quoted in Howard, 2000). Similarly, Baxter's biography on Kubrick also details this private agreement without public announcement, explaining that the secret was kept until 1979, and only given away when John Alcott was not able to get a still from the film (1997). Then, Warner Bros. officially confirmed the withdrawal of the film, which took place five years earlier (Baxter, 1997).

Lamberti (2012) and Krämer (2011) on the other hand, document the withdrawal of the film from UK cinemas rather differently. They explain that the initial run of *A Clockwork Orange* came to its end in 1974 and so, contrary to popular belief (e.g. Burton and Chibnall, 2013: 252), it was not withdrawn from the cinemas by Kubrick or Warner Bros. (Lamberti, 2012). Then two years later, in 1976, Warner Bros. planned a re-release, and it was then that Kubrick intervened, asking Warner Bros. not to go ahead (Lamberti, 2012). The film was then banned from being distributed in any shape or form, including videotapes, and could not be screened in the UK until after Kubrick's death in 1999. The ban was defied on a number of occasions. A documentary about the film's ban was screened and in 1992, the film itself was screened in a London cinema; they were both prosecuted for infringing copyright (Lamberti, 2012).

Due to the extremely negative experience with the release of *A Clockwork Orange* in the US and the UK, Kubrick's insistence on having the final say with regards to the final cut gradually began to change. In the years that followed, when

worldwide distribution of the film was in progress, Kubrick took a step back and conformed to the conditions of the countries in question. His dissatisfaction with this process is however evident from his correspondence, for example this letter from 1976:

> Re: censorship cuts. I am not happy about the thought but if you send me an exact feet and frames breakdown of what cuts would get the film past censorship, I will consider them. Have you ever seen the so called 'R' rated sections which we cut into the USA prints? This gained us the improved rating from 'X' to 'R'.
>
> (SK/13/5/33)

The application of the R-rating proved to be necessary for the successful distribution of the film to other countries. Information obtained from Kubrick's archive confirms this. Executives Dick Ma and Frank Wells would wittingly inform Kubrick of the conditions countries were imposing on the film in order for it to be distributed to and would proffer suggestions in relation to re-editing the film. For example, Ma informed Kubrick of the conditions in Puerto Rico: 'Because of nature of population and more pertinently of the exhibitors, we believe more bookings and thus more revenue can be secured from territory by utilizing domestic "R" version instead of original "X" version. Hope you agreeable,' (SK/13/15/3, 1972).

In most cases Kubrick agreed, albeit with little enthusiasm. In 1974, he informed Frank Wells of the 'quite substantial cuts' made for distribution in Greece, explaining that he 'went along with black blobs and some cuts for Japan'. However, he drew the line at the conditions for Hong Kong, stating that they were 'beyond any reasonable consideration' and that he preferred to wait for a new government that would allow the screening of the film (SK/13/8/5/9). Although Kubrick acquiesced to earlier cuts, Hong Kong was a step too far, demonstrating that Kubrick's willingness to collaborate had its limits; he did not accept any conditions for the sake of distribution.

Thus, while Kubrick did fight censorship, he was forced to take into consideration the circumstances surrounding the screening of *A Clockwork Orange*. This was especially the case in countries where the public were likely to react similarly to UK audiences. When distributing to New Zealand, for example, Dick Ma wrote to Kubrick about the on-going protests surrounding censorship clearance:

> As result of numerous letters protesting censorship
> clearance of CO New Zealand minister of internal affair
> has requested we submit picture for private screening for
> government officials including prime minister. Leader of
> opposition also invited but declined at the end. Had no
> alternative but agree cooperate with minister. Foregoing
> similar to what happened in London and hopefully will end
> with similar happy results.

(SK/13/5/3, 1972)

In certain situations and in certain countries, censorship clearance was not possible. As Ma wrote: 'Far East: due current agitation against sex and violence in films generally, have deferred censorship throughout Far East until more opportune moment' (SK/13/5/3, 1972). In other cases, the battle would be fought by Warner Bros.' lawyers. Umberto Orlandi tried to assuage Kubrick's concerns when writing to him about distribution in Italy:

> Nothing happened in Padna stop please disregard rumours
> and above all don't release any statement to press without
> asking me stop your communication to Ansa[18] agency
> concerning cuts supposedly performed by Venice festival
> jury might jeopardise line of defence our lawyer should we
> go to court so please let us and our expert lawyers handle
> situation and stop worrying.

(SK/13/5/3, 1972)

---

[18] Italian News Agency.

Orlandi's plea to Kubrick to 'not release any statement to press without asking him' was a result of previous experience with Kubrick opposing criticism of his work. He rarely communicated with the media, but in 1972, Kubrick submitted a letter to *The New York Times*, responding to a strongly subjective interpretative review of *A Clockwork Orange*, written by Fred Hechinger. Kubrick's exasperated letter (SK/13/8/3/62) stated that '[i]t is because of the hysterical denunciations of self-proclaimed "alert liberals" like Mr Hechinger that the cause of liberalism is weakened, and it is for the same reason that so few liberal-minded politicians risk making realistic statements about contemporary social problems' (1972). As Baxter notes, Kubrick defended the right to freedom of speech (1997).

But his reaction did not lead to a positive outcome. Instead, in the same year, the *Detroit News* announced that they would no longer advertise X-rated films (Baxter, 1997; Krämer, 2011), thereby following the lead of other American press media from years before, as has been discussed earlier in the chapter. The restrictions to advertising the film reduced the powerful role advertisers have in the successful distribution of a film. This finding engages with Barbara Klinger's definition of the role of promotion as: 'represent[ing] a sphere of inter-textual discourse that helps explain the complex relation between commodity discourses and reception' (1989: 5). By analysing *A Clockwork Orange*'s promotion campaign, I will debate the impact of its discursive 'sphere' and elaborate on its meanings and effects.

Advertising/promotion of *A Clockwork Orange*

The rating controversy over *A Clockwork Orange* had two effects – on the film's distribution and on the advertising campaign. Based on the disputed content of the film and the extreme public reactions, the campaign also became subjected to restrictions, which reflected the controversial advertising material. But it also had another effect, which Warner Bros. and Kubrick considered positive in terms of advertising the film. D'Alessandro explained that Kubrick adopted the same attitude he had with articles written about him and his work: 'As they say, there's no such thing as bad publicity' (quoted in Ulivieri, 2016: 226). This proved to be accurate; the critics' and public responses (some representatively archived in the binders of UK press cuttings during the period 1970-1979, SK/13/6/30) brought

the film into the spotlight, sparked interest and consequentially resulted in an increase in audience numbers. In order for the film to continue to fill cinemas, Warner Bros. and Kubrick had to keep the film in the public eye before and during its screening in the UK, the US and other countries in which it was distributed. It is at this stage that Kubrick's handover (and even loss) of control becomes highly evident.

Advertising and promotion is a form of narration that distributors employ using 'textual signifiers' (Wright, 2013: 1), carefully constructed and combined in order to frame a 'discourse around particular films rather than the film itself' (Wright, 2013: 3). This applies to *A Clockwork Orange*; it is the discourses, specifically the controversy created around the film, that were crucial in promoting the film. Janet Staiger's account of four discourse areas (1990) that the product being advertised is subjected to (and should be considered in creating a marketing campaign) is therefore relevant to the study of *A Clockwork Orange*'s advertising techniques and tools. An advertising campaign must consider the following: the established general advertising practices, conditions in the industry, social conditions and the state's regulative systems (e.g. censorship laws), and social science research methods (Staiger, 1990). All of them were considered in the promotion of *A Clockwork Orange*.

As the distributor of *A Clockwork Orange*, Warner Bros. led the planning of the advertising campaign. However, as in other areas of filmmaking phases, Kubrick wanted to be in control. However, from the beginning, this proved difficult because of Kubrick's initial lack of knowledge about advertising. Early on, therefore, there was a shift of creative control in that Kubrick had no choice but to place control of advertising into the hands of other external collaborators. As Senior explained: 'He admitted that he didn't know a great deal about advertising techniques, so we had someone brought over from an agency to explain them: posters, newspaper ads, etc.' (1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983).

Once Kubrick became familiar with the basics, he was able to collaborate with those people in charge of advertising and publicity, in planning the campaign, specifically, Julian Senior and Mike Kaplan. They developed an advertising technique that they referred to as a '[m]emory jogger on releasing a film' (Senior,

1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 223) and *Media proposals* (SK/13/5/36, 1971). The 'Memory jogger' that Senior and Kubrick created was a 30-page list of guidelines for advertising *A Clockwork Orange*. It detailed how many prints/copies of the film should be made, how many trailers were to be created, the information on various cinema facilities and equipment, such as the type of projectors and their masks,[19] information on whether specific TV networks preferred video or film (Senior, 1980 in Ciment, 1983: 223). The initial *Media proposals* and 'Memory jogger' resulted in an edited booklet – Warner Bros.' official *Press book* (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971).

Mark Millar refers to the press books as 'publicity stories' (1994: 188) which present a company's promotional strategies. His analysis of Warner Bros.' press books as 'helpful guidelines for the exhibitors' identifies that they usually consist of four parts: publicity, exploitation, advertising and accessories (Millar, 1994: 188). They contain the ideas and material that press agencies and cinemas can use to promote the film in their local areas: publicity stories, adverts, music, TV and radio spots and promotional material. I have categorised the promotional techniques/strategies used for *A Clockwork Orange* into five categories:

- Theatrical promotion: trailers and film posters
- TV and radio advertisements
- Print: Paid advertisements in newspapers and magazines
- Promotional material
- Promotional tours and interviews

I will consider each of these areas in turn, using *A Clockwork Orange* campaign as a case study.

Theatrical promotion: Trailers, film posters

Trailers are a reliable promotional tool as they represent a 'textual bridge' between the production company and the audience (Johnston, 2009: 21). They communicate the text by 'persistently drawing from the rhetorician's handbook and propagandist's toolkit' (Greene, 2013: 14), intentionally employing the 'promotional rhetoric that speaks to ideological and cultural conditions' (Kernan,

---

[19] Film screen masking is done to adapt the size of the screen to the aspect ratio of the image.

2004: 7). Warner Bros. used trailers that carefully considered the psychological effect they would have on the audience. They relied on the social, ideological and cultural circumstances around the controversy of *A Clockwork Orange* to manipulate the audience, reflecting Lisa Kernan's concept of trailers 'as representations of social space of their time' (2004: 159). This is why this technique is said to have allowed Kubrick the most creative control. While Kubrick undoubtedly exercised his control in deciding which shots from the film should be used for the trailer, it was Pablo Ferro, a typographer and designer of the credits in *Dr. Strangelove*, who was supposedly present in creating the trailer (Bradley, 2011), despite Warner Bros.' press book stating that 'Stanley Kubrick himself prepared the trailer for "A Clockwork Orange" and it is a great one' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). If one is to adopt Frederick Greene's concept of the trailer maker as 'a storyteller, hired to tell a story about another story' (2013: 15), Ferro is most likely to have been the storyteller in this case. Bill Seymour, the trailer producer at National Screen Service, a British trailer company, told Keith M. Johnston (2013) that he recalls Ferro coming to the company to put the trailers together (also for *A Clockwork Orange*). The authorship of the trailer can only be questioned from a moral point of view, as legally it was Kubrick and Warner Bros. It is highly likely that the majority of the creative ideas were Ferro's, but this is difficult to prove. It is indisputable, though, that the trailer was not a product of the director, but a result of a collaboration between Kubrick, Ferro and the National Screen Service.

The trailer for *A Clockwork Orange* combines very brief shots from the film, sometimes only a few frames (Krämer, 2011). This technique enables the manipulation of the 'image, graphic design, chronology, pattern and rhythm in the production of pleasures independent from if ultimately referential to their features' (Greene, 2013: 14). The shots were edited into a minute-long mix of flashes and juxtapositions (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971) and accompanied by the sped-up version of Gioacchino Rossini's *William Tell Overture* music piece used in the film. The whole trailer employs a unique technique of giving away the content, not by dialogue or voice-over, but by flashing words on the screen, such as 'witty', 'frightening', 'thrilling', 'metaphorical', 'sardonic', 'comic', 'bizarre', 'Beethoven', repeating throughout the mix, imitating the rhythm of the overlaid

song. Embodying the 'spirit of the 70s', the trailer abandoned the narrative rhetoric used before and turned to the 'genre rhetoric' to address a new generation of audiences (Kernan, 2004: 42).

Krämer's observation of the differences between the promotional techniques used for *2001* and *A Clockwork Orange* (2011) sum up this new approach. The promotion for *2001* focused on a wide range of audiences, whereas *A Clockwork Orange* was 'likely to put off many, if not most people' because of its X-rated content (Krämer, 2011: 427). 'Hence, the people who were most likely to be offended by *A Clockwork Orange* (in order then to complain about it in letters to Kubrick) were unlikely to attend screenings in the first place, which helps to explain why there were so few negative responses among Kubrick's correspondents' (Krämer, 2011: 427).

While it can be said that Kubrick had a lot of creative freedom in the design of the theatrical trailer, this was not the case in the creation of posters and TV and radio advertisements. Censorship again became heavily involved, limiting Kubrick's creative freedom in developing the adverts. Creating the film posters was also challenging and more information on the process has recently come to light. In interviews with Steve Mepsted (2011) and Jonathan Jones (2016), Philip Castle, a British illustrator and the creator of the posters for *A Clockwork Orange* and *Full Metal Jacket*, describes the creative process he was involved in, his collaboration with Kubrick and the changes that had to be made because of the censorship rules.

The most widely known *A Clockwork Orange* poster[20] features a triangle with one of the naked women statues from the Korova Milkbar, an eyeball and Alex (the protagonist) with a knife. The idea evolved from Philip Castle's sketches (Strick and Houston, 1972 in Castle, 2005) after Kubrick had shown Castle his finished film. Castle, whom Sim Branaghan and Stephen Chibnall refer to as 'pop artist' among the artistically conservative British poster makers of the 70s (2006: 98), first attempted to fit the content of the drawing (the protagonist Alex with the knife over a statue of a kneeling, naked woman) inside a giant letter 'A', imitating

---

[20] More information on *A Clockwork Orange* posters, their imagery and variations can be found in Krämer (2011), *The Stanley Kubrick Archives* (Castle, 2005) and in the Kubrick Archive in London (SK/13/4/14/2/8, 1970).

the shape of a pyramid. Castle was aware of the importance of symbolism for the narrative interpretation, i.e. he was fluent in the creative process, based on 'fragments of key narrative elements' being 'transposed in posters into fragmented images and text' (Haralovic, 1982: 53). His creation has, in fact, taken Staiger's promotional imperatives (1990) into account; he followed the established poster-making technique (drawing), considered the industrial and social conditions (by intentionally pushing the limit of acceptability) and, finally, also obeyed the regulative systems by making alterations in order for the poster to pass the R-rating in the US. The poster was controversial due to the nudity and violent images of eyeballs and knives and was, therefore, censored. As discussed before, some of the American newspapers objected to any advertising of *A Clockwork Orange* and a specific alteration to the US version of the poster to be used in theatrical promotion had to be made, in which the naked woman statue had to be covered with underwear. This alteration was made by employees of the Warner Bros. advertising agency, which, besides Fox, was the principal advertising agency of the early 1970s (Branaghan and Chibnall, 2006). The Warner Bros. advertising agency can, in this case, be seen as an 'internal' collaborator (if one is to view Kubrick-Warner Bros. as the primary collaborative relationship, i.e. referring to Kubrick as the 'in-house' director) and, as such, had advantages over other 'external' collaborators, including Castle. Conflicts arose when it came to recognising creative inputs, as the 'internal' collaborators often preferred to recognise creative input from their workers over the 'intruders'.[21]

Castle's poster was often transferred to the studio for corrections; for example the shape of the letter 'E' in the film's title had to be altered. Castle explained:

> The 'E' at the end of this sentence has been made different and the 'S' is slightly fatter than my original. And that would have been Bill Gold's entry into the process. It's fair enough. But, they only used this for the American and English posters. All the others were mine, which I roughed out myself.
>
> (quoted in Mepsted, 2011)

---

[21] For discussion on group membership see Gilbert (2000).

Based on the corrections, Bill Gold, the poster illustrator and the head of advertising at Warner Bros., became associated with its design: 'Gold was in charge of the studios where they did the posters and the credits and the titling. Well, they altered my lettering and this rankled me at the time. But I had no power, I know' (Castle, quoted in Mepsted, 2011). Being robbed of the copyright for his design of the poster (and the international versions of it as well) was upsetting for Castle, as it was his (right to) authorship that was ignored. The situation also strongly upset Mike Kaplan, and he wrote letters to all those who published the posters as Gold's work, to alter this information (Castle in Mepsted, 2011). Today, Castle is still not officially credited as the creator of the film poster, and when Gold exhibited some of his work, including the *A Clockwork Orange* poster, he took credit for its design (Castle in Mepsted, 2011). It is only recently that Castle's poster-designing work is discussed in terms of collaborative authorship: 'The conception, development and execution of the iconic key art for *A Clockwork Orange* was solely created by Stanley Kubrick and artist Philip Castle, with assistance by Mike Kaplan as Kubrick's marketing man and vice-president of Polaris Productions, his American company' (*Reel Art Press News*, 2010).

This provides an example of conflict in the field of copyright, one that speaks to the autonomy of creative work and also illustrates how creative work continually evolves and changes (due to demands). Other posters, of which various examples can be still found in poster shops today, feature stills from the film, either on their own or combined with the title and/or the 'letter logo' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). The poster that was used for advertising the film later was altered, in that the woman statue in the middle of the letter 'A' had been completely removed, and it is this version that is distributed across the world today. Many versions of the poster were further used for outdoor advertising. *Media proposals* list instructions for it: '500 pairs of bus posters, 500 quads on underground, bus shelter posters' (SK/13/5/36, 1971), and instructions for the use of other media, newspapers and magazines.

Print: Advertisements in newspapers and magazines

Print advertising in magazines and newspapers usually begins during the shooting of a film by accompanying the articles with some stills from the filming. However, this was not the case with Kubrick. Kubrick would avoid publicity on his sets. Senior commented on this issue:

> At the moment we are having a problem with photographs for the press. Stanley refuses to have a still photographer standing beside him, taking photographs of every scene. All the important magazines, from *Time* and *Newsweek* downwards, have raised objections to this. But Stanley won't be budged.

> (1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 223)

Senior agreed with Kubrick that the use of enlarged stills from the print of the film was the best choice quality-wise, but expressed his concern with Kubrick's technique of choosing them by going through the edited film frame by frame. 'Naturally, this causes problems, for as long as he hasn't completed editing the film – and he works on it right up to the last minute – it's impossible to give any publicity material to the press' (Senior, 1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983: 223). The lack of advertising during the shooting of the film had its drawbacks, one of them being that the reactions to the material were not visible immediately but only after all the material had already been produced. This resulted in further financial investments in advertising due to the many alterations that followed. Krämer notes that this resulted in the issues about rating intensifying during the marketing campaign and that the combination of this campaign technique and hostile press response led to the advertising ban (2011). *Detroit News* took the decision to no longer advertise X-rated films, which included *A Clockwork Orange* (Krämer, 2011). This meant additional work and increased financial investments for the production company. An example of additional work is Rob Gold's research into various magazines and the restrictions on X-rating (SK/13/8/4/16, n.d.), in a prepared list in the *Media proposals*: *Daily Mirror*, *News of the World*, *Sunday Mirror*, *Sunday Times* and *The Observer*, and a plan for a campaign in 'Specialist magazines: student, pop, "underground press" magazines' (SK/13/5/36, 1971).

An original attempt to avoid the restrictions and pursue creative freedom in advertising is mentioned by Philip Castle (in Jones, 2016). Warner Bros. published their newspaper *The Orange Times*, in which Castle's controversial drawings, stills and 'even cartoons' and an 'assortment of press cuttings pertaining to the film's pre-Christmas 1971 limited release' could be freely published (*Press book*, SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). Despite Warner Bros.' press book inviting advertising, e.g. 'Here is a provocative way to get college students and other sophisticated moviegoers to see *A Clockwork Orange*' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971), the advertising campaign only contributed to the growing controversy around the film, and the campaign was forced to bring the focus back to the available print, e.g. newspapers and magazines.

The ads in print were reprinted posters, which combined credits with cue lines such as 'Being the adventures of a young man whose principal interests are rape, ultra-violence and Beethoven' and credit lines such as 'Best film of the year' and 'Best director of the year'. They were distributed to press agencies and cinemas in the form of a press book (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). Kubrick meticulously monitored the publication of the adverts; he would measure the size of each one that was published. Frederic Raphael retained a vivid memory of this activity:

> I remember there were newspapers all over the floor –
> German newspapers. So I said, oh, what are you doing?
> You... you got a new floor? 'What... what do you mean?'
> Well, I mean, all the, you know, newspapers – that just
> been retiled or something? So he said, 'No. No, no, no, no,
> no, no, no, no. Those... those are German newspapers.
> Excuse me. If you look closely, you'll see they've got ads
> for my... my last movie in it, you know? And I've been
> measuring the ads.' Measuring the ads? Why are you...
> why are you measuring the ads? 'Because, you know, in
> the contract it says what size they have to be, you know.
> Some of them are, like, two, three millimetres short, you
> know. So, I mean, I get them to do it again.'

<p style="text-align: right;">(quoted in Web of Stories, 2017)</p>

Measuring the ads in the newspapers and magazines was Kubrick's way of exercising control over the advertising process that he had begun to lose. Despite collectively developing the advertising campaign with two external collaborators, namely Senior and Kaplan, external circumstances influenced its progress. The circumstances of the creative process changed and the campaign was affected by them accordingly, as proven by the censorship actions that followed the public's response to the film.

Not being able to control the environment, or having the creative freedom in advertising, Kubrick at times directed his exasperation towards his collaborators. Baxter notes that Kubrick was dissatisfied with Warner Bros. 'mishandling' foreign distribution (1997: 269). This can be observed in the negotiations in 1978 for the distribution of the film between Warner Lieberfarb, the vice-president for telecommunications at 20th Century Fox, and Albert Salem, the distributor in Rio de Janeiro. Lieberfarb explained that he and Senior tried to convince Kubrick of the logic behind the release plan that Liebefarb had proposed, but he concluded the letter with more caution: 'Although I am not certain by any means that he will agree to a different pattern, I think we have an honest chance provided we make a comprehensive marketing program. Both Julian and I are anxious to assist and will do everything possible' (SK/13/6/11, 1974). A conclusion can be drawn that Warner Bros. actively attempted to implement creative changes to form successful collaborations with foreign distributors and communicated this to Kubrick, in the hope of his positive response. As noted earlier in the chapter, this sometimes happened – Kubrick trusted Dick Ma and many times would back off from insisting on his initial edit of the film, but sometimes he did not.

TV, radio advertisements

As a standard practice for a film's release, the advertising campaign for *A Clockwork Orange* targeted various media, including TV and radio spots. According to Senior, the 'Memory jogger' sketched ideas about the types of promotion (1980, quoted in Ciment, 1983), which he later gathered and presented in the *Press book*. Advising the agencies, distributors and cinemas on exhibition methods to be used was based on material for advertising in the audio-visual media in the form of TV spots, radio spots and TV outlets. But these did not come

with the sealed deal for distribution of the film (which was based on bought rights for screening the film) but had to be separately arranged with the Warner Bros. *Campaign plan manager* (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971).

The decision to employ this option of a separate arrangement was not solely based on Warner Bros.' plan management, but was mainly due to the fact that there was no clear attribution of responsibility for arranging local media coverage and the power in designing the campaign was still in the hands of the local exhibitors (Burton and Chibnall, 1999). Thus, Warner Bros.' press book was only a 'guide' to the design of the marketing campaign and not obligatory materials to be used. Nevertheless, it was still very explicitly designed.

The press book presented precise descriptions that provided a list of timed TV spots that 'feature the fast almost subliminal cuts interspersed with quick descriptive one-word sales messages. All this with the background of the *William Tell Overture* from the film' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). In the trailer, the flashing images of the promotional messages are included in it but differ to the TV outlets. While one might consider this differentiation as compliance with BBFC's censorship rules, this could not have been the case. According to Su Holmes, BBFC classified films 'in whole rather than in part' and did not X-rate the TV trailers/outlets in the same way (2005: 236). They insisted on the 'artistic rationale for film censorship' and, following the spirit of the 70s, allowed freedom in the design of TV trailers, as they should reflect 'the cardinal factor in the censorship of films – the intention of the director' (Holmes, 2005: 237). TV trailers for *A Clockwork Orange*, therefore, were not subjected to limitations in editing the content, but were designed to achieve the best results from this type of promotion. The press book offered two edited clips from the film; the first one includes a scene from the beginning of the film, namely the Korova Milk Bar accompanied by the music of Beethoven, while the second edited clip features the scene from the music shop (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). Warner Bros. suggested using the two edited clips in TV media advertising in a few ways; the outlets could be used in local talk shows, 'at the end of a too-short movie' and set up as projections in cinema lobbies (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971).

These suggestions were Warner Bros.' selling technique, which they employed by strongly encouraging (again, not enforcing) the use of the radio. They advertised two radio spots, 30 and 60 seconds long, featuring quotes from reviewers (of course, the positive ones), as 'some of the best prepared spots in recent years' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). They were to be placed on youth, specifically college-orientated radio stations, and 'will ensure a successful engagement for you' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971; Krämer, 2011).

The press book is an example of a cleverly conducted advertising campaign. It offered material to the distributors and the press, but at the same time took into account Kubrick's controlling attitude towards the advertising of his film, and most probably strongly insisted on the use of the suggested material. This can be speculated from the *Press book*'s call to 'make sure that all opinion makers in your community see it' by instructing the cinemas to 'set up screening well in advance and feel the effect at the box office' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971).

Luring the distributors with the promise of successful box office results was, of course, driven by a goal shared by Warner Bros. and Kubrick. Not only did the cinema box offices profit, but Kubrick got a percentage of the profit. By signing the contract with Warner Bros., he was to receive 40% of the profits (Baxter 1997). Kubrick's demand for the best presentation of his film was therefore strongly supported by Warner Bros. The campaign included as many selling techniques as possible. Some were more successful than others, depending on the media's accessibility and popularity. According to Krämer, at the time of the film's release, newspaper advertising was more important than film trailers or TV advertising (2011). Therefore, expanding their promotional campaign by including other promotional material for the film proved to be a profitable marketing decision for Warner Bros. and Kubrick. The promotion materials came in many options and were widely distributed to various countries.[22]

Promotional material

---

[22] Copies of the final approved booklet for English, Italian, French, German and Portuguese can be found in Stanley Kubrick Archive (SK/13/4/14/2/9, 1971).

Promotional material for *A Clockwork Orange* was aimed at audiences around the world. Contrary to most[23] of the other advertising material, it was partially produced before the film was finished. This is indicated in a postcard that Kubrick and his assistant Tony Frewin received from 'Gus'[24] in 1971; it stated that he (Gus) expects the film to be finished before his return (SK/13/6/4). The postcards, aimed at the UK and French markets, featured artwork from the film, such as pictures of the main character with the woman statue from the Korova Milk Bar (SK/13/6/4, 1971). They were accompanied with specifically designed *A Clockwork Orange* stamps (SK/13/5/38, 1971). Other promotional material such as sweaters (referred to in a letter from Mike Kaplan, SK/13/6/7, 1972), iron-on patches featuring Alex in a bowler hat on an orange patch including the film's title and cue line 'Best Film of the Year/Best Director of the Year' (SK/13/6/5, 1971), prove that this material was created after the release of the film, advertising its awards.

The same is true for the 'just been published' softcover book of the film. The press book describes it by citing Kubrick's description: 'A complete, graphic representation of the film, cut by cut, with the dialog printed in the proper place in relation to the cuts, so that within the limits of still photographs and words it is an accurate record of the film' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). This softcover book was to be one of the 'must have' promotion materials for Kubrick fans and cinema students. A reference to the book's publishing company (Ballantine) is made and other promotional material the company had created is advertised, and the press and cinemas are encouraged to take advantage of it, announcing that they 'will be happy to cooperate in making tie-ups with retailers' (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). Thus, not only did Warner Bros. create the material with the help of other collaborators and give them authorial attribution, but it also promoted work that the collaborating companies did and allowed them to market other material that they produced. Warner Bros. formed collaborations in promotion wherever possible.

The *Press book* features music records and albums for *A Clockwork Orange* and Kubrick's other films and advocates a collaboration between the press and

---

[23] I say most because the trailers, TV and radio spots and posters were also being worked on during the production of the film. Kubrick had already been working with Ferro on clip selection for the trailers during the editing process.

[24] This could be Gustav Hasford, the screenplay writer for *Full Metal Jacket*.

cinemas and radio stations, suggesting that a 'Kubrick Music Retrospective' could cover a 'complete day of programming' with his music tracks (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). Warner Bros. even proposes arranging discussion groups with music critics and students, specifying the topics that could be discussed (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). They supported their idea with the fact that 'prestigious syndicated radio program *Sound on film*' had already advertised the film's music on 'numerous stations' and were best to be used, again, to draw in the college and student audiences (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971).

Connecting different media was a distinct marketing feature that Warner Bros. used in many cases, referring to it as 'tie-up' technique. For example, the music albums were to be sold in music record shops advertised by a poster with the title 'It keeps on selling like Clockwork', clearly connecting it with 'now playing in' cards and stills from the film (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971). These combinations of promotional material indicate how advertising posters played a role in other advertising media. They were not only meant to be used as ads in newspapers and in exterior advertising, but also in the promotion of music, record covers, book covers, 'now playing in' cards, special ad-pub mats (SK/13/5/2/7, 1971), foyer souvenir brochures (in English and German, SK/13/6/27, 1971), etc., all by taking the images and titles from the poster and still photographs to make combinations of various promotion material. This was all implemented to connect with the audience – to promote viewing, reviewing and passing on recommendations for viewing of *A Clockwork Orange* in the cinema. The promotion campaign ensured that the film was unforgettable both after and before the viewing. Warner Bros. urged the use of the inviting lobby and theatre front displays:

> In this extremely visual film, Stanley Kubrick has given
> you a wealth of raw material for different and effective
> theatre fronts and lobby displays. Make use of the
> materials available in the form of stills and reviews and be
> as creative as you can. This effective promotion has been
> paying off since the film first opened its exclusive
> engagements.

<p style="text-align:right">(SK/13/5/2/7, 1971)</p>

Besides the creative combinations of material and tie-ups of different media, a successful complete advertising campaign included other 'exclusive engagements', specifically, promotional tours and interviews.

Promotional tours and interviews

Whereas Kubrick was not keen on giving interviews and public appearances, some of his collaborators had little choice. Malcolm McDowell and Anthony Burgess were involved in the personal promotion of the film by providing TV and newspaper interviews and doing promotional tours, as they were obliged to by their contracts. This promotion technique proved to be contentious, too. The reason lay in McDowell and Burgess' displeasure with Kubrick's controlling work practices. 'Rigid on advertising and distribution,' was how McDowell described him (quoted in *An examination of Kubrick's 'A Clockwork Orange'*, 1972), and shared his opinion of Kubrick's constant attempts to retain complete control in the promotion phase with an anecdote from the time of the one-week publicity tour in New York in January 1971. Each morning, after the limousine would pick them up, Burgess would ask McDowell, 'Have you shit today?' to which they both burst out laughing, mocking Kubrick's over-controlling nature (Hofler, 2014: 249).

However, as representatives of the film, they had to put their personal feelings aside and advertise the film in a positive light. This proved to be challenging because they were directly confronted with the controversy surrounding the film. Philip Strick and Penelope Houston write about the controversies around the film's effect, resulting in Kubrick finding himself 'in the front line of somebody else's war' (1972 in Castle, 2005). But it is, in fact, his collaborators that were confronted with it in person in the promotion stage. During interviews, they faced aggressive questioning about the film's impact on society, forcing Burgess and McDowell to defend the film's reputation. Barbara Walters, the hostess of the *Today* show, criticised the explicitly violent content of the film, and confronted McDowell and Burgess with the news of a crime that had occurred in New York – a group of teenagers had dressed up as 'the droogs' (the violent gang from the film) and sexually assaulted a nun (Hofler, 2014). Burgess described his reaction to what he felt was a personal attack on him:

I was not quite sure what I was defending – the book that

had been called 'a nasty little shock' or the film about

which Kubrick remained silent. I realized, not for the first

time, how little impact even a shocking book can make in

comparison with a film. Kubrick's achievement swallowed

mine, whole, and yet I was responsible for what some

called its malign influence on the young.

(quoted in Hofler, 2014: 250)

The frustration that arose when they were left to 'take care of the mess' that the film had caused, was due to the fact that Burgess and McDowell were not prepared for such situations by the distributor in any way. Neither could they count on Kubrick's assistance in dealing with it and this realization left McDowell and Burgess strongly resentful. They saw Kubrick's step back not as a sign that he was handing over control, but that he was washing his hands of any responsibility. The origin of the dismay is more complex and more factors led to such reactions of Kubrick's collaborators.

Kubrick's reluctance to grant authorship for the creative work has been repeatedly discussed in this study as a dominating factor. However, another one, closely connected to the first, can be observed, namely Kubrick's lack of humanity when it came to working with people. His lack of humanity was both professional and personal. Not having their creative input recognised has both material and emotional connotations for workers. Firstly, at a professional level, the lack of recognition for their work harms their career, their status and their morale. Secondly, loss of morale leads to feelings of dejection because of not being shown gaining respect (earned by hard work) and results in a strong emotional response. McDowell recalled Kubrick's attitude before another scheduled promotion of the film: 'And then with Stanley, I gave him absolutely everything I had – everything I had – and he barely called me after that. So it was like a total rejection of you as a person. Sure, he'd call when he wanted me to go to America to sell the bloody movie, but it really hurt. It was shocking' (quoted in Labrecque, 2014).

While the promotional tours and interviews proved to be a powerful approach in successfully advertising the film, they were galling for the people who did them. The promotion process was physically and mentally demanding, but the biggest issue was the lack of recognition of an individual's work. Unrecognised autonomy (creative and personal) and lack of recognition and attribution of an individual's creative input are a recurring feature of dissatisfaction among Kubrick's crew. The success of the film had been such that the title *A Clockwork Orange* is forever associated with Kubrick's film; 'Nobody comments about Anthony Burgess anymore but he is the real genius here' (McDowell, quoted in Genova, 2016).

McDowell's frustration was shared by many of Kubrick's co-workers. They felt let down by the director when it came to recognition of autonomy and authorship of their creative work. Such experiences continue to fuel the myth of Kubrick as the inhumane tyrant: 'Kubrick was the kind of personality who'd use and dump. He'd squeeze you till the pips squeaked and then, when it was over, it was over. Of course I was hurt by that. I'd left my soul up there on the screen. But that's just the man he was' (McDowell, quoted in Mackenzie, 2004). Interestingly, these traits also encourage the public's fascination with the director and, as such, contribute to the continuous promotion of his work. This can be demonstrated in the effect that Kubrick's decision to withdraw the film had on international distribution.

Distribution

The film was withdrawn from the UK cinemas and the distribution of the promotional material was discontinued as well. However, due to the film's widespread publicity, the effect of the withdrawal only spiked a series of actions taken by the audiences and Kubrick's fans. People began to travel abroad in order to purchase copies of the film, which in other countries were distributed in the form of video, music records and other promotional material. Plane tours to Paris were organised to enable people to access the material (a copy of the film and its marketed material). McDowell described these events as a consequence of Kubrick's 'shrewd' commercial decision to create and continue taking advantage of the myth around the film (quoted in Labrecque, 2014). Kubrick was set on encouraging the continuous publicity, even when faced with the prospect of his

film not being re-approved for distribution to the cinemas. McDowell gave his perspective on Kubrick's decision: 'I mean, the thing was that it had played for a year in the West End. It wasn't like it was an economic hardship. You know, I mean, it had played its… It had done its time, as it were' (quoted in Weiner, 2014). While the 'shrewd' commercial decision was successful on the one hand, on the other, it failed to achieve one of Kubrick's main intentions – to give the audience the best experience in seeing the film.

Kubrick would be so persistent in this demand that he attempted to have control over the cinema environments, too; this included the technical capabilities (projectors), screen quality and even the colour of the ceiling above the audience seats. In Kubrick's opinion, the colour of the ceiling created an undesired glare, and so he instructed painters to repaint the ceiling from shiny white to black. The story was, according to Julian Senior (1980 in Ciment, 1983) that painters initially made a mistake in using a shiny black, which led Kubrick to send them back to repaint it with a matte black.

Despite his persistent attempts to control the screening environment, it is with distribution that Kubrick had the most difficulty maintaining control. This was especially the case in distributing *A Clockwork Orange* videotapes to other countries. 'After all the care Kubrick had spent in lighting and setting up the shot and then people were seeing it on a horrible scratchy old video. That's the irony there,' stated McDowell with reference to Kubrick's loss of control (quoted in Labrecque, 2014). Devin Faraci points out the same fact: 'The message of his film was being missed, and he refused to let the movie take on a life of its own. They say that once a movie is released it belongs to the public – Stanley Kubrick obviously didn't agree,' (2013). Nonetheless, as demonstrated in this chapter, despite his best efforts to control the film's image and reception, it has had a life of its own to some extent.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided insight into the creative power that Kubrick's external and internal collaborators had over the advertising and distribution of his films. Contrary to other phases of filmmaking where Kubrick appeared to be in control,

it is in distribution and advertising/promotion/marketing where the success of the film not only depended on but was governed by other people, thus undermining Kubrick's total control over his filmmaking. Successful distribution and promotion rely on other external collaborators – individuals or companies, such as press agencies, and even the public's reception of the film. Kubrick's influence lessened and he had to rely on other people's assistance and decision-making. It may be precisely because Kubrick found it difficult to share control – and collaborate – that he partially lost control of the process of distributing and advertising *A Clockwork Orange*.

The first part of the chapter demonstrated that Kubrick's manipulation of events ceased when the film was subjected to BBFC and MPAA's evaluation. The rating they attributed restricted Kubrick's creative freedom, resulting in him compromising with re-edits to get the film released. However, despite conforming to the externally imposed rules, the release of the film was accompanied by biased reviews, fuelling a public outcry and, as a consequence, affecting the film's reception to the point that the film was withdrawn from the UK market.

The second part of the chapter argued that these incidents assisted in creating the myth of *A Clockwork Orange*, which worked as a promotional tool by itself. It influenced the promotional campaign in terms of restriction of the material allowed to be used in advertising, but at the same time created free advertising of the controversial film and attracted audiences precisely because of the uproar that surrounded it. Although Kubrick's decision not to continue to exhibit the film in the UK did influence the film's income from UK distribution, it proved to be profitable from other sources. Other media, such as the videotapes of the film and the film itself, were successfully distributed internationally – to Italy, Germany, Portugal, France, South America, China and Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand, etc.

However, the myth created around *A Clockwork Orange* was not only a successful promotional tool for international audiences, but also influenced the reception to the re-release of the film in the UK after Kubrick's death in 1999. Newspapers featured titles such as 'Kubrick's "Clockwork Orange" will be re-released uncut after 27 years' (Pearce, 1999). As a result, the film was shown in 328 cinemas,

earning £619,000 during the first weekend of its exhibition (Krämer, 2011: 119). It can be said that Warner Bros., in collaboration with the promoters of Kubrick's legacy, namely Leon Vitali, Anthony Frewin and Jan Harlan, successfully targeted the promotion campaign for the re-release of the film at the controversy around the film's rating certification. While Kubrick did not achieve the completely successful distribution of the film in the UK, due to losing control in the advertising phase, after his death, the advertisement, exhibition and distribution of *A Clockwork Orange* was to a large extent successful.

Conclusion: Hidden behind the noise

This study set out to challenge the mythology that surrounds Stanley Kubrick's filmmaking practice through a focus on historical discourses around collaboration. Its aim to develop a new approach to the study of collaborative or multiple authorship was pursued through a new interpretation of the historical discourses surrounding Kubrick's filmmaking. I have critically addressed the past and contemporary approaches to the study of authorship and autonomy, and suggested an alternative way to recognising the creative input of production crews.

An auteur approach to Kubrick's works commonly sees the director as the central presence in his films and focuses solely on their involvement in the production process and on the themes and stylistic approaches that characterise the body of work. This study's intention was not to negate the validity of the auteur model, nor the distinctiveness of his films but rather to address the problematics of interpreting his work as a director solely from this perspective. The auteur model still dominates Kubrick studies (or fandom), as observed in adaptation studies, industry studies, biographical research and textual analyses based on various philosophical, psychological and identity connotations to Kubrick's work. The sea of literature that arises from this approach has strongly contributed – and continues to contribute – to the Kubrick mythology. It does so by assuming his complete autonomy and control over his filmmaking with the representation of Kubrick as the 'obsessive perfectionist' (Edwards, 2013) and a 'tyrannical' (Ulivieri, 2017) boss unwilling and unable to compromise his vision or decisions in any way. Although the auteur model continues to dominate Kubrick studies, a turn towards the collaborative model has been observed in recent years. I have pushed the idea of collaboration further. By recognising the significance of the 'noises' of production, the correlation between mythology and auteurism in Kubrick studies can be challenged. My analysis is predicated on the view of filmmaking as an intrinsically collaborative endeavour, hence its focus on the crew's inputs within Kubrick's working practice.

> Truly creative collaborations – a production designer
> whose ripple of insight makes a cinematographer's work

'sparkle', a unique solution suggested by the boom

operator, a collision of opposing ideas between the writer

and director that transitions into an even better idea – are

worth more than gold to filmmakers.

(Hodge, 2009: 19)

The analysis of the collaborative elements in the filmmaking environment and practice offers a fresh perspective on Kubrick's work practice. It has shown that Kubrick was well aware of the importance of collaboration and communication and, contrary to the image of his self-sufficiency, did employ collaboration regularly.

This study has also focused on analysing the discourses in the mythology, the archival, literary and interview sources, and presented them in the form of 'stories'. These are stories of how Kubrick's crews were formed, how they functioned in the creative environment of his productions, stories of individual creative inputs and collaborative effort in the pre-production and production processes. They are also stories about Kubrick's control – from his exhibition of control, his willingness to collaborate, to moments of the loss of control over the process in the later, post-production and marketing stages. The stories address technical aspects, communication and idea development and identify a range of collaborative practices Kubrick engaged in. As such, these stories form clusters of discourses that have emerged from specific filmmaking stages, specific collaborative relationships and specific creative practices. They serve to disrupt existing Kubrick mythology, challenge the accepted view of Kubrick, and reveal alternative perspectives. These are used to create a nuanced argument about collaboration and creativity in Kubrick's films.

Within existing research on Kubrick and emerging studies on his collaborative practice (e.g. academic as well as Tony Zierra's documentary on Kubrick's last film, *Eyes Wide Shut*), I situate my intervention within discussions about authorship, the nature of collaborative relationships and their effect on filmmaking practice and on the workers. My study has expanded the analytic framework to more production stages (pre-production, production, post-production and

promotion stage), focused on various production processes (crew formation, planning, filming, editing, research) and revealed information about Kubrick's productions. It has demonstrated how the extent of control he had over the production process fluctuated, to the point of losing control entirely at the promotion stage of *A Clockwork Orange*; through these fluctuations one can discern Kubrick's reliance on his collaborators. These individual collaborative relationships are examined in terms of the flow of creative input, originating from Kubrick, the idea generator, the innovator, the implementer and the author but with significant contributions from his collaborators. The study focuses on the workers' inputs (creative, organisational and executional), shedding light on what has hitherto been dismissed as mere background 'noise' of production.

This does not mean that all background noise should be viewed as 'voices' nor that all voices should be considered as authorial inputs; but some reconsideration is needed. The crew is a collective of individuals who not provide their labour but contribute to the creation of the final product with their skills, knowledge and emotional and intellectual commitment. Although individual workers are not authors of the product, they are authors of their work, which also means they are authors of the creative input that collectively shapes the final product. By identifying the various individual contributions in terms of research, ideas and knowledge in the technical execution of ideas and solutions to challenges, I have attempted to identify the significant voices and contributions, particularly in moments when Kubrick was not in control and needed his collaborators' skills. By doing so, I show how certain discourses have shaped the mythology around Kubrick, highlighting their role in the historical account of events, actions and perceptions of Kubrick as a director. Through identifying these complex sets of perceptions around authorship, autonomy and creative freedom in the collaborative environment of filmmaking, I identify the discursive patterns that characterise collaborative practices in Kubrick's filmmaking.

Superseding a historical analysis, I have located the filmmaking process within its social and cultural context and have suggested that filmmaking practice can be compared to other creative group work in society. A social group is formed and functions in a social environment; in the case of film production, this environment

is the film industry. The industry has its institutions (that guide and affect the work) and social processes that occur in the process of filmmaking. This includes communication in the groups, the flow of creativity, the hierarchy of control and the ways in which it limits individual creative expression. Studying the creative process within film production as a social phenomenon means that workers can be seen as members of the society that is the filmmaking industry. As such, it has its own rules and practices that dictate the creative process. This contextual approach to understanding the creative process has resulted in a study that identifies the individual elements that lead to moments of collective/collaborative creativity.

Through employing a combined methodology, this study has shown that discourses can be more successfully analysed by not only juxtaposing archival material and personal testimonies, but by applying perspectives arising from theoretical approaches such as social studies. This study has focused on recognising these processes (or elements of them) in the production practice through the analysis of the discourses that arise from interviews and by searching the archival historical evidence of these processes. In this way, I have analysed the mythology discursively and formed a new perspective on the creative process that Kubrick's crews engaged in. I argue that the creative process was only possible through collaboration but that collaborative practice in Kubrick's productions is complex and exhibits many contradictory features which are still combined in such a way that they enable the creation of the final product.

Findings

The importance of the collaborative work identified and explored through this dissertation can be seen in recent documentary accounts of Kubrick and specific members of his production personnel. As a response to the Kubrick mythology, these documentaries focus on presenting the director and his filmmaking practice from a different perspective and mirror many of the themes in my work.

The first attempt to present a different vision of the director was made two years after Kubrick's death by his long-term collaborator and brother-in-law, Jan Harlan, in *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures*. Although the documentary focuses on Kubrick's life, it strives to put the mythology to rest with various testimonies

of his collaborators, family members and friends. The interviews mostly address Kubrick's personality, challenging the idea that he was a recluse in his personal life and a tyrant in his working practice. My research has also shown Kubrick to be capable of forming close relationships with some of his long-term collaborators. Douglas Milsome states that he felt a part of his family (personal interview, 2016), and Jan Harlan, who in fact is a part of the family, was responsible for production matters. Such relationships indicate that Kubrick was drawn to working in an environment formed of close collaborations with people he trusted and who trusted him. Vitali explained how Kubrick once stood up for him when facing delays with an external company: 'You say to them, if they're talking like that to Leon they're talking like that to me' and concluded, 'it really felt that there was some kind of loyalty there' (quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017). The myth of Kubrick as an over-demanding director is clearly not unfounded, but moments of compassion, loyalty and friendship challenge the image of the 'cold' (Bogdanovich, 1999) director.

Filmworker and *S is for Stanley* tell stories of two of Kubrick's closest collaborators, Leon Vitali and Emilio D'Alessandro, who are also Kubrick's all-in-one assistants. Vitali's story on the beginnings of his collaboration with Kubrick is representative of what I identified as sociocultural and the socio-cognitive dimensions of his collaborations. Due to his accumulated cultural capital, evident from his knowledge of the film production process, Kubrick would maintain a certain social status, which he utilised when forming collaborations and negotiating deals. Sociocultural approaches as reflected in Kubrick's communication techniques, gave his collaborators more flexibility in terms of whether or not to engage, whereas socio-cognitive approaches proved to be more complex. Kubrick's knowledge of the industry and the independence he had gained in the middle of his career (when signing a contract with Warner Bros.) secured a position in the hierarchy of the film industry that allowed him, to a certain extent, to form the creative environment, which then dictated the creative process that the workers engaged in. This has been identified as employing the hierarchical order of power in the industry and is essentially the foundation upon which popular myths about Kubrick are based. It is under these conditions and within these restrictions that he was largely able to manipulate and so affect the

conditions of the environment the workers experienced when forming collaborations with him. The social creative environment proved to be challenging: it was stressful and demanding both physically – such as over-time – and creatively.

Vitali's and D'Alessandro's stories refer to their total lack of personal life and an over-demanding schedule. Such conditions led to conflicts, resulting in mental exhaustion or resignations. However, those individuals able to withstand these challenges were rewarded by fruitful collaborations. Individual workers either embodied the belief of the 'team ethos' (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011: 131), the common goal and satisfaction of doing one's job, the rewarding experience of working with the great director or, importantly, standing their ground and fighting for their creative autonomy. Although Vitali's story does not contain many examples of such instances, D'Alessandro's does, which confirms my observation that the solution to minimising or avoiding conflict was in the hands of each individual – their ability to function within the set restrictions, or the ability to modify them, for example by negotiating with or challenging Kubrick.

This indicates two things. Firstly, it is an individual's personality and the extent to which they were able to fight for their autonomy that shapes their perception of the collaboration with Kubrick. In accordance with the mythology, the creative environment, social (the atmosphere in the crew, together with the director) or physical, affected the film workers' perceptions of their contribution being unrecognised and unappreciated, resulting in feelings of resentment and conflict. In terms of the individual's creative input, the problem lay in the hierarchical nature of Kubrick's work practice. However, successful challenges to Kubrick's autonomy lead to the second observation: Kubrick did occasionally comply with his collaborators' demands. The *War* and *Practical stories* chapters in my study follow this argument, presenting different challenges that the crew faced during the production of a film and elaborating on techniques that were employed to deal with the challenges, demonstrating that it is often individual motivation and the group ethos that enabled the crew to 'survive' the demanding environment.

However, this was not the only element sustaining the collaboration. It was Kubrick who also made the environment more conducive to collaboration,

through his openness to experimentation and enthusiasm for innovations, thereby creating space for the crew to actively engage in the search for the solutions to challenges. The director was actively keen on other people's inputs and would allow them to experiment. Douglas Trumbull exemplified this in *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures*, recalling Kubrick's response to one of his suggestions: 'I think you could be right. Just do whatever you need to do' (2001). *Practical stories* detailed some of the individual and collective creative solutions to technically and creatively challenging situations, thereby also challenging the myth of Kubrick as dictator. These stories, I argue, show that Kubrick's openness to innovation and experimentation (by employing new techniques and using new technical equipment) was a crucial element in the functioning of the collective. They show Kubrick encouraging his crew to express their creative ideas, and through this practice, building a collaborative practice that defied the hierarchal decision-making, a practice I have identified as complementary collaboration.

Kubrick's willingness to collaborate can be seen from another perspective, too and this perspective is not often discussed, as it contradicts the notion of the 'know-it-all' director. In *Post-production* and *Promotion stories* I showed that while Kubrick was very knowledgeable about the processes at the research, planning and production stages, at later stages more external collaborators were required. Although this is due to the complicated processes involved and therefore the need for a larger team, for example in the special effects sector, I have also suggested that Kubrick was very specific about *who* to include in that expansion. Knowing he was less knowledgeable, he sought collaborations with people he believed possessed it to the extent that would satisfy his demands. Because he needed to rely on other people's knowledge, he could not maintain the absolute control over the process that the mythological representation of the director purports. The evidence indicates that this occurred regularly and that Kubrick had formed quite a few lasting relationships with people on these positions. It is rarely stressed in literature and it still does not come through in the documentary work on his life. It is, however, detectable in the individual stories. In the last two chapters, I have elaborated on this argument, analysing the nature of these relationships and have come to a few conclusions that, again, contradict the myth surrounding the director's working practice and personality.

In the earlier stages of production I showed how Kubrick would create small groups of close collaborators, who he would then position as intermediates between himself and the crews (as demonstrated in the pre-production planning and organisation of *Full Metal Jacket*), thus employing the *divide and rule* strategy. This becomes even more evident at the stages when the shooting has finished. The fact that Kubrick had a close circle of collaborators over many years indicated that trust was important to him. However, in post-production and the promotion stages of production, new people came on board and new collaborations were formed. Stories from Mike Kaplan, Colin Flight and Douglas Trumbull show that trust in various forms played an essential role in the process of Kubrick choosing his external collaborators. Referring back to Kubrick's lack of certain post-production and advertising knowledge, Kubrick sought collaborators who had the skills and knowledge that he lacked. In other words, these collaborations were based on cognition-based or knowledge-based trust. The post-production laboratory process was discussed as an example of Kubrick's dependency on Rank Laboratories, and the analysis of the collaborative relationship between Flight and Kubrick demonstrated that Kubrick needed his collaborators to repeatedly affirm their technical skills. Without this, Kubrick was not able to develop affective trust, which, I have argued, was the basis of his long-term collaborative relationships. This said, another observation has been made in connection with the myth that Kubrick needed control over the process at all times. While in some cases Kubrick was clearly dependent on his external collaborators and had to trust them, he would also opt for collaborations in which trust was control-based. This includes collaborations that emerged from Kubrick's student-mentor relationships. By giving the job to an 'ex-student', Kubrick made sure that the system of work he trusted (and had possibly taught the student himself) was employed, which gave him some control over the process, as evident at the editing stage. The stories of close collaborators often highlight this feature of Kubrick's practice, perpetuating the notion that maintaining any creative freedom or autonomy when working with Kubrick was intensely problematic.

My study has attempted to examine the discourses that inform and shape these issues, thereby unpacking the mythology that resulted from them. Discourses identified at the pre-production, production, post-production and promotion stages

of Kubrick's productions reveal a complex relationship between control and trust and establish the role that they played in Kubrick's collaborations. Kubrick's practice of control in the early stages of the filmmaking process was hierarchical, but within an intermediate space, as demonstrated in *Practical stories*. On the other hand, his collaborations were also complementary, as evident in the stages of production where Kubrick collaborated with the crew in finding and executing creative solutions; on these occasions, workers had some degree of creative freedom and individuals were encouraged to contribute their creative input. This image has not been entirely confirmed by *Filmworker*, however. Vitali, whose account of working with Kubrick represents an alternative to the myth in some ways, clearly felt underappreciated at times. *S is for Stanley* and Harlan's documentary, on the other hand, do present the director as a complementary collaborator.

In documentaries, Kubrick is described as 'going berserk' (Vitali, quoted in *Filmworker*, 2017) when the process was not running smoothly. In my last two chapters I describe the loss of control Kubrick faced in certain aspects of filmmaking. Trust became increasingly important in the final stages of the production process, when he had to rely on other people. This probably dictated his defensive, 'berserk' behaviour. An analysis of the promotion of *A Clockwork Orange* showed how Kubrick lost control of the marketing, distribution and reception of the film. Despite his superior position in the film industry hierarchy, there were certain rules and conditions that he too had to abide by. As a result, he was not in control of the entire process of his filmmaking. A growing loss of control meant greater reliance on his collaborators and a greater need to collaborate.

The findings of this study thus confirm that Kubrick's filmmaking did involve collaboration. Individual contributions are clearly identifed and demonstrate Kubrick's practice of not only 'allowing' them but actively reinforcing the need for them. Despite his urge to control as much of the process as possible, Kubrick knew when to step back and let other people take the initiative. This said, Vitali and D'Alessandro also tell stories of Kubrick sending them to fight his battles. Such moments of hierarchy are, however, complemented with features of the

collaborative practice that this study has identified and which the documentaries present as well. New academic research has started to focus on this alternative perspective on Kubrick's filmmaking, but is still very reliant on the auteur approach to the study of filmmaking. I call for more work in this area. More attention needs to be paid to discourses that examine collaborative moments, because, as this study has demonstrated, such an approach opens pathways to a broader understanding of the collaborative nature of the filmmaking process. Whether studied through examples of less autonomous directors or those that are 'clearly auteurs' such as Kubrick, these features are present and paying more attention to them unravels some of the mythology that dictates some of the misconceptions about the process of filmmaking.

Limitations of the study

Despite contributing to Kubrick studies with fresh insights into the filmmaking process, this study also has some limitations. Firstly, historical discourse analysis has some intrinsic limitations. While archive and interview sources do reveal rich information, they are also a cluster of perceptions and memories of the events and as such, reveal more about the influencing discourses rather than what actually occurred. While this applies to discourse analysis generally, any challenge to a myth runs the risk of creating another myth in the process. This study might not repeal the overall Kubrick mythology, but it does present another archivally informed view that contributes to Kubrick studies and more specifically, on the debate about collaboration and authorship in his films.

Secondly, my research design, despite my best attempts, is limited. The study would have benefited from a higher number of personally conducted interviews. This was unfortunately not possible; one reason is that, because Kubrick's productions took place many years ago, many of his collaborators are no longer alive. The second reason is that my skills in locating and contacting the collaborators were limited. Research based on a smaller amount of case studies is limiting in terms of the amount of information obtained and this impacts on the extent to which patterns can be identified. Although more interviews would have simply provided additional subjective accounts, they would also have perhaps revealed discourses that I did not detect in the examination of the archive material

and existing interviews. New testimonies would have possibly assisted in identifying these discourses, resulting in providing more representative patterns.

My choice of case studies could also have been expanded to earlier Kubrick films that have not been discussed in this study. I decided not to include these earlier films for two reasons. Firstly, there is less information from personal testimonies, and the analysis would have resulted in a smaller representative pattern of stories to compare to the also scarcer amount of material in the archive. Secondly, a study of his early films would not have fitted with the theme of collaboration since it is during his later projects that he developed long-term collaborative relationships with assistants such as Vitali, Hunter and Harlan.

I also encountered difficulties with the use of the archive. Often, the discourses that I identified in the interviews were not found in the archive. I mainly attribute this to the size of the archive, which made a complete examination of all the documents impossible. This said, I might have also missed some important information when reviewing the documentation. Finally, the documentation had been curated a few times, initially by Kubrick and later, by Kubrick's close collaborators and family, before being donated to the London Archive.

Having completed the research, I have a few thoughts on what I could have done differently. Based on the vast amount of information I have gathered, I could have focused on other themes in relation to authorship, such as conflict.

Implications and recommendations for further research

Collaborative authorship could also have been studied in more detail theoretically and analysed practically and, in this way, could have perhaps been more concretely defined, thereby developing a more explicit model of attribution in terms of collaborative authorship within the film industry. While my initial idea was to do this, the task proved more complex than I had anticipated and a clear definition more challenging to establish. Although I have not come across an 'all-applicable' model in other studies, and although it is clear that every film production is an individual case with its own specifics, nonetheless I believe a more explicit definition of collaborative authorship could have been produced and actually applied to the practice of filmmaking. Similarly, more analysis of the

connection between 'voices' and 'noises' could be developed, explicitly elaborating on which noises could be considered voices and the process whereby voices are perceived as noise. The connection between them has not been clearly established in this study and remains therefore an objective for future research.

This study has demonstrated that far more research could be done in terms of studying collaboration in filmmaking. This applies to Kubrick studies, which are still mostly informed by the auteur approach. With more insight into collaborative relationships, the idea of authorship as a discourse could be further developed. Besides the above identified missing link between voices and noises, specific areas to be addressed would be other production workers' (the periphery) contributions and their consideration of autonomy. My research has tackled attributive autonomy, but has left space for argumentation and analysis, specifically those sectors that are considered as background 'noise' within academic and practitioners' accounts.

This study has also provided further insights into *how* studying collaboration could be approached. The presumption of collaborative authorship challenges single authorship theory. Predicating further studies on the idea that Kubrick did not always have total control over the filmmaking process could lead to further insights about the production side of filmmaking. Some of the academics I have engaged with have already stated their interest in studying Kubrick as producer. By applying the collaborative model, instead of the authorial approach, the role of Kubrick as producer could be researched from a multiple authorship perspective, especially given that he tended co-produce. This would contribute to the discussion about the extent of his control over the process, on his relationships with other production companies (information that is not publicly disclosed), and his collaboration with Warner Bros., for example. There is potential for examining Kubrick's collaborative practice with external collaborators, as well as with collaborators who were higher up in the hierarchy.

Another implication of this study is that practitioners' and academic accounts should not be discussed separately, as when combined, they form an ideal synergy of theory and practice, which both sides often tend to dismiss. The final scene in the *Filmworker* illustrates how practitioners can, at times, be disregarded in

222

research. In this scene, Leon Vitali is featured attending the Stanley Kubrick exhibition and, despite not being invited to the opening or being asked to speak, with no financial compensation, engages in 'touring' the exhibition with students and fans, bestowing details that could only be revealed by practitioners' accounts. Implicit to this scene is that the gap between academia and industry has yet to be bridged. This study has attempted to do that by drawing on both sources of information and not giving one or the other more weight. It is hoped that it therefore provides a more balanced and comprehensive study of collaboration in the film industry.

My own future research will still focus on Stanley Kubrick and his collaborative practice. I have come across a vast amount of information that I was not able to thematically include in my research that awaits further development. There are aspects of collaboration and specific collaborative relationships that have not been discussed and individual practitioners that have not yet been given their 'voice'. Also, the archive is so extensive that my four-year research has only covered a small percentage and there are documents that, in combination with other practitioner stories, could reveal information that might challenge current beliefs (my research outcomes included). This study has resulted in some new observations that, together with emerging findings from other academics and practitioners, can be developed further, ideally resulting in a visual representation. As a result of conducting this research, I have become more skilled in historical discourse methodology and have become quicker in recognising information that has the potential to be developed further. This skill could be applied to the study of other productions. I would like to apply historical discourse to the film archives and body of work made in ex-Yugoslav countries. I envisage producing a comprehensive account of Yugoslavian film history to present to students.

This study has also developed my competence in the appropriate application of the chosen methodology to present and develop an argument that can substantially contribute to the debate about attribution of authorship and about the recognition of creative input of individual film workers within a collective. The historical discourse approach to studying filmmaking practices has proven effective in revealing information that is invisible to the eye and hidden behind the noise

created by mythologies. The analysis of archival sources, archival interviews and the ability to search for new information when personally conducting interviews, has proven to be a successful methodological combination in generating new perspectives and, as such, contributes to the continuous evolution of research methods in Film Studies. It is hoped that the new insights presented in this study about the structure and nature of Kubrick's filmmaking will instigate a broader interest in studying filmmaking as a collaborative social process.

Appendices

Interview 1

Interview with Peter Hannan

16.4.2016

Telephone interview

P. Hannan: Hi, it's Peter calling. Peter Hannan.

Interviewer: Hi. I'm Manca.

P. Hannan: Hi, is this a good time?

Interviewer: Yes, it's fine, I'm home.

P. Hannan: OK. Hm, most of these questions are very conversational, really. We'll start with one, what attracts you in filmmaking. Well, my school was next to a cinema so I was always in the projection box and so forth and I was very lucky, and I was always attracted to cinema. But actually, my first job was in newsreel. Cinema newsreel. Not many people know what newsreel is really.

Interviewer: I'm just thinking what it could be.

P. Hannan: Ahm, every cinema shows the news of the week, twice a week. It was before the television news took over really. And when you see any documentary on, old documentary and they'd show you archive footage that is newsreel footage. There were a number of newsreel companies, Movietone news, Paramount news, Citysound news, Biz news, British Government news, there were number of companies. And they had special newsreel cinemas. And that would show all the newsreels, all the different companies. And that programme would change twice a week. So that's how I started, and if it was a really big job we'd use in colour, normally would choose black and white. But you must have seen old footage, films of the war, archival stuff. And that is all newsreel. So

225

that's how I started. You say if I prefer shooting film or digital? It depends on the script. Depends on the film. The production. I love film that's the way I was brought up but my last three films have been digital, so it doesn't worry me really. Well if I was asked to do film, I would love to do film again. If the opportunity arose.

Interviewer: Yes, I saw it was. A few last of them were on Alexa. I guess Alexa is considered to be a really good one, but film still has its magic.

P. Hannan: Oh indeed it does, yes. And nothing is as good as film. I don't believe. Well, film is very pleasing to the eye.

Interviewer: Exactly.

P. Hannan: But anyway. Whatever the, obviously then your next question...

Interviewer: Yes, does that affect your work, the digital, I mean. Did you have to make any changes in preparations, considering that now you can make as much as footage as you want really?

P. Hannan: Well, we've lost a little bit of control, because once it's digital people can do whatever they like with it. Producers. And we've been trying to get the rights to, that they can't sell film, sorry, digital information on to projects, but they can. We haven't won that battle. They'll always find a way to make more money out of it. But that's the way it is. And that's what we have to live with, really.

Interviewer: and what do your preparations look like?

P. Hannan: Oh, I do a lot of homework. It doesn't matter if it's film or digital. I do a lot of homework. I always ask them for a month or give them two months, so I give them an extra month for free. I think it's so important; really I've shot the film before the film has started. Although it always changes immediately. After the first week, the film decides where it's going. And it takes you with it. Which is wonderful and exciting. Sorry?

Interviewer: Sorry, yes, just continue, please.

P. Hannan: *Harry Potter* was on film, but the last one wasn't. *Children of Men* was on film.

Interviewer: Really?

P. Hannan: And you say, well *Children of Men* wasn't storyboarded like *Harry Potter*. Harr*y Potter* was, every frame storyboarded, what you call previews. *Children of men* was much more free; you had more freedom. Well, it's different ways of working really. Your next question was... *2001 Space Odyssey*. A lot of special effects but they are all done in the camera.

Interviewer: They were all done in the camera?

P. Hannan: Every single effect in *2001* was done in the camera. And sometimes, like the moon landing, that piece of negative went through the camera 14 times. For different aspects of the shot. Like people behind windows, it's like dust, the little spacecraft coming into land, they're all different elements, but they were put together on film. So everything we shot we shot three times. We'd have three goes at it if we messed up. And for instance the moon landing, that was shot over 12 months. And it lasted… Coming in to the pace, we shot on the weekend when nobody was there. Just with a 3 men crew. So nobody could rock the camera, move it. We had an amazing special effects director called Wally Veevers who worked everything up beforehand. But after Jeff Falson was left to go and do half of six pence we broke up, well that's when I started, we broke up into lots of different units and each unit was run by a focus puller. And we photographed polaroid. And take on the polaroid down to Stanley and he would decide what he liked. And he would ask the focus puller how we would do a particular shot. But even if it was your idea, you may not get to shoot it. He might combine other people's ideas, he might just use his own idea. But he was a great man; he would get all of different ways of doing things and working out which is the best way. And give it to one of us to do. But he could pick the difference if you messed up by an eighth of the stop, he could tell.

Interviewer: Oh, really?

P. Hannan: He was extraordinary, really. But Wally Veevers who was the great special effects man on film, he was the man behind it all. He deserved an Oscar, but he didn't get it. Stanley got it. And actually…anyway… That's all.

Interviewer: So he was the head of all the departments for special effects?

P. Hannan: Well he was until the last year at least. He was always the director of special effects. Then there were other special effects directors, but in the last year, before it came out, Stanley Kubrick was the director of special effects. But Stanley was an amazing man and I had a great relationship with him. Extraordinary man, actually.

Interviewer: I saw that you were quite young when you worked with him?

P. Hannan: I was. Yes, I was.

Interviewer: Was that at the beginning of your career?

P. Hannan: No, it was my first feature that I worked on, but before that, I was documentaries and commercials and stuff.

Interviewer: Would you say you prefer documentaries?

P. Hannan: To film? No. that was my living at the time and I loved doing them but to get the opportunity to work on *2001* was extraordinary. And I was a focus puller, I wasn't a cameraman. Although we all broke down into a number of units and we probably had 6 units, I expect. We worked around the clock. We would do 8 hour shifts each. There were people who would come in and we would go home.

Interviewer: You worked 6 days a week and one free?

P. Hannan: No, it was only 5 day a week. But we worked on the weekend if nobody was there, a very long, complicated shot, where the camera had to track some times between two stages and the track might take all day on a lead screw. And do a frame every 4 seconds or could be every 8 seconds. As the camera never stopped, it was just what they call a lead screw. It's like a big axe, just slowly kept turning and taking the camera towards the subject or away from the subject,

whether was required. But it was exciting. I was being paid to go to university, really. It was extraordinary.

Interviewer: OK. So would you say that all together through your career – do you experience film as a crew, as like equally collaborative environment?

P. Hannan: Again, every film is different. Every director is different. Some directors don't do any homework at all and just ask you 'what we're doing today'. I've had that experience. Some directors just stand back and watch the film being made, others are totally involved and know exactly where the shot is going to be and only shot that particular part of the scene they need from that angle. The actor doesn't have to go through the whole piece from every angle. So only the bit that director wants. Other directors you have to go through the whole piece. They're all different.

Interviewer: Which do you prefer personally?

P. Hannan: Well, I like the director to know what they're doing. Know what they want. Yes, of course, I mean, yes, it is a collaboration. I don't think I have ever been told how they wanted the picture to look. But I always asked, I always ask to see the film before we start shooting. The film the director has in his mind. Some of them have seen the film in their mind's eye and have stills as reference, so it gives you an idea. Others don't have any visual sense at all. They're brilliant with words. They're all different. Every single director is a different animal. And I love them all, really.

Interviewer: OK, so now we can come to the last question. It is maybe a bit conversational again, but I'm very interested in it, also from a personal perspective. Do you think that film is still strongly considered as a product of primarily the director or is the attribution of DOPs authorial rights in the UK, does it function good in your opinion?

P. Hannan: Again, everyone is different. I mean it's a difficult question to answer. Storarro has been trying to get authorship rights for cinematographers for years and years and years. But he hasn't won that battle. Some films are totally collaboration, particularly I use operators, camera operators and I'm lucky that I

work with very, very good operators. And their contribution to the film is amazing. Some of them are great, great story-tellers. And great politicians. The way they liaise with the actors and the director. All my work with the director is normally before the film starts. He'd be busy doing his thing and I am busy doing mine. But the operator works for both of us. He is the go between, really. He looks after me, and I look after him. I don't like to get tied into a corner where you can only get one angle, and you can't get a lot. But sometimes that happens. Is an example. Often you handle at the end of the stick, anyway I could do it. Because there was no way that I could actually get around. Especially working as sound, a boom operator. But anyway, that's fun as well. There are lots of problems and as Kubrick would say 'Don't play in the middle'. And a great director, Nic Roeg would say 'Use the difficulty'. So if it's very difficult, make that difficulty passive for the shot. Use of difficulties will make it better. Or to find the way out of it. Nic Roeg is brilliant, a brilliant director. And he knows exactly what he wants before he starts. But also things happen. You get the luckiest thing of lucky mistakes, from director and actor do something or have a mannerism that wasn't in the script but it makes more for the character. On the performance, one of the sparks, to think of it, made a comment and it was put in the script because it was such a brilliant comment. It's team work. Certainly team work. The costume and the make-up, everybody is important on the film set. I believe. Everybody. The discipline is not as good as it used to be. Because of the digital, often they don't turn the camera off, just let it run, and people run in and do things. I had make-up people walk on the set half way through a take. But they aren't very experienced, the make-up people. That's something that's not as good as it was. Film discipline was fantastic. Everybody knew what they were doing, how to do it and respect each grade, each department. That seems to have gone a bit, but I'm sure it will come back. It needs to come back.

Interviewer: That must also be up to the assistant director I guess?

P. Hannan: Indeed. Anyone would say that. But, hm, they would like to make a film without a cameraman. They believe we get in the way, actually. They try to make a film without us, really. But other first directors, first assistants are

amazing and save the film and have wonderful ideas and are great diplomats. There're lots of different types of people.

Interviewer: Who did you enjoy working the most within the last few years? Do you have anybody special in mind?

P. Hannan: Oh, dear. I've only ever had one bad experience in my life. And every other film I've worked on I've loved. I have some favourite directors, and some are amazing personalities, some of them have been very quiet but wonderful people. I wouldn't single anyone. I'm very lucky that I worked with Kubrick, I'm incredibly lucky that worked with Nic Roeg, I'm incredibly lucky that I worked with, oh God, Partridge, Longcrain, Playson, I've been very, very lucky. Amazing, really. And in all, I only had one bad experience.

Interviewer: Are usually the crews you work in, do they consist of many cameras?

P. Hannan: Sometimes. It's nice to work with one if you can if it's right for the film. But I have worked on a film that had 15 cameras out. That depends on the subject, on the production, really.

Interviewer: Are the films with one camera still done?

P. Hannan: Yes, they are. The first assistant… First you would have two or three so you can do all the different angles at once. But that depends on the director. Some directors like it. Ridley Scott uses a lot of cameras but he has a wonderful eye and he puts, makes sure that every camera is in the right place. He's a very talented man. There are no rules, really. Well, you've got to know all the rules, so you can break them. Yes, really, that's true.

Interviewer: Well, I'm very happy that you agreed to give me the information. For me, this is very valuable information.

P. Hannan: Well, I hope, I don't know what use it can be but…

Interviewer: It is actually what I am researching, just various interpretations of creativity and authorship and what individual artists think about that and how they perceive themselves and these elements. So it's exactly what I needed. If you

allow me I would use this information in my thesis. If you wish it can also be anonymous, but I would be very happy if I can use your name when I give this information.

P. Hannan: That's fine, yes. I didn't say anything that is going to upset anybody I hope. That's fine.

Interviewer: Thank you.

Interview 2

Interview with Douglas Milsome

19.4.2016, telephone interview

Interviewer: Hello, this is Manca. Is this a bad time?

D. Milsome: Hello. No, no, we said eleven. You're spot on. I don't think you're second late or early.

Interviewer: Thank you very much.

D. Milsome: Not at all. What are you doing in fact?

Interviewer: I'm doing a PhD and I'm interested in interpretations that individual artists, specifically cinematographers, have on their creativity and collaboration and authorship.

D. Milsome: So it's more about me than it is about Stanley Kubrick, is it?

Interviewer: Exactly. Because I was always in the collaboration and I would believe that a film was a collaborative product. And cinematography is my passion, I'm interested in it, so I'm very, very glad to talk to you.

D. Milsome: OK, well I hope I'll be of some help.

Interviewer: I'm sure you will be.

D. Milsome: I've forgotten most of the things I did now. I've had a full career now, and it needs to be recycled.

Interviewer: I know, I know. I would have a few questions if that's alright.

D. Milsome: Yes.

Interviewer: And I also ask for your permission to record this conversation only because I will forget probably.

D. Milsome: OK, sure. I don't use some nasty incriminating expressions that can be used against me.

Interviewer: OK. So, I'm interested in how you transitioned from focus puller and camera operator and later DOP. Were you always interested in cinematography?

D. Milsome: I can't remember time when I wasn't. No, in fact, I'm really, I can't recall, in what, 50 years maybe now you know in camera from the very first time I started. What was it, in 1958, ranked as a trainee because I heard Pinewood studios, you know the Rank organisation had some permanent camera crews they kept. On staff and cameramen, camera operators, first assistants and second assistants camera; that was… the first focus puller was what they call the AC, assistant cameraman. So I started as a sort of second assistant, in a very nominal role as a runner where they give you a three year course, I don't do all this now, really, it doesn't apply, but they do it, for three years they put you through. There are stages; like stock motion, model animation and physical effects and that sort of thing. And then you maybe spend about 6 months at the processing laboratory. I spent near a year in the processing laboratory, see what happens to film after it leaves the camera. And then you get into the set where you are playing the real role of live action photography, you know like I suppose films, being an assistant on the set. As a clapper, we call them clapper loaders who really just charge the magazines and log all the film and then make a rack to load them, quite a responsible job and send the negative to laboratory, you know. So I did that for many years and lots and lots of films. And then I progressed, form there I think I went into the army for a while, after the 3 years had elapsed, you know from the trainee course rank, I was called up to do the national service, unfortunately. And I went anyway, but then I sort of grabbed into the army, and I did 2 years of national service in the army. Which was OK, so it wasn't a total waste of time. So I was then able to come back to Rank, but I felt by then time I was, I would rather become independent than not because Rank labelled you a little bit and the money was awful. By that time I was married so I thought I'd take my chances in the big world, the freelance world so I became self-employed. Then I was a second assistant for a few years. And then I got a break on the film called a Blow up with Antonioni. Which obviously, I took. I knew the cameraman, and I knew certain

people among the producers. So it had already been 10 years as a second AC, I then spend 16 years as a 1st assistant cameraman and I did hundreds as a first on main units and worked with the best cameramen in the world. And that was when I was in rubbing my late 30s I suppose, and I decided to operate. I did some commercials for a couple of companies in London and as a DP I just thought I'd get a chance. Having already done *The Shining* as a second assistant, focus-puller to Kubrick, I was also a second assistant cameraman to Kubrick on *A Clockwork Orange*. At request to *Barry Lyndon* which I did for him as a second AC, first AC sorry, focus. And then I started *The Shining*. So all those films were up until I got a break really to do some photography for Kubrick on *The Shining*. Which was largely second unit stuff which was mounthood and all the air scenes in the movie which I shot. Part Montana and all that sort of stuff and the Overlook hotel. So I got not just named, not just as an AC, I got named very well in every department really. The process of committing myself to… applying myself to the DP role if you like. So when I did take over finally on *The Shining* as a DP, when John Alcott had to leave for various reasons, he was moving to America. Stanley said to me 'would you just carry on shooting' which we did, and I took on the role as the DP for that several weeks so that we completed *The Shining* that way. I can't even recall what happened, I know I did then after, when the film was over, I thought well, I'm not going to get much work as a DP until maybe *The Shining* comes out, so I decided to operate. And I did about 3 or 4 films; *King David*, *Highlander*, the first *Highlander*, Russell Mulcahy and a film called *Plenty* with Fred Schepisi, nice Australian DP actually. And then David Hemmings invited me down to Australia to shoot a big second unit for him on *Race for the Yankee Zephyr* which I did then as a second DP work on that and all the operating. Then I stayed there and did 3 others in New Zealand for David, his company down there. And then I got a call from Kubrick to come back to England, which I did, I was going to stay in New Zealand, come back and shoot *Full Metal Jacket*. So there's the basic sort of 52 years wrapped up in 5 minutes of telling you.

Interviewer: Thank you. That was…

D. Milsome: Well, I'm babbling on a bit because there's all sorts of punctuations and intervals, but that was when I think I did have a very good background

training with Rank and that's what, I don't know whether the present day becoming cameramen who go to school and learn everything completely, you know from the bottom up. They want to go mainly from the top end and come to the DP. I think my background training helped me a lot as a DP, you know because I worked with masters and great DPs and most of that stuff rubs off on you when you are in the front line having to achieve that yourself, you know with no help. It's a bit of a lonely job, isn't it? It's only what you gather and gain practically in a hands-on situation, you know.

Interviewer: I completely agree. Considering that you have shot on film and digital what do you personally, what do you prefer – digital or film?

D. Milsome: Well, in a way, digital is still, in my view, pre-determined, sort of artificial colours, it's certainly getting better. I'm choosing, I'm being an expert by now, on digital because I suppose the tightness of the schedule and things that I can see my work immediately, you know. There is that effect to it to a large extent, you know. You have an instant sort of image of what you're producing. Film can take a little longer now with the processing side of it; I think it slows it all down a little, you know, with the labs. Major labs aren't really situated to handle bulk footage they're maybe now, but I know it slows the process down. And this is a very big show, you know, we had the time. I probably personally would probably go with digital pro-reso. I go pro-reso because I quite like the way that the 2K HD allows Canon log and all that stuff in the stingian grading, you've got quite a lot of latitude to go up or down, several stops each way. And then you have a so-known nine four output format that records for TV workflow, so most cameras have the switch ability to go from video log to less linear look and the holistic look. I prefer integration of all the parts of assembled to make it run whole. You know, which films tented to do. But I think it's now coming together, for me, that future stays and it has taken a long while to stay high-def, but I think it's getting to be the more preferred route, you know.

Interviewer: Do you mainly work with Alexa or Red Cam?

D. Milsome: I like the Alexa. I tend to treat it more like a film camera. And the Canon 320 is quite a good one. It has that sort of rounded look you get, you know

the fresh tones and things, especially if you use, I like the Cooke lenses S4s. They've been around for jonks I know, but they do handle the overexposure much better on high-def. This is what I find the problem with it is pulling in overexposure if you're working inside. And the background, you want to see out the windows rather than heavily into the window itself, you know, you can, they resolve, and they're less freed on overexposure, the Cookes, in my view. As eyes tend to overexpose and that sort of thing. So I can get a balance better. But I do use still polaroid camera which I used when I was working with Kubrick a lot. So a basic flat pack. It's only black and white but it gives me a balance in black and white of the exterior balance so I can get… It's like an exposure metre really. I don't often use a metre with high-def, I just take stills with it. And that way I can actually, because it has got a variable shutter, the polaroid, I can show the director basically the balance between the light and shade, the tension, whatever he wants to gain, because all the directors don't like burnt out windows. It's not a commercial they want to see, you know, real life applications, exterior, you know. And of course now the high-def is becoming… because you've got the visual interpretation, there's a time monitor on the set, you can also judge that more carefully. So there's no surprises to the producers and people, which I don't always like. I quite like surprising them while waiting for the film to be processed and shown in the dailies. You know about a day or two or three days later depending on where you're shooting of course. That secret is not mine anymore. It's all very visible to a party watching the video. We call it the video village and it's sometimes now that the committee talk about the lighting more than they did on film because they couldn't see what I was doing there, you know. So, yes, in many ways, it also has, with high-def, a lot more, I don't know, cables and equipment, which I am not sure about, really. I mean there was a case when somebody said to me, he quoted Spielberg, when, he still shoots film, so do quite a few others actually, that 'is it an armour, future arm of cinematography, is it the captured Kodak moment or is it electronic buggery' he called where you're driven by 'pixels driven technoheads'. The cameraman now is largely taken away sometimes from the end result, because you know, everybody has access to it. And in that sense, you know. Sometimes they get too intermediate the technicians, they're tearing the wedge that is falling off the scopes and that. I know the limits of film and how they can go down and I'm sure high-def can as well. I quite like, I

like trashing the high-def stuff. I shot one, a couple of years ago now, I think the film is still waiting to come out, it's Ukranian and they shot called *The Bitter Harvest*, which is about Stalin and you know, the persecution of the farms, all the Ukraine and how, Holodomor it was called. And everything was candle lit and everything else. I quite like the Alexa and the Cooke look using the candle light scenes you know. It created an atmosphere which I quite like and that atmosphere is like film grain as you like, it's very good for you to see the film *The Bitter Harvest*. I don't think you'd know it was shot on Alexa, and it was animated as source on film. And that's what I'm trying to keep to. That film look, achieving it through the media, through the high-tech media.

Interviewer: Considering now digital and film, are the preparations any different? How do you prepare for a film and how for digital?

D. Milsome: Well, that's a big question, I don't know. I think in the same way really. I mean, you know… Hang in a second. Sorry, there was just somebody at the door, I beg your pardon. Well, I don't know, cinematography now is, I quoted this before, is an art that requires mastery of a constant evolving craft, so, you know, it's a mixture of art and science and camera computers. From linear to holistic. Linear is a motion along a straight line, which I think will grasp some things that the video gives you. So it's a little mind set really. I don't know. A lot of directors love to keep the camera running, you know, because you're not limited to strictly thousand foot loads or five minute loads or four minute loads as you are with film. And it's more precious really. Whereas, because you can keep the camera running, you think that it helps the actors to just keep doing a take and take and take without any stopping interruptions and it's a better thing. Directors prefer I think the high-def that way. But I think it does, it leaves, because of all the running time, you pay for terabytes of storage, and I don't know, it's persistent editorally. So sit through all the drafts and gun to the piece you want. Whereas with the film it's more exact. You dig the piece to cut it and then you do four or five more takes and you printed it, like with Kubrick. You knew what you wanted and you got it. Sometimes now I think that these cameras, the high-def cameras, you've worked on one haven't you yourself, you can just keep them running for a while, it depends on how much you've got in there. As long as you're up to 144

sort-of gigabytes, gigs per hour, you can run that camera for about 20 minutes. More, probably. And then you've got problems I think with the high-def with overcranking and undercranking and that sort of thing. And I'm feeling also that you lose a bit of the creativity. I used to engender ingenuity behind film because before all this stuff was out there, you know, you would create something. You know yourself. Like we did you see, *Full Metal Jacket*. There are scenes in there, in which there were no effects at all. It was all real. If you saw somewhere or bullet effects, we used to superimpose one frame over the other. Or put the camera out of synch so we'd get a double exposure over things. This can be so easily achieved now in Da Vinci's in the post house, you know? With a click of a switch you can make it from day to night. So it's more accessible and easier for the future cameramen. I don't think they're masters of art at all. But because it simply creates an effect which pleases most people and most people really wouldn't know good photography if they would fall over it, you know.

Interviewer: I completely agree with that.

D. Milsome: Well, I can't tell now, because it's got better, it has. But it's taken a long, long time, you know, to get to this stage. But there are so many options out there. Now I'm prepping a film that's all about cameras, my God, I mean, the director had a Go pro, you know, Euro 4, and so we could use this on some shots. Well, I said, OK, and it's got an underwater thing you can put it in, and it costs 400 pounds. When I bought my first camera, it was a BL; it was £27.000. And that was 30 years ago. I got it second hand, but I still paid. You can buy cameras now for a couple of hundred quid, you know what I mean. And they're alright. Stick them anyway you like. Well, I don't know. Is that getting anywhere? So, prepping, I don't know if there's a simple answer to that.

Interviewer: Do you use shooting script?

D. Milsome: Shooting script? You mean storyboard?

Interviewer: Yes, when in preparations…

D. Milsome: No, I don't actually. I mean the director sometimes wants this sort of visual. I think for action stuff perhaps it's maybe good to storyboard it, but then I

don't draw fairly well so I have to get somebody that can create those images. But I also don't want to be locked into what the skilled artists sees, the concept of the images against my own later down the line. Some pictures get locked into that stuff you know. And I still feel I need that freedom to expand on those. But given that they may help editorially, how it fits together, how many shots we need to make it work. Sometimes the boarding can be of some practical use. As long it does not take up any time. But I think directors feel, the more insecure ones, that they've got the whole movie boarded in fact in there, you know. When they're going to the scene, they know how to block it and where to put the camera. So a bit of the, what's the word, gut reactions and feelings when you get to a scene, the real scene, on the day, weeks and weeks and weeks later, when you get the cast together, seems to diminish. You can build on that compulsively if that's the word. You know, try and make up more as you go along. There's a word for that, isn't there? What is that one, I can't remember. I don't know, I'm not sounding very technical.

Interviewer: That's alright. So, do you... would you say there is anything that dictates your cinematic preferences, like in the sense of how you communicate your ideas between the camera sector and other sectors?

D. Milsome: I'm not good at that, no. I don't know. I'm not good at exactly I suppose conveying the images in my mind. I think it's something that I have to work out with the designer. Because, if you work with the designer close in the set depends on of course of what you're doing. It's like the environment on *Full Metal Jacket*. While it wasn't real, and then that's trying to create that mood of war because you're not actually in Vietnam, you're not fighting a war. But you've got to create confusion and a sense of hopelessness. That's part of what Kubrick's plan was, you know. He moulded the actors into a form he imagined. It would be in a real war zone. My job was to make it look like a war zone. You've got to feel the aggression on one side which he does and the visual effects on the other. So when you bring in the palm trees and set them on fire and blow things up, for a film like *Full Metal*, you don't actually have to go to a war zone to do it. If you are creative, you can produce that effect. Which we did. We shot *Full Metal Jacket* which was set in South East Asia in south east London. So this is what the

photography can bring to things. That's a kind of simple example. The room city away, the shot out of docks and I know the demolition and the urban warfare was shot in Dockland London. To get that subtropical effect. Well, that was all design and photography, you know. But affects the most when you're working with the visual director. You have to help each other and work as a team in that way. People say to me still 'how long were you in Vietnam for that shoot' and I don't like to blow the daff because that's the creative side of it, really, isn't it? So when you talk about how do you… what was your question about bringing it to…?

Interviewer: Well, in the sense how do you combine your sector, how they communicate, how much does that dictate your style?

D. Milsome: Well, I was told that my style is rather moody, I wasn't sure what that meant actually, it can be worrying, but it tends to near to darkness. In my view sometimes style is no replacement for good ideas. Because you bring ideas to the sum and then need more than technique to replace it with the content. If you've got the content, which is the script, that is it. And in fact, the rest of it, the mystery and the beauty is the real art staff you give like content, alright? I don't have a strict combination of things, it's mainly from ideas, fresh ideas not from films you keep going to see and knicking the ideas, keep repeating what was done on this and what was done on that, trying to fill that gap with something what you've done original so they can quote Doug Milsome, they can quote you. Did you see Douglas' film, you know? Not keep saying, oh, you know, it's just, that's what I keep striving to do, and I think the older I get, the more visual I become but less able I am physically to perform like I used to. Assembling books, maybe I should write a book, I don't know. Does that help you?

Interviewer: Yes, this is exactly the main things I am concerned with. How do you perceive film? Do you think it is still too strongly considered as the product of primarily the director?

D. Milsome: No, I don't think so.

Interviewer: No? Because I don't know how the authorial rights for DOPs function in the UK but are you personally satisfied with that?

D. Milsome: With what?

Interviewer: With how authorial rights are given to DOPs. I don't know what the policy is in the UK?

D. Milsome: No, I don't think they are given the rights. I mean if you continuously work with the director then perhaps, you'll bind to come across, it logs into his thoughts and… But I think you're right; I think it's, I don't know. There's so many things involved. Union management you have to please, the personality has to fit, you have to have this logistical flexibility, the phone rings today, and you're gone tomorrow for three months or a year. And you also have to have some technical invention. I can't get through. Well, I actually I made movies, and I think a bit like Kubrick to get through a sort of bad taste of chronic social disorder. You know what I mean? I have to be doing something behind the camera. I can't do something that's not making movies. It's the thing you never stop doing, you know. You don't retire from it. And I think Kubrick too; he is a sort of a disembodied enigma, who puts his public persona in terms of what people see on the screen. And I think that happens to a lot of people who are creative, you know. You just interpret that individually to what suits the subject matter. You know you treat every subject different. I love drama, I love period. What I don't like is shooting contemporary humour and things that are not very good. Disney used to say when I shot something for them 'oh we at Disney like our comedies bright' and I said 'well I'm the wrong cameraman for that'. I can't like bright. It depends on how you interpret your work. But then that's my authorship that I think on certain things. But I've never done really, I've never earned, well I've earned a couple of Emmys but I never actually won an Oscar for anything. So obviously my interpretation or authorship isn't good enough. But it does so depend, having said that, whether the film actually makes any money or whether it's successful. To show work as a cameraman is often, since it's, you know, exhibited theatrically. It then can't be examined by your peers, it just goes straight to television or something like that. Then it's lost you know, it dies, your work is lost, especially video. I like films to be, if I can get something somebody can pick up on it, and a lot of films don't get theatrical release now. They're so franchised, you know, the blockbusters, all the great directors' names are on them,

it all comes down to how great name directors. I do it just to keep busy you know. I like to do that.

Interviewer: I saw, yes, when I looked at… you have a very rich filmmaking career.

D. Milsome: And very varied, isn't it? And some I would actually rather forget I ever did. Some awful ones amongst them.

Interviewer: I haven't seen all of them but--

D. Milsome: Where are you from by the way?

Interviewer: Slovenia. I work at home in my country, and I come from a family, my dad's a DOP, so that's why I am more familiar and interested.

D. Milsome: Does he work in Slovenia?

Interviewer: Yes, he does.

D. Milsome: Is that like Zagreb or somewhere?

Interviewer: Close to it. Zagreb is Croatia. And this is exactly why I'm so interested in how authorial rights are because in my country it's horrible. The artists are not given enough credit, I think. But, I guess, is it in how the individuals can express creativity. Do you feel that the hierarchy affects this in any way?

D. Milsome: Creativity?

Interviewer: Yes.

D. Milsome: Yes, I think it does. I mean the film died when you used to have film capture the original way of lighting, every living material, colours. So there's still more colours on film than generated artificially in pixilation, there is. The subtleness sometimes of the colours and the difference between light and shade intentions I think can still be added with film, but the authorship of that is tough to convey in the large sense, when it's committed to high-def, because… anybody now can change what they first conceived. Maybe, you know the cameraman

offers up down the line 'I want to do that', often they want to do that without me. I mean they now think of the high dynamic range. You know, Dolby laser predictors can now do ten times more tones of black. Now, who needs ten times more tones of black? So it's all become more binary and nits and angles and all that. I think they're being drowned now, the creativity has been drowned because of the technical world. So the authorship becomes minimal. My input becomes less, less important at the time because any guy experienced can give an idea, what I need to do with the directors is, getting it to work. The film needs to be done in 30 days which maybe that's quite a long time, 20 days, you know I don't get the Kubrick's 1 year anymore, you know, 25 weeks, you know, you've got 15, 20, 30 million, that you can create. Now you've just got to knock it out, you know and do it quickly. And this is where I think the high dynamic range comes in, it does. I mean, I saw some tests the other week, where the cameraman shot an exterior in the desert in the middle of Sahara somewhere, and he comes, and he looks through a window. The Sahara behind him, the F 120, the F stop is just unbelievable, and you want to see his face and then reflected in what he sees in the glass with inside of the café. So you've got three variable distinctly different massive exposure level difference, you've got exterior, you want to see his face, and you want to see the reflection. But when he shot it, the guy had not a clue what he was doing. The reflect of the background was burned up, he went silhouette, and you saw nothing inside. But they sent it to this lab, and it came back looking perfect. That had absolutely nothing to do with him. This is what we are losing. People don't care now. Because most times they say we'll fix it. We'll fix it. And I was quite astonished. Who needs, I mean, ten times the density of black. Our black is black. I mean when you see *Barry Lyndon*, did you ever see *Barry Lyndon*?

Interviewer: Yes, I did.

D. Milsome: You did, OK. Well, every frame in that like an 18th century painting, it's renaissance of that period, and we avoided any electronic artificial light in those scenes. It was all illuminated with a candle. And that was when film was like slow. Slow, slow, slow. 100 ASA, now the high-def film is 2000 ASA. You don't see these high speed lenses, with Kubrick but you did that you got that

effect. You cannot get that effect on high-def. If you go and see *Foolproof*, it's nothing like *Barry Lyndon*. You see Barry *Lyndon*, I showed it recently at a theatre in London and a 160, I don't remember, 150 or 160 DPs showed up, more than 140 plus some kids. Now most of those BSC members weren't even born at the time we shot this, so it's 40 years ago, right. They were astonished at the look of it. They said it was a feast for each eye. And a delicious feast for each eye in fact actually. But this is where, you know, I think we made movies like this to get just a talking novel and make it intensely visual film. So it's a ravishing set of images on a single sheet of celluloid. Celluloid, not on tape. Given those same lenses today, I was still training to use those lenses, I did know where they are, these Kubrick lenses, they're 0.70 right?

Interviewer: Yes.

D. Milsome: So they're still a stop or two stops faster than any other lenses produced since and these were made to shoot still for out of space photography. Other space programmes Kubrick bought to shoot the movies with. You wouldn't know that today, you'd leave it to Da Vinci. You can do all that now. But you still don't get the film look. You don't get the film look of *Barry Lyndon*. So there you go. That would always in my view be something rather special, you know? I've tried to get those lenses to shoot a high de film recently, but because of the shallow depth of field we couldn't get the assistant cameraman to keep it in focus, so I gave up on it. I mean I was the focus puller on *Barry Lyndon,* and we had a year to shoot that, so if you want the *Barry Lyndon* look you've got to take a bit longer than 30 days to knock it out, you know.

Interviewer: I can imagine. My brother is a focus puller so I am a bit aware how demanding it can be in some scenes. So I can imagine that with these lenses it was a difficult thing. Did you use a video assists in that time?

D. Milsome: No, I'll tell you what we used, and this is something else we created. We got a, if you want to call it a cctv cam, 90 degrees to the camera taking camera lens, right. We had a lens 90 degrees to that was a profile image created from a monitor which I had an image of the profile of the actor above the taking lens of the camera, am I making myself clear? And I could tell every move he made I just

marked it off with the graph. With it and marked it up so every move that the actor made I could follow him, you know, because you only had an inch or two of tolerance in terms of depth of field. Another invention that came from it, that was something developed. So, there you go. And I actually scanned the lenses for the film anyway because they were still lenses so... The thing about me when I was an assistant… I wasn't just a focus puller, I was a technician when the camera broke down. Most cameras I could fix. Strip camera and put back together again. I have not a clue when it comes to high-def camera, I would know the faintest idea how Alexa works. I don't know how they work. You know, like they cut out and put another circuit board in, it's more than that. And also they don't like being kicked around the place and might be chucked in water, might be chucked in freezing cold temperatures, they hate the heat. Whereas film cameras used to go through all that stuff. We shot *Ryan's Daughter* with film cameras in storms. You see, *Ryan's Daughter*, the storm sequence in *Ryan's Daughter*, well you could shoot it on high-def, you would just manipulate it, you would make it like the latest *Moby Dick* film, you know. Nobody goes to sea anymore, it's all shot in a tank. You know what I'm saying, it's generated, it's simplicity really in a way, and it's down to scientists to sort work it out or not if you like but certainly not technicians. Scenic technicians, but not film technicians, to invent and create. So I think it's been swamped now, creativity by the invention of high-def. So the cameraman's role is one I wouldn't choose in the future. I wouldn't. Because they're so many doing it now. I did what I did the hard way. And I think your father came up the hard way, did he? He used to shoot in Slovenia?

Interviewer: He was in Prague, the academy and there they did everything the old way. Started with photography, focus pulling, exactly the same way.

D. Milsome: And it's a good grounding, it's the perfect grounding. Because your knowledge it has a certain depth to it. The rest of it is auto; I find a lot easier to shoot high-def, I do. I don't have to worry so much. Everyone can see what I'm doing, we're all in the same place, so there's no surprises. We get what we get. If we don't light what we light, but we do it later. I mean that's the trouble with the digital media. It used to cost quite a lot of money one time. And I remember shooting three thirds so it would save a little bit of money on film stock. Extend

ourselves to going with the digital media, because it's about quite a lot of money in those days. Now it doesn't cost so much, people spend weeks in post house now, always re-colourising, regenerating, re-mastering, probably a lot of bad mistakes they made on the road. We didn't make those mistakes; if we did, they got replaced usually by somebody.

Interviewer: Mr. Milsome, thank you so much for all. It is really priceless for me and my work.

D. Milsome: Not at all. I think it's a useful thing to know. Have you seen *The Shining*?

Interviewer: Yes, I've seen it.

D. Milsome: What did you think about *The Shining*?

Interviewer: It's still one of the scariest films.

D. Milsome: Yes, because funny, I was as you know the focus puller and did a lot of second unit photography, but the charming part of *The Shining* is the blunt symmetry of the endless corridors and patterned carpets and things like that, you know. Shots of empty halls and doors. It disturbs you really. It's eccentricity and ambiguity for those who really watch it. And you really want, what you want more detailed closure on the novel, which you never really get, so it leaves you thinking at the end 'God damn it'. The puzzle divides, an incomplete sort of troubling puzzle, pieces are missing, but pieces we have don't fit the puzzle. You know what I'm saying? So the challenge is still in the maze or somewhere else like that. And that's what the photography can bring to a film, you know. But you need a director with vision as well. Because you can't, I can't talk to a guy that's an editor or a writer or wherever directors come from now these days, you know, they do commercials, to see it that way. I would love to know how you do convey images across to the director, who really is not always artistically inclined. This is the ego-management side of things, you know. 'Just leave it to me, I'll do it', or they do not want to leave it to you and have a lot of say themselves in what's on the screen and not just the actors and the performance, you know, which most directors used to do in the old days. That's the thing about the jewel imagery of

247

Kubrick's Overlook and the symmetry of mirrors… Jack, who's always been there and it's not about taking people of face value. There were no faces in the movie. They're all masks. So how do you film that, you know? So it's a big question, isn't it? Every film is a lot of questions. And when you talk about it, you and I are talking about this this morning, we could talk for weeks and still not cover it properly really. So, good luck with what you are doing. I hope I have been of some help. Because I don't know the answers, I'm not one that is good at talking. I get interviewed quite a lot, and the moment they point the camera at me because I'd rather point the camera at them, my job is behind the camera. And when I'm on camera I tend to sort of dry up, it's funny.

Interviewer: Well on the phone it went fine. You gave me such an interesting conversation.

D. Milsome: But that's probably because I'm going through a lot of notes that I've made, you know. At which you can't be looking at the interview because you're looking at the lens you know. Let me know how you get on, keep in touch.

Interview 3

Interview with Colin Flight

16.10.2018, High Wycombe, in person

Interviewer: I think that's working; supposed to be, hopefully.

C. Flight: Okay. If not I'll be doing it quickly on the phone down at Cyprus by the pool…

Interviewer: The flight is quite long.

C. Flight: Yes, about four hours, it's not bad. I mean not bad as I used to do because I'd go to work on a Monday and they'd say to me, 'We got a problem at Kantana Films in Bangkok. Can you get to Kantana this afternoon?' So you'd be getting on a flight that afternoon for the next day for Kantana, or it could be I went to Australia a lot. 'Thanks, Alex', I'd say let's go to Australia. The flight time… it's 22 hours. It really depended on what the issue was and how soon they wanted to get you there but a flight that's four hours, to me it's not bad. I used to virtually live in Santa Monica for… I liked to live in Santa Monica because it was far enough away from Hollywood studios and the centre of Los Angeles, which I wasn't so keen on. I loved to see the sea, and it also allowed me to go north where I worked with the big engineering company up at Camarillo, which is just outside of Calabasas. I used to drive, I used to get up in the morning in this beautiful hotel, Casa del Mar in Santa Monica, and I'd get up and I look out the window and see the Santa Monica Pier. I can see the sea, I see the dolphins, I'd say, 'Oh my God, I work here'. I get in the car and me and my engineering guy, Bob would get in the car, and we'd go to drive off to Camarillo, we'd go down the Pacific Coast Highway up through Malibu and cut across the Ventura to Camarillo and spend time with this engineering company that we worked very closely with. Other days, of course, I'd go along the Santa Monica freeway and then I'd go… Oh, don't know whatever it is called, and straight into the studios, into the centre because Deluxe's studio was in the centre. If I had to meet with any of the studio

people at Raleigh, we were very close. It was good, it was all within the range and close to the shops as well.

Interviewer: Deluxe was also in America?

C. Flight: Yes. We owned the big American facilities. The transition of-- we started off, sort of jumping around subjects that we started-- Rank film laboratories was the laboratory that really-- the rival company right from the base in Denham, which is not too far from here and close to Pinewood Studios. It was a film studio. Film laboratories were part of the film studio at the time. There's a fantastic-- your guys have got it. The ones at the university, which I gave it to when they did the big interviews, Denham they called it. Lovely, lovely program probably from the forties, I guess it was, end of the thirties, early forties about the people coming into the studios, they shot *Cleopatra*, lots of features, lots of stuff there.

It really indicated the differences abut Ranks as a laboratory. We were doing 300 million feature films, but the worldwide group was a company called Technicolor, and they had places in America, in I think Italy and in the UK. They were a global name and of course when filmmakers were looking to shoot, have a film centre around the world, they wanted to distribute it around the world. They'd say, 'what is there in that one laboratory if they can do all the countries?' That was recognised probably in the seventies, eighties by the then managing director. I'd come on board as a lowly chemist at that time, but we ended up buying the Deluxe Stu-- we ended up buying the studios in Toronto called Film House, which are the biggest laboratory-- because it gave us access to the American markets. See an American release would be 4,000, 4,500 films on one release, which was fantastic in those days probably 6 or 7,000 as it got- as it went on because the cinema growth was massive. That in itself, you think that the UK released even in the old- those days probably about 600/700, it did grow to about 1100 screens, what equals every screen requires print, so that's where your money's coming from. If you got 4,500 screens every time you do a production, fantastic, you're making very good money from a laboratory perspective. The only way we could get that printing, other than Stanley's work, the only way we'd get that printing is by having a facility there, and we couldn't get into Hollywood at the beginning. We

got the operation. Then six months later Deluxe came on the market. They were selling Deluxe Laboratories in the centre of Los Angeles. So, they said, 'Let's go and buy that, let's go buy that one as well'. We had to go through court, we had to go through-- because the Americans did not like giving up ownership of anything, and it was a long court case.

I remember the documents, I threw the documents away now, but I had all the court case documents, and they finally ended up buying the Deluxe cooperation. We started transferring some of our people. We reinstated it engineering-wise, it was early nineties. We then had the three facilities. We had Rank Film at Denham, we had Deluxe in Hollywood, and we had Film House in Toronto. Three facilities to form the base, but-- The key factor for that, the reason that we still didn't-- we struggled to get some of the major contracts, was because they all got different names. We sat there as a board and said, 'Look, we've got to call ourselves something. Do we call ourselves Rank? Because Rank's owned the business. Or do we call ourselves Deluxe?' Well, we said that the Hollywood studio's known as Deluxe, so Rank Film Laboratories became Deluxe. Deluxe London, then it became Deluxe Hollywood and Deluxe Toronto. We had to have a single name that matched what people are telling we are doing. All of a sudden, we were one business, people then thought that we'd given up because we said, 'Oh, we've been sold to the Americans.' No, we were very much a British company at that time, because we were part of the Rank Group, the Shepperton, Pinewood we took in as well at one point, but they had all the different divisions within the film's side. That was until the mid 90s; when they started to sell stuff off, they decided they would determine if they were going to sell bits off. We got sold in about 2006 to Ron Perlman, to the --

Interviewer: Why did you decide to…

C. Flight: Well, they decided they wanted to split the businesses, and it was really the Rank Group who owned it, who said we don't think we can make as much money now from this business as whatever. But we made a fortune. Just to give you some ideas of what we were doing, Rank Laboratories, as a unit. I took over as a boy in '96. The business was in major trouble because we-- It was getting the way that we operated, correct. It was in line with what we were trying to do

251

around the world. They were very close to closing the Denham facilities; it was just not making money. We might have as well taken all the product into America, and built out in America, which obviously the European cooperation didn't want us to do. But then we would turn over 40 million. We'd make 40,000 pounds if we were lucky because the economics of the business wasn't set up correctly. To look at film as a business in that aspect was important because we had to pay back for all the things. And also, to allow for investment with the people and with the cooperations. We were lost because we had typical British management at the time, very narrow-minded, very short-sighted, very old-fashioned, didn't embrace the new culture of working with people, working as teams and things. They were very much a hierarchy. They had the offices on the top floor, they didn't come out of their offices, they wouldn't speak to the people on the ground floor, it just wasn't their way. We were in trouble. The new MD had come in and said to me, 'Colin,' he said, 'I hear you're the best technical man in the business. I want you to change the way we're operating, the technical side and operations side, to try and make us a proper business,' he said. I said, 'Well, I don't know if I want to do it.' I was under pressure, I was like, 'Oh God,' because I was only a boy, really. He said, 'You only have two chances,' so I said, 'Okay, I'll do it. I'll do it.' So I did it, and I changed the culture within a few years, with other people, it wasn't just me, it was a group of us that changed it. Very much, I loved it because I had worked with some of these guys in the laboratory from the ground floor upwards. I could go back to them, it wasn't always easy, I could go back to them with changes because I knew the laboratory and stuff, I could do most of the jobs, technically understood aspects of the job. I wasn't asking about anything to do, to do anything that I couldn't do myself, first and foremost. I could do the job. I could do grading, I could do printing, I could do processing, and the chemistry and all that sort of stuff. There was a respect because they knew I knew the business. But it wasn't easy all the time because they were saying they have to change shifts, 'you're going to have to change departments, you've got to become multi-skilled, but the benefit for you is that your wages will go up. We'll give you more benefits. If anything happens here that we finish, the place finishes, whatever, you're going to go up and get a job somewhere else because you have that skill. We'll make sure you've got those skills. We'll ground you in skills that you would normally not have exposure to,' because the jobs in the laboratories,

the main laboratories at that time, including the technical process, were all defined by an agreement with the Union. They had specific pays for specific jobs, and you were not allowed to cross those boundaries. If you graded, that's all you could do. We changed that.

Interviewer: Like, by law, as well, then?

C. Flight: Yes, it was by union law because the unions would say, 'Right, if you don't do that, then we're going to come out striking, we're going to have a work-to-rule,' which is ridiculous in a business that could be failing. But, we changed it, it took a while, but we did change it. The culture changed, the people changed, and we embraced it. I would come in, if I asked people to work weekends to try and catch up with stuff, I'd work weekends as well, I couldn't let them just do it. I didn't just sit at home and say, 'Yes, and you guys get to it'. My management-- I gradually changed my whole management structure. I took fact management, I didn't have-- The previous guy, the roles were back to about 20 managers or something. I took the whole lot out. I said, 'Right, I'm going to have five or six managers. I wanted new people through, because I brought people through who thought the same way, who weren't necessarily massively qualified. They were engineers, they had engineering backgrounds and things, but I wasn't looking for graduates necessarily, I was looking for people who understood the way I was thinking, that was important to me. To have empathy with the workforce, to understand that they needed support as well, it wasn't just about demand, demand, demand and the guys in the team were very important to me and that became much more of a focus of the way I operated, and as of '98, '99 – two years after taking over this role, my boss said, 'I want you to go and Rome, I want you to build a business in Rome. I want you to go out there.' I was like, 'I've never built a laboratory before. I've never done it.' He said, 'But you are technically capable,' and he said, 'I want you to go out, I want you to go out. I want you to go and buy the land, then to work out where to put it,' he said, 'I'll work on the structure for the operation staff because we have a couple of people in mind who'd want to run it because it's quite difficult to cross borders with a British team in Italy or an American team in Italy.' It had to be an Italian team which I fully understood, absolutely fully understood.

Interviewer: Really? So you had to – or what? Did they already give you a team?

C. Flight: No it was decided around me, and I had to train and build with them because they were working a lot. It was easy for them because the team were looking at that aspect of it. The boss really, he said he wanted-- He would pull in people from Technicolor and the rival businesses, he thought I'd own their business. We established business there, there was a number of reasons for establishing business in Italy. One was economically, the exchange rates at that time were different and you could play exchange rates against volumes of film to by product at certain volumes from America because through Italy, the film product, it was a lot of playing in the marketplace, one of the most expensive aspects of what we were doing was the actual raw material products, the print films and stuff like that, so you could play the market.

So I went into Rome and built a facility, we were going to buy and adapt all these other businesses I looked at, and there were some in the centre of town. We looked at one operation where I had to dig down. They said, 'You can't dig down into the grounds here because you're so close to the Colosseum. The Archaeological Society need to be here, and if you go below 200 you have to have them there to watch you. It could take you three years to build,' so I said, 'Oh my God.' So we chose a place, and I started looking around if we chose – you know, Bob and I chose the place on the outskirts of, not too far from the Technicolor facilities but on the outskirts of the GRA. We found this facility a bit off the hill when we took the hill to 54,000 cubic metres of soil later, we transformed a flat piece of land and built this facility, and it became probably the most advanced laboratory in the world. It was so unique. We've gone into the project not saying 'I'm going to adapt what we've got in Denham or what I've seen elsewhere.' I said, 'We've got an opportunity here,' and we all felt the same because I've got this team of people who felt the same. We had an opportunity, a golden opportunity to film that. Film was going to go, video was taking over, we were told. Suddenly I've got 15 million pounds to build a facility; state of the art facility. So we sat, and we went through it, and we took so many risks. I took so many risks, but we built a facility that was just unbelievable. Bob said 'like the breweries', where they had three or four people pumping stuff around in big tanks

because, effectively, that's what a lot of it was, and the engineering that went on, what we did in that place. I did software engineering as a background as well, we created -- Oh I think we did have the background for 450 programs to move solutions around it, everything was automated, all touch screen. One of my Master's themes was human-computer interaction.

The ability to get very very complex issues, like solutions, moving solutions about in certain forms and how they clean the tanks and the pipes in between, because it was critical because any mistakes would destroy the film, and to put it on screen so that anybody could look at it and say, 'I want to move back to there to there.' They were trying just to not sound stupid to say, 'You can't do this.' But it was to enable people, I used to say, it enabled my managing director who knew nothing about anything, to be able to come and move solutions around. That was the basis of Rome. Rome was so far advanced than anything that Hollywood were building or anyone else in the world. When people came from all over the world to look at it, 'Oh my God, we can't believe these facilities,' and one of the key things for that was the fact that we created a facility that was good for the people. We had seen in India and places around the world that people were secondary to the facility. The machines went in, the air pollution was horrendous. In India, the guys came back and said they were walking around in chemicals on the floor on bare feet, and I said that's outrageous, how can you condone that? How would I feel going to bed at night thinking, there are people probably due to get cancer because they're not working in the right environment. So crucial for us to create an environment that was perfect. We'd put in the best air conditioning. We worked with these sucks that would pump the air around, and it would take all of the stuff out.

The work environment for the guys who were working there was the best it could be. We isolated areas. We worked out the engineerings, the mechanics of the film, and how we would set the machines up. We created our own machines. I had that ability because I had the capital background. I could manipulate bits and pieces to help me. It was always the same; it wasn't for me, it wasn't for me getting an Oscar or anything like that. Out of my 10, they all said, 'we want an environment that we would be prepared to work in ourselves.' I went to a laboratory in London

in the 2000s, we were buying Soho laboratory in the centre of town. I could hardly breathe because the acid in the air, the fumes were terrible. They said, well, he's spent all this money and he hasn't put anything in an air conditioner. I can sense it. I have that sense because I've been around chemistry all my life. I said, 'Okay, I can smell it, and it affects me.' The first thing we said is that you're going to have to spend three, four hundred, five hundred thousand pounds on good air conditioning. 'Where's the payback in that?' 'The payback is you've got healthy staff. People will want to work in that environment.' That's how awful it was. That was 20 odd years ago. 'We don't care, why would we be doing all this for the workforce?' 'Well, because we want it to be in a good environment.' The noise, the lighting was done – this soft yellow lighting, sodium lighting for when you work from dark to light rooms in the laboratory, because they've got works in the dark, because it helped to ease their minds. It's not bang, bang there, putting stress on their eyes in there. The mental states of people having to work long hours and things. We created an environment that was very clean; you could have eaten off the floor of the chemical room because we tiled it and did certain things in there. I always faced criticism from the powers because my virtues are quite high, but I argue that the environment that we were creating, the film environment we were creating, was good and it helped people wanting to work there. You could probably produce more volume, in truth, in a better way. Obviously, the issues of environmental understanding were coming in at the start of that.

A few years before we were building this laboratory, there were facilities that our own laboratory didn't-- they were pumping chemical into the ground. They thought that was the way to deal with it. These are carcinogens. What about the future? What about the people of the future? What's going to happen in 30 years time when they want to build some houses there or something? It was their responsibility. I think it was one of the films that said that with great power comes great responsibility. That is absolutely right. The responsibility for the environment grew. I worked with a company called Austep in Milan. One of the companies that was associated with the engineering company when we were doing the Rome platform was an environmental company. Alex and Sylvia in the Austep group. Alex is a superb chemist. He aligned with Professor Verstraete of Gent University, probably one of the best environmental scientists in Europe. We

worked very closely to try and create a perfect control base for Rome. We just didn't put Rome as a laboratory with these new techniques because we thought about, 'Where is this stuff going to go?' We built a treatment plant for it. We were forced, because of discharges, to build a treatment plant. We had to learn how we dealt with treating a huge laboratory. I learned environmental science. We were learning like this all the time. I was trying to keep the costs down, because I was hit with 752 million pounds extra cost which I didn't expect, so I had to move everything around and shuffle it to get that. It was an important responsibility. As much as the responsibility when you take over as a manager, you don't just manage a business, you have a responsibility to make sure things run and the customers are getting their product. You have a responsibility for the people who work for you. Their environment's got to be right. They've got to go home to their families. They want to go home and talk about nice things, and they're not being bullied at work. We had a structure of managers; some of them were bullies. Individuals, certain types of people. We're all individual, we all have our own needs, and we all deal with things in certain ways. I couldn't at all, I couldn't, I hated bullies. One guy said to me, one of the evening managers because it's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week sometimes, one of the evening managers was heard to say that he walks around and he's glad, which is the wrong way of doing it. As soon as they heard a manager was coming from the top floor to walk round, the workforce thought 'We've got to get up, better make sure we're all working, we're all being seen to work'. That's no way to run a business. You walk around there and say, 'Colin, how are you? How are you doing? What's happening? What's happening with you? What's going on? What's good? What's bad? What problems you've got? What issues you've got?' I went to Toronto Film House before they transferred to the new laboratory and I was talking to the guys; they said, 'Who are you?' I said, 'I'm from London. I'm the technical guy from London. While we're here, we're looking at how you're doing with this machine and how you…' He said, 'That's interesting.' He said, 'So you're a manager from London?' I said, 'Yes.' He said, 'You're talking to us?' I said, 'Well, yeah.' He said, 'Our own management don't come and talk to us. They don't ask the questions you're asking. They're not interested. They just do what they think is right, not ask us, and then have to do it again, because they got it wrong.' There you are, therein lies the secret. Economically, a viable better solution to be open

and discussed. You get a buy-in from people and you learn stuff, every day. I was supposed to be the top bloke in film, but I still learned stuff, in terms of, 'Oh yes, when that happens, this happens, and when that happens, this does this.' That's interesting. Because you can get it. They feel open. They can talk to you about anything. They can talk to you about-- They'll tell me that their daughter's ill, or whatever, and it was so important, it was part of that same package. You never think, 'I'm not interested in all that.' You were interested because it was their well-being as well. It was part of the way they were. And you'll then ask to meet them, last minute notice, 'we've got *Avatar* coming up this week and we've got all these prints to do for *Avatar*. We need to work for the weekend, I'm sorry for the late notice.' 'Yes, okay, we'll work at the weekend.' They'll do it.

And that was the buy-back, that was working together, and it sounds ideal. People used to come out to the labs, who used to come and visit me because fairly a good amount of people come and see me. They said, 'I love coming here because everyone is so friendly, and everyone's so happy.' I said, 'It's not a master stroke to do it, just be a human being, just be a person.' You're not any better than anyone around you. You're just a person who's working within a group of people. You're trying to establish that friendship, that bond. I still see the people from the laboratory that is long gone, but we get together for a drink, I still get information from people. People are very kind, it's that aspect to it that's really important to me. My boss never understood, because he was very much a money man, he was a financial man, and he couldn't understand that. But I could get those laboratories, when I ran all the laboratories, I could get them. He'd say to me, 'I won't get involved, because if I get involved I'll interfere with what you're doing and we won't achieve it.' I said, 'You're absolutely right. Just leave me to get on with it, and I'll do it.' Whether it's big spends, I was controlling maybe 100 million pounds at one point, with various investments going on. You control the fuel market, in terms of volumes we were 350 million in Denham in '96 when I first took over. We expanded into the European base I built in Barcelona, Madrid and Rome over those foreign years. In 2009, which was our big year, the *Avatar* year, we did over 2 billion feet of film. We'd gone from 350 million to 2 billion feet of film. With probably the same amount of people, but they were just spread out in

different locations, with new equipment and new investments, new ideas, new scientific arrangements.

We didn't just rest on what we were doing, we were always trying to improve the environment for the people, the processes, the methods of achieving certain things. We did well. It was a team effort. People say, 'You're brilliant.' No, no, no. I'm brilliant within a team because I need that feedback. I have people that had some fantastic way out of the wall ideas, and I say, 'Run that by me again, let's have a little think about it.' I wasn't worried about them doing a U-turn, because the ideas were very good. One of the things we were building in Rome, and it's quite a complex project, we had to put in all the chemical tie-up, anti-acid floors, so there's no leakage, we can contain any leakage, because it can't go to the water systems, we don't want to destroy the environment, whatever. The guy said, 'If we're going to build this plant, I'm going to build it in Milan. I'm going to do it as individual sections so you can actually plug it together at the end.' What they call a skid. We made the chemical plant in Milan, whilst we were building the plant in Rome, and we went up to Milan to test it out, water test all the things. Because they're all filtered, pumped, everything easy to get to. And they split it down, we just had to join the pipes when we got it all together on site. This plant was massive. Your guys have got it, I gave them the videos for it. Massive, huge plant. Massive amounts of chemicals. You're talking 300, 400 thousand litres of solutions at any one time on the processing side, let alone the waste side, where we could be managing 5, 6, 700,000 litres at any one time. So, huge volumes. You had to understand what was going on.

They say with great power comes great responsibility, and it's understanding that that took me through my life, saying that I joined primarily because I was just-- I was a Romani almost, because there was no time to make friends. You'd just make a friend, and then my dad would say, 'We're moving again, we're going to the other part of the country.' So off you go, and you're schooling would change, everything would be different. The education systems in the UK, greatly different from south to north and various different systems were used. They'd all use the same system supposedly, but they were unique. I was reading and writing music in Yorkshire, then I moved to Harrow, and then I was back three years ahead of

everyone else. So, there was that as a child. You're trying to contain that-- You didn't have the base of lots of friends and things like that, we were quite a poor family, so it was a struggle. Those early years were a struggle. Of course, when I got the job at Kodak, my dad came home and said, 'We're moving.' I said, 'Well, I can't.' I said, 'I've got a job now.' Even at 16 years old I thought, 'No, I've got to make a stand somewhere, I've got to say 'No' because they were going down to Plymouth, which is on the southwest coast. Of course, there's not a lot of work down there, and I was in London, in the London area, so I was like, 'Well, I've got a job here, I've got a really good job. So I can try. I've got to give it a chance.' So I went in the digs, 16, 17 years old, I went in the digs, and my parents moved off. I was on my own effectively, at that time. It was very weird, it was a decision that probably helped me in the longer term because it made you very independent, very much more. I can't imagine my children at 16 being on their own, you know? Having to do the washing in the sink… And you adapted to what was going on. After a while, I was living… I got made homeless, funny enough. I was a homeless boy, which is quite bizarre as well. I look back at it because I hadn't thought about the consequences of being the homeless. I was in a room, I was renting a room in a place called Oxbridge, not too far from where I was at Denham. The guy said, 'You know, you got a notice to quit, you got to go.' I was like, 'Well, what do I do?' I went to the Advice Bureau, which is like a group that is set up to give advice on where to go, and links into the community. They said, 'Well, the council may be interested in giving you a mortgage if you're prepared to take a mortgage on.' 'Oh, yes, maybe.' So I did, and I got a mortgage on my first flat at 18 years old. I guess I never looked back from that period, because it gave me that knowledge that-- My parents never owned any property their whole lives, we had always rented through the services, they had had to. As a family member, I was buying a flat, 'My God, I just can't believe this. What's involved? What does it mean, "buying a flat"?' What did I have to pay out for and stuff, I had to learn all of that. I got married very young, I was only 19. I met my lady, a girl who was local, and we got on very well, and we married and had children, we divorced just as I got into my big job. We had problems in our life and, respect, I still talk to her now, chat to her now, but a long time ago. I was on my own for a long time, during the periods of the biggest changes in my life, because of the issues of having to work abroad, and maturing and growing up, for instance, and it

was quite difficult. That was difficult because, probably looking retrospectively back at what I was involved, beca-- I started off as a technical guy, obviously, I was joining the laboratory. I was at Kodak three years, jumping back, sorry, jumping back three, three and a half years, I was at Kodak, and I went through the system there. I had an average education, and I worked in the expanded research group in the film coating tracking areas, so I was watching, I was part of the teams that were coating the actual emulsions onto the film bases. We'd mix up all the chemicals, we'd go and make the corrections, and we'd watch. The track was about a mile long, and it would coat down emulsions, it would go through the track, it would dry, then it would come around on itself, and it would roll itself up into a big roll of film, which a particular Kodak colour product, whatever it was. The end roll would go into what they called a coffin, which is a wooden thing and it would be stored somewhere in the cold until they needed it. They'd pull it out, they'd slit it, perforate it, then tube it to the marketplace. You're constantly opera- - The tracks had to be working all the time, because, as I say, not far from a mile long, so they needed to be working all the time. You'd always pick the products, you had to have a clean-out and then go onto the next product quickly, so it was a mass production.

When I got to 19, I started thinking, 'It's good money, it's very good. I'm married now, I need to move on, live a life. Is it going to give me what I want?' I mean a lot of the guys were going off to do, I think, four-shift routes, when you'd get one weekend off in four, and stuff like that. I thought, 'I don't know if this is for me, really.' I had this vision of wanting to do research, I wanted to do experimental, I wanted to go to the proper research division. Well, you have to have a degree or be on the way to your degree. 'So, can I not do that? Will you sponsor me to go? I'll go back to school, I'll learn the stuff.' They said, 'Well, we don't really do that. We have people coming in as graduates, we don't have to do that part.' So, okay. I had to think about what I wanted to do, I took the chance, I mean no one ever left Kodak. They had great pension schemes, and all the things that you-- 'You're leaving Kodak? What are you leaving Kodak for?' So, yes, I took a chance. I went to Rank Film Laboratories as a chemist, I started there as a chemist, and worked in the chemical lab there, unbeknownst to me, there was a transformation model. All the people I used to work with at Kodak said, 'Oh,

you're making a massive mistake.' Suddenly, my world changed because, I guess I had that drive, whatever, so I was able to push and chase the things, and it just sort grew from there. I spent a few years on shift work, and various things in the laboratory as I was a chemist. After four years, I then went into process control and evening shift.

I worked from four o'clock in the afternoon until probably half past 12, 1 o'clock in the morning. That was sometimes seven days a week. You'd be outside of the normal run, but the wages were good because you'd get overtime money and things like that. Sort out things; like the money to buy the house and move on from there. That drove my issue about buying properties; like obviously, I've got this thing where I buy properties and I do them up. That was part of it that upsets me, that the only way the working class people themselves would ever get money is by investing in property. That was it. You're not going to earn it unless you get your own business or something. That was it. That was the position I was in at that time, but always independent, always pushing, always looking for another option, a way of doing things. Now I thought, 'Well I want to study,' I don't want to forget this issue. I wanted to study and do something different, so I went back. Whilst I was doing that, whilst I started having children, I decided. 'I have an evening shift, if I've got a lunch break, and I've got some time, I'm working overtime. I've got this breaks, and these people are just sitting around playing cards, and I don't want to do that.' So I thought I'd study. I studied, at the beginning, at the Engineering Research Council, and the Open University. I took on Maths. I took on a degree course in Maths. I started studying Maths. I was getting distinctions. I was doing a Pure and Applied Maths. It was so rewarding. It was fantastic, and I was meeting all these interesting people who were doing all these subjects, I was thinking – 'I love--' To me, education is fantastic because it's only by doing it, you realize how little you know. As you start looking at things, and that again was not because I specifically did anything in teaching Maths or anything like that. It's because it's the way your mind thinks and copes with new information or complex pure maths. It's like, 'Oh, my God.' And the physics and the various other things I was doing. Then I had gone on to the computers. Those days, this was the 80s, the mid to the end of the 80s, of course, computers were in their infancy, and were in their true aspect of pull down menus

had just started to come into things. There were and these funny little screens you're working on, and I was doing Pascal programming. I was learning how to program, and stuff that I was doing. Of course, it got to a stage really in the 90s. I thought 'The children, they're now at school. I need an evening shift, I need to be on days.' I almost went back to Kodak at database because I had a qualification database management, so it's part of my-- Knowing me, I did my normal degree, my honours degree, did that, and at the same time, I was doing my master's degree. I was trying to compact everything in. Some years I had about four exams, and it would be complex area issues of the software associated with controlling a nuclear power plant or something. Again your mind was able to deal. I don't know how because when I look back at it, I don't know how I did it. But then, obviously, my job changed and they said that the Kodak job didn't come off. They pushed me through quality control management on days. Take and drop the money and various things. In '96, suddenly, I was given this opportunity to be this big manager. I was thinking 'Oh my God…' I'd never been prepared for all that work. I did project management, I did all sorts of stuff as part of the master's courses, but on the honours courses I hadn't got to this stage, and suddenly everything's like you can put into practice, that aspect into practice there. It was the other side of my life that probably was the big side of it. The idea that you're independent, you learn to make decisions, but the respect for people around you as well. It was that combination rather than the education factors necessarily, whether that gave me the confidence, I don't know, because I was making decisions that I look back now, and I think, 'Oh my God, how did I do that? How did I ever achieve at that state? How did we create so unique a situation?' Some of the machinery we're building right at the end, and we build the machines for Hollywood and these massive production machines. We created something that was phenomenal. Film processing it would be; when I first started, it could be 50 feet a minute, 100 feet a minute. You were lucky if you go up to 200 feet in a minute. The machine created by the guys at Camarillo, in the end, was 1330 feet a minute. Astonishing. It was not just the mechanics of the machine, the size of the machine, but it was things like we had to have; because the oxidation of the developer, you couldn't put a full solution full tank in, you had to do nitrogen base, so it was running on nitrogen. We had to seal it.

It was like science fiction that. When I look at that, and when I look at when I started or left home, that transition period was quite unique. The laboratory life is fantastic, I loved it, the same passion that you have for film, or I have of film. Because my position was so unique, because as I started doing, I became the operational director, then I became the customer services. After customer services in the sales aspect of it, I looked at the budgets. Suddenly you became-- I was doing the project maintenance. I was doing the design and building things as well, I'd come away from the site where we're building the structure.

I work with the engineering teams about where you put the pipework in and things like that. Then I have a conference call about how we're doing this production, how we're achieving this volume. And then there will be a customer on the phone saying, 'Look I'm not happy about this. Could you come to talk to me about this feature? I'm not sure about the camera thing and stuff.' You know one moment you're down in the drains, and the next minute you're talking to somebody about how they're actually shooting a feature. It was such a unique thing. I guess at the time I was very pressured. I didn't relate to it as being pressured because I loved it. It wasn't about being in charge of everything. It wasn't about that. It wasn't intended to be that, it was just I was the easy one to use because I had such a broad depth of knowledge. Because I was easy to deal with and because, if I worked with somebody who wasn't quite sure, I could explain to them in reasonable ways about how to do it. I was never rude, I was never horrible, it was always the important thing to me that I come off well I think, not because I want everybody to like me, but more because I wanted people to think. Well, actually, if you're not worried about the personality and you're listening to them and understanding, you're learning. If you're worried about 'that person could say that to me and he's a bully, and he's looking down on me now. He thinks he knows so much more than me', you're in enormous pressure, you don't need to be like that. Education should be the love of passing on the information you have and the knowledge you have. I never worried, never shied about people, some people used to say management. The more you tell people, the more chance there is of you losing the job. They're going to take over. If someone could do my job better than me, they deserve it. It doesn't worry me. It never bothered me. I never had this 'I'm in this position now.' I didn't go to a lot of functions, I never met a lot of

people because-- I went to functions that were work associated, but not outside of. I never lived the job. I never said, 'Oh yes I'm this, I'm this.' I never did that. I found it uncomfortable. I was quite embarrassed actually with that. If people were like, 'Oh my God,' I got embarrassed with it. I used to love being on site and they didn't know who the boss was. They'd say, 'Who's the governor here? Who's the governor?' Then you could see them pointing to me and they'd say, 'Oh my God, the governor?' He's got a T-shirt rolled up. That was it. I loved that. To me, that was so important. When someone spoke to you and talked about a subject and if I could talk about a subject, great. I used to go to colleges because I liked going to colleges to talk to students. To talk about what they wanted to achieve and other things. They would talk about film, and I used to say about what we did. I said, 'don't believe it's all glamorous. It's not all glamorous. It's not glamorous at all sometimes. Sometimes it's so pressured, so stressful that you won't sleep, you won't eat. There are things going on. It's just the way it is.' I said: 'There are certain lessons I can say to you as students in this room. I could say to you, the first one is communication. As people, we must communicate. We must learn to communicate better. You could be the most brilliant person in the world but if you can't communicate you're going to be more stupid. Because you're not going to be able to pass on the information. You're never going to get people to buy into what you're saying let alone understand what you're saying.'

I met some geniuses in my time, I was very fortunate. Professor Pastrati comes to mind. He was talking about chemistry because he's up here, but he gets the whiteboard, and you do stuff, and we talked through it, and he was brilliant. Dr. Mary Lan Oxford University Maths. I struggled in some aspects in Maths. She would make things simple. She was brilliant. She was so good; she could make it simple so that even I could understand. Integration by part, oh my God, terrible stuff. She made it so simple, and I was like 'wow, that's what I want to be'. I want to be clever enough to really understand the features but bring it to a level that everyone could understand. The more people understood, the happier I felt. That's good because you're passing on something you've done. I think that's-- If I come to the end of my days and I've got lots of friends in the business, and I'll be able to give something back to the film business that's given me so much, then I'm happy. That's how it works.

When I decommissioned, when we finished the laboratories, they closed down. I was asked to stay on because obviously, the environmental aspects had to be decommissioned. I signed off the decommission for Rome, got involved in the decommission for Barcelona. Shut down the Denham site, took two years to shut it down as part of the selling process. That allowed me to step back from the role I was doing before and to be thinking about some things about my own future because I was still quite young. Deluxe phoned me and said, 'Look the people from Los Angeles said 'We want you to stay on board because you are the only person left who understands the film piracy aspects of it, the systems we put in place to combat film piracy'. So I'm a consultant for them on things like film piracy and stuff, though I don't I really get any work tool to be fairly honest. To be truthful, I'm there as a consultant, but really, every so often they have changed management in the Deluxe. Deluxe is the business that went from that because, suddenly, you could do stuff in your front room that we had to have a facility to do, so it was a unique time. We were a business that made millions and millions of pounds. Once we got to the end of our time, when I look back at the money we were making, it was a fortune, and we were not just making money. We were good at what we did, the product we had, getting Technicolor closed down.

A lot of Technicolor people came to work for me, and they said to me one of the nicest things, and they said it's about giving something back. One of the nicest things… The Technicolor guys, when they left, they did two years with us, because it was forced as part of the process where we've taken out of their business. They said: 'Here's living the best two years I'll work in life. We've absolutely loved it here because of the totally different attitudes of the people here, the management. If there's a problem, if there's a pressure or stress, you'll come find us in you'll talk us through. We have no stress because we can talk it through. We're not worried about what we do and if it's wrong. If we do a mistake, you don't come down and shout at us'. We'd say, 'What was the mistake? Why did it happen?' We'd discuss it. Many times I had to take the brunt of a mistake and go to the studio, to a rough DOP, who'd tell me I was an imbecile, not because I didn't know what he was talking about, but because something had happened in the facility and I had to try and correct that, but then

knowing that I was the person that represented the board level and take it to be lambasted in front of crew.

Interviewer: What did you do?

C. Flight: The things like where film, original material got fogged, there has been a problem, the machine had failed or something, and then folks were like, 'Oh my God, that's a day's shoot, and I have these people here. I want to see the boss of the company. I want him to come down here, come to me and apologize in person.' So that's what I did. I used to go down to the set and say, 'I'm so sorry.' Await till they throw a few nasty words that may not turn out well. Okay, I understand. I won't happen again, and I explain why. The great thing about Stanley Kubrick was that working with him was-- They were all good, all the directors were good, but some are very knowledgeable, but no one was like Stanley. Stanley was very unique because he was unique in as much as he knew his product inside. He knew the product better than most people. He knew his product better than most people, interestingly enough. Laboratories are a black box because you had these people in there who had these wonderful minds. We could float film at 2000 feet a minute on a machine that would just sit there, you could print on there because we had these scientists, we could do all sorts of stuff. We could do stuff in chemistry, and I worked with Beverly Wood in Los Angeles. It was the Deluxe skill. She worked a lot. I think she still works. She might've retired now, but she worked on the original products for looks for things like *Seven*. We created certain looks on features, and we worked very closely together. It was very important. And in the south, Beverly Collins, the director over there at the time. We worked as a team to create the same machinery, same setups, and operations within all the laboratories. There was none of this. Well, this is Hollywood. 'We know better, we do our own.' No, no. We work as a unit, so one of the filmmakers in Hollywood says, 'Oh, they're interested in what's going on?' Well, what happens when I'm going to the European facilities to do some hard estate chapter. They'd give me the same as you are because we have-- I'll send Tom a tree between the way you look at the colours. We have constant conferences. We send our graders over because sometimes on certain feature films they wanted people to bond. Oh great, then they do the Bond feature, like flying to

America to work with whoever, and they fly Lucas who wanted to work with one of our… We fly Greg Raptor to work with Lucas, and he liked what he liked in that person. So we'd fly around, and that's how we were, very-- I spend a lot of time on the road because I didn't like the Facetime calls or video conferences as we had. I used to do face to face, made a lot of travel, but I've got to know the people and I got to know the studio people, people like that. Then we'd have a conference in America. We'd sit and talk through and look on a certain feature that was coming up. We needed it to look like this. We needed it to look like that. We need these things, now, to take over. And then we flew in the Americans to spend time with us. We were chatting just to make the film producers feel comfortable, so it was a lot of work we did. Thomas Polanson came in; he came to see me, we were talking about pictures. He was out with his girlfriend in the UK feature shoots. We set the theatre up, we have these beautiful theatres at Denham, you can imagine the big film laboratory. Lush, big seats, beautiful-- I wish-- It's a shame I hadn't met you a few years ago, I'd love to have shown you the facilities. It was very old compared to the new labs that were built. But the cinemas were lovely, I love them, because you got a big, comfy chair, and you have the latest sound systems. He said, 'I love this art deco theatre,' he said, 'I want to buy this off you.' I said, 'Well, we're going to bring it down, I want to put new theatres in.' He said, 'Oh my God, how can you do that? This is terrible. It's a sacrilege, it's so beautiful.' Yes, but it's not a modern laboratory, not a modern theatre, and you have to be matching what's modern, you know?

Interviewer: Oh, yes, yes, yes.

C. Flight: All the sound just has to be the best of the best because people would come from all over the world to come to your theatre, and if it wasn't good, it would get into the film market that, 'Oh, the Denham theatres are terrible.' So it had to be good. All the Dolby systems had to be right, all this. Yes, the Sony system had to be perfect. All the cameras had to be perfect. It was that aspect of it. There was so much, so much involved with the facility, but the only way you could really understand was if you'd seen it. I truly wish you'd seen it. The laboratory cells were transferred because, well, I work with the buyers, and sold the land and worked with them, and they invited me back to the opening party.

These flats, they turned a building one into flats, which are beautiful. I almost bought a flat there. That was the thing. I was going to buy a flat there, but I thought, 'This is too spooky. Because I'm now living in the place I worked in.' For all those years. I said, 'You know what? I don't know if I could cope with that.' They were quite expensive for a small flat, and I thought, 'Well, I don't know', you know? But in there, they've done it beautifully. They had one of the theatres, the main theatres, the second theatre, which wasn't the biggest, but they had the second theatre. I went in there and I thought, 'Oh my God, it's like I'm back.' They were doing the presentation, they said, 'Actually, we've got Colin here. Colin will tell you that he was… You've got the governor here, so I will tell you not to tell him about the theatre.' Yes, I sat with some of the top people in the industry; these know what they are talking about, for instance, assets and film. But they love that association there, you see, and of course this was set in the flat straight off, but you're very close to the new high speed rail links and stuff, I'm not sure I could cope with that, but, also-- But again, to go through the place and think, 'Oh my God, I was working here…' Sorry, do you want another coffee? Or is it cold?

Interviewer: No, I still have a whole one, thank you.

C. Flight: But yes, with Stanley it was different, because Stanley was a lovely man. He was difficult to keep actual contact with because they keep him away from people, generally. Within the lodge – You'd have a structure which you'd work within – certain people, he'd work with, because he only liked certain people. He only wanted people around him who were knowledgeable. He needed you to be a film person, first and foremost, to truly understand the aspect, because he would ask you a question, it was very complex. And straight away he would just say, 'What about that?' You'd think, 'Oh–,' and if you didn't answer him correctly he wouldn't trust you. That was the pressure you were under for it. The sales guy, Chester, who looked after James, Chester was very close to him. Strange relationship. Chester was one of these old-fashioned people, sales guys, who used to go off shooting on weekends, shoot deer and stuff like that. He was an unusual man. He had not a great deal of knowledge about the business but was quite easy to get on with, I guess, and Stanley loved that in him. Actually, when

Stanley died, Chester did a eulogy at his funeral, and he got the-- Stanley gave him a shotgun, a shotgun as a present in his will. But he only liked certain--, he only wanted certain people to do his grading, and Jeff did his grading. He only wanted certain technical people. Mel was my technical man. Of course, I come from the system, overtaking all of them because I became the boss very quickly, and started running the thing. Of course, the first real feature I worked with him on was *Eyes Wide Shut*. Obviously, that was his last picture, first time I really got involved with him. I did work with him a bit on *Full Metal Jacket*. Because I was involved, he used to phone me up in the laboratory and say, 'Stanley's here, we want to ask you some questions on *Full Metal Jacket* on this, the colours, and this and this, and I talked to him, now bear in mind, Stanley's listening to this.' I said, 'Yes, well, just say what I say,' sort of thing. But in *Eyes Wide Shut*, it was all coming into the process of working with him, specifically for that product, because my technical guy was a specialist in how film certain looks. One aspect of what we were doing, which Stanley was huge on, was restoration. I remember talking to you about restoration aspects of it. It probably goes back to his understanding of film. One of the first features I've read about it the other day, it made me smile, was that he wanted to do a film called *Artificial Intelligence*, *A.I.* He was doing some work on that, around the time of *Full Metal Jacket*. He was trying stuff out because special effects were very limited then. We used to use oxberies and certain adaptations on machinery for special effect work. Computer special effects and things like that were really in their infancy. They didn't have the power to do the things they wanted to do. It was very limited. We were trying EBR processes and so on. We tried all sorts of processes that were-- He was trying. We had a few test runs of the *A.I.* He was doing some test shoots. The product was coming through. We were trying different ways of developing it, different ways to get this product, but it never came to anything, until he saw *Jurassic Park*. Once he'd seen *Jurassic Park*, it was outstanding, he said, 'I can do *A.I.* now because those special effects are stunning. I can now do.' Because we jumped into the modern age, albeit that the new special effects now are so much better than *Jurassic Park*'s were then, and were just better than we did *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom*, the *Superman* stuff, and things like that. We got all the lines around it. Some of it has got-- *Baron Munchausen* was somewhere there. So yes, he got a product, but he suddenly could do what he wanted to do.

Spielberg would spend time in his kitchen at St. Albans and talked to him because he was the master. Stan was a master. He knew film. They all knew that his technical ability, sometimes the films were average but the way he shot them, his cinematography was fantastic. But he did everything, Stanley. He'd be on the back of the camera, personally. He'd be like, 'All right, shoot like this. This is what we do.' Editing, he'd be the editor. The editor, Martin Hunter, on *Full Metal Jacket*, certainly with us, he was doing the editing as it happens, but he only did what he was told to do because Stanley edited it as well, because he wanted to do everything. He wouldn't let anybody – he wouldn't necessarily trust people to do it. Leon Vitali, who is called 'Leon crazy and has a box of frogs'-- But these people were so shady, he wanted people around that he could trust. I came to that group laterally, I suppose, through *Eyes Wide Shut*. Then we talked on the phone and stuff. He said, 'Well, I've got this and this. What do you think?' I said, 'I'll do this.' He said, 'Okay, come. If you say that, it's good.' It was fantastic. Really, it was great because he trusts me. In the same way with the problem that he called 'lost in space'. The direction of shooting was not really wowed, and they would complain that we were doing bad estimates, not our issue, because our sales guys weren't techies. They didn't really. I gave them 10 minutes. I would have taken some pictures. I'm going to do some things and make this guy understand, so I drove to the Shepperton, *Lost in Space* set. I'm talking to the guy. He was da, da, da. I said, 'Look, just understand one thing. You chat all you like about it. You go and do. You have the same problems there as you've got here.' I said, 'You need to understand what is going on.' I said, 'He's your cameraman.' I said, 'He's shooting to the end of the roll. You've got a 200-foot roll or a 40-foot roll on there. He's shooting end to end.' You've got important stuff on the end. No cameraman worth his salt will shoot to the end of a roll, because you need something to join onto. You need working-- anyone understands that you need that working space. You need that couple of wraps that you can-- I'll tell you something, I wouldn't be standing here at the moment. Honestly, if I worked with Stanley at Pinewood, and I said 'your cameraman shooting right into the end of the roll', he'd say to me, 'Right, I'm going to fire my cameraman.' Now, he'd fired the cameraman. What I've said, he would fire the cameraman. He went, 'Oh, right.'

Anyway, I've given this to you, the director of that, what his name was-- the guy, DOP on that, sorry. He was doing the first run of *Lost in Space*. He called and he said, 'Can I speak to Colin?' So I came down. He apologized. He said, 'You're absolutely right.' He said, 'What you said was absolutely right.' We've got to the end. Thank you very much, we're getting to the end of this feature,' because it is that understanding, that knowledge. It isn't just about bullshit. It wasn't just about trying to cloud the issue. Some people do truly understand. It was about telling the truth. This will improve what you're doing as a DOP. So, it'll improve what your team are doing. Your handling of features. How the boys-- I mean, one of the weakest points of a picture shoot is the guys who have to do the camera loading, because they're not trained how to handle film. I've seen film. I've seen important features where someone's pressed the film too hard and they're winding in the dark. You've got a mark all the way through the middle, maybe ruined original material, important material. I've seen every torn personal camera and stuff that goes through a process, because it's a continuous process. Your feature could be over here, and this other feature could be coming in here. If it hasn't been very well handled, it will break. It's roll after roll after-- you have to continue the process. You've always got to be, in your mind, thinking about what's on your machines, but also checking. We used to wind through film for breaks and curves, and if there was anything a bit suspicious, we'd isolate and run it as an individual unit. So many techniques that were established, because first and foremost was getting the customer's work out in good quality, and that meant having a good stable process. It meant you're replenishing with the new solutions going into the bath at the right rate, you're monitoring it with a chemist who was doing analysis not once a week, four or five times a day, to see what's happening, and you could adjust your process. You have a quality control system that allows you to monitor different aspects of the dupe processing, the original processing and the print processing. You've got different systems that allow you to observe and make adjustments as the thing continues continuous improvement and quality control. Those aspects just give you colour reproduction, and it was one of the things that Stanley was most worried about, colour reproduction. With *Eyes Wide Shut*, he was force processing because of the lighting. He didn't want loads of lights; he didn't want to light out all the detail. He wanted the detail in there, but of course by doing that we had to then force process under the same method. You can slow

272

it down and speed it up too. You have a normal standard processing speed, which we have as a uniform, which would be 150 minutes, say, is the process by which strips give us that detail. Now once we've got that, we force process something that's been lit in a different way to make the emulsions and colours shift. Most of *Eyes Wide Shut* was force processed, which for us was good because we charged a fortune for it, because it affected the overall processes. You couldn't put normal stuff through it because we were running at different speeds. There were latitudes within that force process, and of course what it does is accentuate issues within the products, emulsion grains, and managing that was more-- 'What's that there? What is that moon?' Because you've got too grainy, you can see the grains. It's a big issue for a lot of the digital people when they came in to doing films, when the digital people started to take the product, scanning it, putting on features, saying, 'Oh my God, you've got that there.' I don't know what it's called. *Golden Age*, they had a problem with *Golden Age*, because it had stuff going on in the background, and I had to lecture the Technicolor and the MPS people and Kodak about what they were expecting. They were probably shooting on very high speed stocks in broad daylight, and then of course, there's going to be grain because you're not managing that whole process all the way through, from your original material through. What are you trying to achieve? If you start pushing film, you're going to start seeing the grains and stuff. They look at you in awe, they go, 'Oh, okay.' You just say, 'What are you doing? That stuff's rubbish, you can fix it,' they go, 'Oh, okay.' That's it, and then off you go, off to something else and talk about something else.

Yes, Stanley understood that aspect, he was very good, and we didn't really have too many quibbles with him. Some things he couldn't get right. There was a scene within the *Eyes Wide Shut*, the scene where Tom Cruise is walking and there were the shops and the things in the background, the blue lights with the yellow taxi. That balance and the focus, he would struggle to get the focus right in that and we worked for ages on that. I mean, my God, he'd shot scenes, the scene in the snooker hall, I think he shot it 50 times with Tom Cruise, because he was obsessed about getting it just right. People got used to that. Some people got fed up with it, but most of the actors and actresses dealt with it, they just dealt with it. We'd deal with it as well, because we knew that it was coming, but with the focus

issues, we'd spend talking to him about the focus and what we were trying to do, we'd try different things. We would do it in the laboratory, we'd explain that it wasn't-- it was within the latitude of the film or in the latitude of the cameras… He's got wonderful lenses, but we also had systems with beautiful lenses and things. He trusted us with that, he did trust us, but it was a long discussion. He wouldn't accept what you're saying straight off. He trusted you, but you needed to argue scientifically what it was he was seeing and how he got to that point, because he would not pretend to know and he would expect you not to pretend to know. If you didn't know, you'd have to say, or you'd have to find a resource that was able to help you out.

Interviewer: If you didn't know, would he listen to you then?

C. Flight: Yes, he would, he would listen. That's what I loved about him, and I think that's why people who were around him loved him, because it could be something that he was talking about-- He wanted to process through our laboratory at Denham. Normally, when you do a worldwide release on a feature, because it's then and there and what he would do is he would do the UK version and the German maybe out of London, we'd do the American run out of America, and you spread it out. He didn't want that. He said, 'No, I want all the processes to be done at Denham. I don't trust anyone else.' Even though he had people he'd worked with at Denham, gone to the other laboratory, he still wanted to do it at Denham. I will do it all by worldwide release, but for him, do it at Denham.

Interviewer: How does that work? I was reading a bit... What if they decide, after already you've made a copy, that they want to do some changes? What happens then?

C. Flight: In those days, because obviously these days, you just scan it digitally, and you could later-- in those days you'd just have to cut. You'd cut in the bits. They would do lots of shoots of a certain scene. For instance, you wouldn't have on a particular scene, you might have three camera crews, three cameras doing it, so you'd do it from different perspectives, and they always had a backup plan. So when you process it, they always had a backup. If something was not quite right, they had a backup, they could look at that or try that bit and that bit. In those days,

it was really about the bits of film; cut a little bit in, and that's what they used to do.

They would do – I can't think of what they called it now – they would do a print. You could actually print the rushes and they could actually do a cut in the copy with the printed bits, they'd cut all the printed bits together and look at that so that they could then not fiddle with the negative. They could do it through the actual printing, the print process. You'd make a print of something and then you'd run that through so it's all cut together. Everyone had different ways of achieving what they wanted to achieve. It was very complex in those days, because obviously, you've got different types of printing machines and things. It was not necessarily uniform. There were different types of colour additives; the way that we created colours in printing machines was very different. There was additive and subtractive printing. Some, you had a light source and you put filters in to take the light out to get your colours. On the additive, you open up the valves more, because you obviously have the light valves that split the lights into three waves, you open them up more so you allow more light through to get those to accentuate if you wanted more colour on the yellow, blue accents or whatever. You'd do it that way. There was lots of different ways of achieving that, but that's how they did those early prints. The real one was of course, the original material, the negative. Once they'd got it cut into an original product, which was very unique to that time, not the digital time, they would do a certain number of prints of that. You had to be very careful, because firstly if you damaged it, what are you going to do? They had different materials, they had different types of negatives around that you could take copies of the negative and you could create, but you always lost in that generational jump, you always lost some detail. It might be very tiny – that's what everyone was striving for, that you'd make copies of the negative and it was perfect, but you couldn't do that. You could even copy print, they called it FDP. You could actually copy a print to make a negative of it to do a print again, but the generational loss in that could be dreadful. Especially, with cinematographers being much more focused on critical contrast and the way it looked, if you did an FBD and a digital transfer, because you had to recover a damaged bit.

We then did things like wet printing. We used a solvent printer, and when you'd run the negative through, a wet solution with the print, and it would print through the gamut, because it had wet solution, it would fill the scratches and the marks in and would change the light part so that you'd actually balance it out, so you'd lose-- If you had a very deep scratch, you might lose all the detail. The minor scratches, you would not even see the scratches there. It printed and the light would pass through it and it would change. Very much like a swimming pool. Refraction, light refraction, things like that. You'd see some of it at the swimming pool, you'd put your hand in it, it looks like it's gone off at a funny angle. The refracting index on a perforating mask was very good, so it allowed them to do that. The problem with wet printing is if you put your original ink through it and you've got some damage on one of the scenes at the joints, gradually the solvent solution would eat at the glue on the joins with the different coloured joints you've got, so sometimes it would fall apart in the bath. The most we ever recommend, we wouldn't recommend too many runs on an original negative. We would say 25, 50 most, but some people wanted to run-- You could never do a bulk run on them. Clearly, you can't run at the high speeds, it's all very slow speeds, but we would recommend the least amount of run-throughs as possible. When people used to say, 'Well, that's a bit coloured out, I'm not sure about the colour here,' then you could say, 'Well, I wouldn't push it too far.' Stanley understood that, he did understand that aspect, that the original material must be handled with great care and understanding what's happening to it at the time. Every time you run it, you're creating a potential issue, and when you get damage on the thing, they have sections that they can cut in other scenes of it, but it wouldn't necessarily be the scene you want. It was very difficult. Difficult to make people understand it as well.

Interviewer: My dad sent me before I came, because I wanted to know everything… and he sent me the pictures of how that actually works, so I sort of learned. It's exactly from the films, from the old-- It's in Slovenian, but-- Here they are. Everything so that I'd learn what a dupe is, and what an intermediate is. That every time when you are doing another copy, like you said, you are losing all the information, so the maximum he said in our country was 10, because of that.

C. Flight: Yes. We would take an original material. We would make off the original negative, we would make a master, and it would be a negative of that, which would be a dupe. A duplicate. A dupe negative, that was called, interpositive. It was done with an intermediate stop now, that those stops were created with emulsions that allow for the transfer of colours. It was all about colour curves, but you'll expect the colour curves where you sat your copy within those colour curves, the more central you had it, the more latitude you had, and if people didn't copy properly, you could be at the bottom end of the scale in the dupe, then you'd have to try and gain something you didn't have at the next stage. So that the processes-- The original material, would go to a dupe, first dupe which was the interpositive. They call that the interpositive or the master, because then, you tuck that away. From that master, you'd make an internegative, so you've got your copy now of the original negative material, because the interpositive is a positive version of the neg. You've got your copy negative now, and the beauty of that is you print off that positive. Some people would make two or three dupes, so they had a backup for it. What you do is, once you've got the process going, you've got good dupes, that's good. Then you'd make all your copies for your internegatives off your dupe. So you'd make your negatives, and they were very important to get right and perfect, and you'd make an internegative for a different version for instance, because they might have to cut in. If there are scenes that got titled, and non-titled. Where you've got to put in-- If you've got to put in Hispanian words within-- because there's a word cut out. It says, 'Oh, 10 years later,' and then you put in the Hispanian for that, because there's, obviously, titles on it, and there were different versions. In each internegative, which was then – that's the Slovenian internegative – titled and non-titled. You'd have your different ones as well. On a major feature, you could have many internegs for the different versions, because they had different parts in there that'd be different-- What's the word? They've censored the censor caps. They have different censor caps, because in some countries some things are allowed, some things are not allowed. Again, the internegative for that version would be done there.

Sometimes you get internegative, it could be used for a number of locations, but the interneg, we could only use internegative. We would only use up to-- We might be lucky and get like 300, 400 prints off it if we are lucky. Depends on the

wear and tear, and how well it's handled, but you can always make another internegative or sections of each internegative, and print it through that. It wasn't a problem to us. There was a lot of features to be shot off. If there's a lot of prints to be made off an internegative, then we could make two. So we've got variability, we might make to send one to Barcelona. We could do one, and they could do one, so it becomes your master printing, really. You're not actually using the original-- The original has been stored away. Your master positive has been stored away. You've made all these internegs now, and your internegs are your important material. Very expensive, about a pound a foot, so each of these-- These could be over £10,000. For each of those internegs, we might make 30 internegs or 40 internegs, so big money in there. You have to translate the colours, they have to be proportionate. They have to sit in the central part of the colour curves, so that when you reproduce it as a print, you still sat within your quality system, so you start at that dupe and the colours. I'll try to explain that a little bit later. If you shoot or if you push something to the extremes, so your printing, and you get a reasonable colour but you are right at the top end of the scale, any difference then, if you've got, you've got to fix your shot in the middle part, and there's a colour difference when you are processing, and there's small differences, you wouldn't really notice it. If you are at the top end of the scale, that same small movement would mean that your blues might go very blue and go really strange because you're right at the top end of the curve, so the change you've got at that top end is less lenient and you've got in the centre. If you go like that on the colour curves, you're down here, you're up here and you're sitting here, not sitting proper, you're sitting there or we're sitting there, the colour variability can be massive for small changes, and you think, 'Oh, what's happened?' We're only a point out, but that looks miles out, the colour point out. 'That looks really cyan there, but we're only a colour point out.'

Interviewer: How can you fix that then?

C. Flight: You can't really. It's very difficult to fix it. When we've had negs in that we've had to work with that are like that, you'd just pull your process down and then you'd set aims that were lower, so the variability at the point that it was less lenient, would become the top end of where you print. You would not accept

things, you'd be monitoring it through, so anything that was that far out, you'd be putting it back in or rejecting. That was the only way you could do it. That was the importance of having a proper dupe system. Dupe systems were created over the years, obviously for these original materials, and there were many ways of doing it. There was colour intermediate product that Stanley called intermediate. There was colour duplication where they did the double processing – they used to call it CRI, Colour Reversal Intermediate. They had a black and white process and a colour process within the same bath.

Interviewer: This is the one I didn't understand.

C. Flight: Yes, it was a very difficult process to keep right. We did a number of jobs with it for those who didn't want to spend the money on doing a double dupe system. The colour reversal aspect of it, where they did the whole lot in one go, was very difficult to get right.

Interviewer: In what sense was it better, or what did it give--?

C. Flight: It wasn't better. I don't think it was better, I think it was just cheaper, because it was a single process. It was a single negative as opposed to a double negative. CRI went out, disappeared very quickly, because it was such an expensive process for the laboratory and very hard to keep everything just right. You'd get colour switches and changes. I remember there being an iodide issue in one of the developers. They used to have variances in the process where the iodide would change the colours, you've got a blue and things like, you'd pull out the iodide for your processing baths. The dual process was very much the thing. The smaller labs used to use CRI, but CRI wasn't always the favourite and it wasn't around for too long, in truth. There were lots of different systems, but the dual system was probably the best, that was the best. Then that, I guess, became the process by which digital-- once we started establishing digital, how we should run digital masters and things – that was the process by which we did that. We copied, to a certain extent, the way that we were doing the normal dupe process, not the CRI process but normal dupe process.

Interviewer: When did that start? What year?

C. Flight: Digital? Digital was going on for a long time. Talk about digital… I mean some of the master techniques and things like that. Probably the end of the 90s, in truth, in various forms, but we really got into it in the early part of the 2000, 2003, 2004, five, six, that period. Then colour intermediates, dupe intermediates came in, digital intermediates – DIs, were coming in and suddenly we started seeing DIs on certain jobs that didn't need the original material or a copy dupe, it would just be the digital intermediate that you get. The problem with the digital intermediate when it first came out, and to some extent at its end of its time, was the cost to get it, because a dupe negative would cost you a pound a foot. You know you've got your material, you've copied from your interpos, you've got your interneg, a pound a foot. 15, obviously, £10,000 I think. Now, digital intermediate would cost you anything up to £120,000. It was hugely more expensive, because the process of getting it was more expensive. They'd grade within that, and they could change gradings within it, and different people would charge different things. It also took a long time to go out to the lasers, the area lasers and things. When they scanned it out into a negative form, it could take you two days or three days to get the whole neg out. If you do it on a normal printing machine, it could be two or three hours. It was those big gaps in time scale in a production roll. If you're shooting, if you've got a feature, say like, *Avatar*, you're doing *Avatar*, we've got to be out on screen on Friday, it's now Tuesday, we're printing the last bits of it and suddenly the reel two goes down, it's ripped, damaged on a machine. Right, what do we do? You see, digital intermediate, they've got to phone the company that produced it, which is not necessarily you or one of your divisions, it could be an outside company, and say, 'We've got a problem with reel two of *Avatar* and we need a replacement now.' It's going to take us two days to set it up. You won't get it for two days or three days, so you're going to miss your screen date. That was the big problem: that was the big issue with digital intermediate at the beginning; it was the time scale and how to fit it in to the whole world of film at that bit, and that made it difficult for us.

On top of that, we used to have all sorts of people, even within our own division, we had graders who thought they were gods. They'd say, 'No, I don't like that,' or, 'we don't like this colour.' They'd do the process and say, 'Now, we've added colour variations in here with changes.' We'd say, 'No, you can't have done,

because it's standard processor.' It became very complex. Other complexities around the origination of material were things like the process itself, because we started to see a lot of-- What's the word? Like little bars, processing bars. That was a difficult one, because we were beginning to understand that certain films pushed weren't necessarily processing correctly. It's incorrect processing, and you'd get these little bars in the background, you could see, but you'd start to see that in the digital stuff. They said, 'Well, it's your processor that's not right.' No, it isn't. The processor's fine. Other materials that we're doing are fine. That became a very contentious, a very difficult issue. I talked to the guys at the beginning of the year about it from Norwich, and saying that it was-- Really, it was almost a breakpoint for film, for the film process side of it, because if you didn't get that process' side right, you could get these bars in it. We never understood it. Even in the end. We changed much of the processors to try and eliminate it, but I think it was to do with-- It was probably to do with the way the film routed through and through the computer process as well, because they've put it down there into process, they do the scan, drop it onto film, we then process it. They'd say, 'Well, we can see these bars in there. It's not us. We've got other products going through at the same time. We've got no bars in it. Then, that's got to be you.' That was the problem, 'It's got to be you'. That led to a lot of issues between the digital and the film people, but by the end we did a number of films that were horrendous. My life was geared up to films, aside from building and stuff like that. My life was geared up to films that were not straight forward. You would have a film that really went badly. Not because of anything-- you'd have a problem at the beginning, and then it would be worked. Then you'd get another problem, you'd get another problem going… *The Golden Compass* was a bit like that, but there was a number of films like that, which I look back on and go, 'Oh, God,' and every time we came up with it, 'Oh, no,' but it was-- Your life was around these features that-- I mean, no one probably understood totally what was happening. We had very stable sets of control strips in our bars. They put sets of control strips through with it and they'd read it and they'd see the 21 scales and they'd see where the colours were set in, but there could be variations within that, small variations. They'd go, 'You've got variation in here.' 'Well, you can have variations.' 'Yes, but on the digital, we're seeing it more.' 'Well, then your latitudes are wrong on your digital.' So back to latitudes, where you're signalling

the colour curves. Because it was two different times, it was the digital and the film, there was never that mid-area of compromise. Some people never saw it, because they didn't do enough product but we did tons of product. We had arguments with America over it and things like that. Digital intermediates could have been added at the onset. Digital intermediate's being the next phase for the film processing and finally getting to digital was a nightmare period for us, because of the types of products that were going through. They weren't necessarily shot well and we'd see it through the digital stuff. Then we'd process it and think, 'My God, this doesn't look very good at all.' We had stuff that looked washed out. We'd look at stuff and go, 'Oh, my God.' What was it? Keanu Reeves's film, the space film, *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, something like that. It was because there was a lot of the CGI stuff and it was very poor. By the time it'd gone through the process, it looked terrible. We're like, 'Oh, my God. What a dreadful film it is.' They spent a fortune on the special effects, but it looks dreadful. That was always a horrible thing for us, as well film people, to sit and look in the-- because we'd be one of the first people to see these things. We'd be sitting there, sometimes with the production team, you'd go, 'Oh, my God. That looks dreadful,' but you'd think, 'I can't say anything to them and they're not saying anything. This looks so flat. This looks horrible.' But that's the advent from-- I guess things have developed over the years, have gone from what was sort of like a -- We had full control over, could have control over the whole process, to an area we didn't have control once the digital intermediate had gone outside. Even within our own Deluxe group, we had no-- because you were a different breed of person. The digital person was very different to the film person. People who were in the film would sit at the theatre and look at the picture thrown a long way to a screen and you'd think-- You'd look at it and look at the defects and the format. A digital person would always sit, doing great, and they'd be sitting right on the screen. The screen would be here. They'd be going, 'Oh, yes, you can see that. You can see this.' Yes, but you can't, if you do it away from which how it's going to be shown in the theatre. Trying to make them understand that was always very difficult as well, because they were these young kids coming through that we saw, 'These old people telling us this, "those young kids, they don't understand,"'. I was in the middle of it, because they were trying to stop this contentious issue, because it was affecting the timescale of feature film. It was

always the hardest thing. In some ways they still have processes in laboratories that do still exist. There are; we help kids out, a place in London called iLab. We've done a lot of work for a place in Slough they call themselves now, for these labs. There are a few little labs around that do things, but in a slightly different way. Ironically, in the early days of Star Wars, they were saying, 'We can't wait to get off. We're going to do everything digitally.' Now that they've got digital, they've decided to do Star Wars back on process, they process it as film, they shoot it on film, so they want it processed and then transfer it to scan, and then work on it digitally afterwards. They're all over the place, but that was just the way things happened with film at the end. We knew it would be an issue, but once you went digitally all the way through, it wasn't a biggie. Once you've got your Reds and all that sort of thing, digital cameras, and it was all the way through, you control the whole process. But once you've got different places and different-- It was hard enough lab to lab, if someone preferred to do an original process in Technicolor in Hollywood, and then do the final process with us, you'd see variations in what they were doing. The colours were different. They had processes according to what they wanted in their country – in the West Coast is what they used to call it. We had our look in the UK, in Europe. They have a certain look which was rest of the world, the West Coast look. So with contentious issues there and the product they sent you is sent with scratches, there's marks all over it. 'Well, there weren't marks on it when we sent it to you.' We don't know, it's a rival business so we don't know. Japanese were interesting, because we had the Japanese ones that do their own stuff for their printing, so it used to create issues for us and stuff, and then I got an opportunity to create an issue for them. I had been running all over the world to do things. *Dreamgirls*, they had problems. 'This is not very good. It's this--' Anyway, we got the subtitles, we're doing the subtitling at this laboratory in Japan. I said, 'It's not really good, it's no good, you got it. Can't we do anything about it?' No, because they hadn't been good with us. We just said, 'No, no.' So, they had to fly this stuff back to Ford's, to Japan so many times. We tended to work very well with other laboratories, but you try to be fair. Generally, because a lot of the other places didn't truly understand what they were trying to do and we would say, 'Look, guys…' I was offered, the guys saying, 'Look guys, you need to be looking at

this.' 'No. We know.' Okay, that's fair enough. I'm saving you guys money and I could save you thousands of pounds if I give you this advice. Generally, we were seen as the good guys in other laboratories in this business. I used to get calls to other laboratories in the UK, because they didn't understand the problem. They'd give us a call and we'd talk through something. Talk through an issue. It could be something as diverse as recovering a developing agent in a developer in a process or CD3 in a neg, but they might say, 'We have a recovery process. It's so expensive, this material, you could actually put it through a filter bed, but you sent the developer to get the CD2 out of it and work with that.' We used to offer advice for all sorts of businesses on that, because we were experts at doing that as well. Our chemical recovery businesses were very good. We were very conscious of the cost associated with aspects, but also environmental. If we were reusing it, it wasn't going down the drain, because you'd save it, wasn't going down the drain, so it was that whole balance, this whole picture of understanding economic costs, what the customer ones, how the product looks, plus this idea of responsibility within an environment. Then, of course, the responsibilities you go through environmental, and from an economic aspect of it. Silver was a big issue in the film process and laboratories, because it was something that wasn't truly understood. Silver was part of the light sense interpreter, the silver hay lights cost within the film, because the T grains connect to a coupler. The coupler is the dark and the sensitivity, depending on where it is in the set, how much it cost, and what it's there for, if it's within the blue layer or whatever, it's sensitive to that light. Then, once the light touches it, the coupler reacts to it and then effects, because it's connected to the grain, it changes to that colour of a varying degree, depends on how it's affected the sciences behind of that. It's understanding that aspect of film sensometry that, even to that depth, that understanding, what was going on within the product itself, it was quite interesting. So much associated with getting those things right, the colour's right. I've got a couple things to show to you. Otherwise I could get really boring.

Interviewer: No, actually. That is not boring at all. Everything that has to do with film interests me.

C. Flight: Got some stuff to show you in the other room that would interest you. I was thinking actually that under normal circumstance I wouldn't do it, but I think it's going to be lost. I'm going to give you some Stanley Kubrick stuff. I think your father will understand. To be honest, I've got stuff that I couldn't bring everything with me, because there was so much on it. I was throwing away stuff that broke my heart, really. Something like this. This sort of stuff is on our walls. This is the old film posters from about a hundred odd years ago. I've got a few of those. I had them all. My previous house to this one, was massive. I had a hallway which was probably as big as the ground floor. I had all these pictures up on the walls. They're beautiful pictures. They're tucked away most of the day, because we've got leaks in the roof here. I've got to get around to solving all that. I don't put them out because these things are so old.

Interviewer: I just wanted to say, is this going to-- For example, if the sun hits them?

C. Flight: I'm very careful about where I put them and store them. Really, I should sell them to somebody who's-- I got the guy who built the Denham laboratory, is a guy called Walter Gropius. He's very famous. Him and Corbusier were some of the famous modernist designer architects. These are original drawings from Gropius from the 1930s. These are things-- They're going to skips, and I was thinking, this stuff is so precious, so important. Trying to find somebody who can actually deal with it. I want you to have this. I'll stick it out, and I'll put it on the stand. Here you are. This is stuff from *The Shining* when we did some stuff in *The Shining*. What it is, is an example-- Look at these pages. These are the grid charts. The stuff that's Stanley was doing. Your father would understand all these. These are the checks on the lenses. When we did the dupe process, we were copying-- He wanted to make sure that all the stuff, all the materials, from the different dupe parts of the process, which you can see here, were correct. He'd put side by side from previous shoots and say, 'Look, I can see the lines.' Your father would know how to put these up on a board. I'm showing how these are all set up. Anyway-- Yes, take those ones.

Interviewer: You're sure?

C. Flight: Yes. That's from 1980. Designed in the 1980. What else do we have?

Interviewer: Thank you.

C. Flight: Still have the other things. We got stuff from here that was done-- Some of the early plates-- Some of the old dye plates and things. Showed you how film was split down.

Interviewer: Yes. I see, because they are the basic ones.

C. Flight: Yes, how they split the lights and stuff like that. This sort of stuff, these sort of items had the soundtracks and things. I don't know where they'd end up, because I must admit, I just grabbed a lot of stuff.

Interviewer: It's a shame when something closes and then a lot of stuff gets--

C. Flight: It's history as much as anything. I hate the idea. These are the emulsions, that's the emulsions on films. It explains the different layers and that's on a subtractive system. This is obviously slides they did for shoots. Interesting, but it's fantastic. I love it. I love all these sort of stuff.

Interviewer: Yes.

C. Flight: I guess, what I should do is try and get this up to a museum or something.

Interviewer: Absolutely.

C. Flight: Because it's stuff that--

Interviewer: You said there's a museum. Like an archive.

C. Flight: I believe there's one at-- The BFI were doing a lot of stuff for me. There's an archive in Aylesbury. There's a motion picture museum in, is it Bradford? This is a gate from the old Oxbury. You'd set up the graphic-- Your frame size, yes. That was very much part of what we were doing. When we were taking an academy negative, where they'd shot academy full frame, standard frame, and they wanted to squeeze in things, we could take certain parts of the picture by measuring and then taking that middle section or something. Whatever

they wanted to do above centre-- It's usually a percentage above centre line that they take and they'd squeeze it out.

Interviewer: That's what I wanted to say. You would have to either compress it or extend.

C. Flight: Yes. That's it. That's exactly what we do. The great thing about the academy negs, is that you can do anything with that. Because you've got all detail laying you can squeeze it and drop it down. You can make it bigger.

Interviewer: How much do you lose on quality?

C. Flight: Quality, not so much. It's not bad, because you're actually working with the original. Especially the length is-- the lens is this long. We've got a huge lens. You lose a certain amount of product within the natural framework yourself because you're taking centre. For instance, on *Terminator*, they do it because of things like the special effects, because the guy's on the motorbike, because they shot that for the academy. We've been chased by the creature, the robot, he's on a motorbike, riding on that from the shopping centre. Of course, he's not on a motorbike-- he's on a motorbike but he's on the back of a trolley on the back of a car, just going on like that. What you do is you shoot in it so that doesn't come into it. That was the whole part of the process. You take a certain aspect to that so you could take out the booms and various other things, so you can pick whatever part of the frame you wanted to shoot. Just shoot it as your neg.

Interviewer: Yes, I have seen that one time in a cinema when we had a screening for our film. They made a mistake, I don't know, with the mask, I guess. You could see all the booms in the top. I was like, 'Ah--'

C. Flight: Those happen sometimes. Sometimes they frame them out.

Interviewer: Yes.

C. Flight: Yes. That's the sort of techniques. You'd have to learn techniques. We had all sorts of features that would be certain looks, certain things. You'd always be watching for it. Because there was an issue on one of the lenses had slit on one of the machines. We had a drop off on a film called *Frankenstein* a few years ago,

many years ago, 90s. Now, in a cinema, they only shoot a certain part of the frame of the print. You've got a print frame of that. They'll only shoot that bit and project that bit. Each cinema's different, so you might shoot that bit, and then you might better see these marks at the sides. It was a lot of taking a gamble.

Interviewer: I guess, when you go into the projection room and when they check that, you know how to--

C. Flight: Yes. I used to get them to run a grid, a standard grid. No way they projected that grid because I could see the grid as they projected it. I know whether it'll work inside the feature. Sometimes, I'd say, 'Yes, okay, go with that.' We'd have a lot of money tied up in features. This work could get rejected or if something's out. I just got loads of bits and pieces here that sound useful. The guys from the Uni took a lot of the stuff. As usual, the DVD documentary stuff they did with me and stuff like that through my things. They've taken a lot of those materials. They're good to view if you wanted to have a view of some of the-- particularly the one on the Barcelona lab, they've got DVDs there of when I built Barcelona. I presented that to the studios in 2006. They got finished in 2005, 2006. To me, it's a remarkable laboratory because of the way it was set up. It's an improvement to Rome. When I showed it to the Hollywood guys, they said, 'That doesn't look like any film that I've ever seen, because it was so unique, but it's worth looking at because it was such a massive thing in a small watt just like a these type of things.'

Interviewer: Do they still exist?

C. Flight: No. The main laboratory is gone now, because when all the film--

Interviewer: The Rome one as well?

C. Flight: No, that's gone. We sold that. That's a factory now.

Bibliography

Abrams, N. (2015) 'Becoming a macho Mensch: Stanley Kubrick, *Spartacus* and 1950s Jewish Masculinity', *Adaptation*, [online], 8 (3), pp. 283-296. Available at: Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/article/8/3/283/2274345 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Abrams, N. (2018) *Stanley Kubrick: New York Jewish intellectual*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Abrams, N. and Hunter, I. Q. (forthcoming) *The Bloomsbury companion to Stanley Kubrick*.

Agel, J. (1970) *The making of Kubrick's 2001*. New York: Signet/New American Library.

Allen, G. (2017) 'The reader on Red Alert: Stanley Kubrick, Peter George and the evolution of fear', *Cinergie*, [online], (12), pp. 117-125. Available at: https://doaj.org/article/ccb47c9b873d40f6af3e7609738fd757 [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Allen, R. C. and Gomery, D. (1985) *Film history: Theory and practice*. New York: Knopf.

Allsopp, C. (n.d.) '"Full Metal Jacket"', *Christine Allsopp Make-Up/Fx, Hair Wigs*. [online]. Available at: https://www.christineallsopp.com/full-metal-jacket [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Amabile, T. and Gryskiewicz, N. (1989) 'The creative environment scales: Work environment inventory', *Creativity Research Journal*, [online], 2 (4), pp. 231-253. Available at: Taylor & Francis Online https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10400418909534321 [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Anon (1987) 'Supplying the props for war films', *The New York Times*, [online] 20 August, p. C14. Available at:

https://www.nytimes.com/1987/08/20/movies/supplying-the-props-for-war-films.html [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Anon (2010) '*A Clockwork Orange* – The story behind an iconic poster', *Reel Art Press News*. [online] 23 November. Available at: https://www.reelartpress.com/news/newsitem/32 [Accessed 10 December 2018].

Anon (2018) 'Mike Kaplan', *Prabook*. [online]. Available at: https://prabook.com/web/mike.kaplan/234740 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Anon (2018) 'Pushing and pulling film: The ultimate guide', *Richard Photo Lab*. [online]. Available at: https://www.richardphotolab.com/blog/post/pushing-and-pulling-film-the-ultimate-guide [Accessed 10 December 2018].

Anon (2018) 'Special effects and visual effects: What is the difference?', *Nuts Computer Graphics*.[online]. Available at: https://www.nutscomputergraphics.com/en/special-effects-and-visual-effects-what-is-the-difference/ [Accessed 24 December 2018].

Aragay, M. (2005) *Books in motion: Adaptation, intertextuality, authorship*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Armstrong, A. (2011) *Interview with Andy Armstrong*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Bacharach, S. and Tollefsen, D. (2010) 'We did it: From mere contributors to coauthors', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, [online], 68 (1), pp. 23-32. Database: Wiley. Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-6245.2009.01389.x [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Bane, C. (2006) *Viewing novels, reading films: Stanley Kubrick and the art of adaptation as interpretation*. Ph.D. Louisiana State University. Available at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/2985/ [Accessed 22 January 2019].

Banks, M. (2015) *The writers a history of American screenwriters and their guild*. New Brunswick; New Jersey; London: Rutgers University Press.

Barthes, R. (1968) 'The death of the author', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 97-100.

Baxter, J. (1997) *Stanley Kubrick*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers.

Bazin, A. (1957) 'De la politique des auteurs', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 19-28.

BBFC (2019) *British Board of Film Classification*. [online]. Available at: http://www.bbfc.co.uk/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Becker, H. S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe; London: Collier-Macmillan.

Benedict Bunker, B. and Lewicki, R. J. (1995) 'Trust in relationships: A model of development and decline', in B. Benedict Bunker and J. Rubin (eds.) *The Jossey-Bass management series and The Jossey-Bass conflict resolution series. Conflict, cooperation, and justice: Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. pp. 133-173.

Benson, M. (2018) *Space Odyssey: Stanley Kubrick, Arthur C. Clarke, and the making of a masterpiece*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bernstein, J. (1966) 'Profile: Stanley Kubrick', reprinted in G. D. Phillips (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews* (2001). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi. pp. 21-46.

Bernstein, M. (2000) *Controlling Hollywood: Censorship and regulation in the studio era*. London: The Athlone Press.

BFI (2019). *BFI Film Fund*. [online]. Available at: https://www.bfi.org.uk/supporting-uk-film/film-fund [Accessed 11 November 2018].

Bier, J. (1985) 'Cobb and Kubrick: Author and auteur: (Paths of Glory as novel and film)', *A National Journal of Literature & Discussion*, [online], 61 (3). Available from: https://www.vqronline.org/essay/cobb-and-kubrick-author-and-auteur-paths-glory-novel-and-film [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Bizony, P. (2000) *2001: Filming the future*. London: Aurum Press.

Blitz, M. (2014) 'A brief history of the movie rating system', *Gizmodo*. [online] 30 December. Available at: https://gizmodo.com/a-brief-history-of-the-movie-rating-system-1676334900 [Accessed 25 January 2019].

Blunden, A. (n.d.) 'Marx and Engels on literature and art: Preface', *Marxists Org*. [online]. Available at: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/subject/art/preface.htm [Accessed 8 November 2018].

Bogdanovich, P. (1999) 'What they say about Stanley Kubrick', *The New York Times,* [online] 4 July. Available at: https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/library/film/070499mag-kubrick-profile.htm [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Bordwell, D. and Thompson, K. (2010) *Film art: An introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital', in J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood. pp. 241–258.

Bradley, P. (2011) 'Pablo Ferro at Cinefamily: Batshit genius and YouTube predecessor whose Dr. Strangelove trailer was better than the movie, Kubrick said', *LA Weekly*, [online] 28 September. Available at: https://www.laweekly.com/arts/pablo-ferro-at-cinefamily-batshit-genius-and-youtube-predecessor-whose-dr-strangelove-trailer-was-better-than-the-movie-kubrick-said-2372275 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Branaghan, S. and Chibnall, S. (2006) *British film posters*. London: BFI.

Breakell, S. (2008) 'Perspectives: Negotiating the archive', *Tate Papers*, [online], (9). Available at: https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/09/perspectives-negotiating-the-archive [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Broderick, M. (2017) *Reconstructing Strangelove: Inside Stanley Kubrick's 'nightmare comedy'*. New York: A Wallflower Press Book published by Columbia University Press.

Broderick, M. (2017) 'Post-Kubrick: On the filmmaker's influence and legacy', *Screening the Past*, [online], (42). Available at: http://www.screeningthepast.com/2017/09/post-kubrick-on-the-filmmakers-influence-and-legacy/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Broderick, M. (forthcoming) *The Kubrick Legacy*. New York: Routledge.

Brody, R. (2012) 'Andrew Sarris and the "A" word', *The New Yorker,* [online] 19 June. Available at: https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/andrew-sarris-and-the-a-word [Accessed 27 December 2018].

Brosnan, J. (1977) *Movie magic*. London: Abacus.

Brown, G. (2011) *Interview with Garrett Brown*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Buckland, W. (2016) 'La politique des auteurs in British film studies: Traditional versus structural approaches', *Mise au Point*, [online], (8). Available at: https://journals.openedition.org/map/2042 [Accessed 14 December 2018].

Bugge, C. (n.d.) 'The Clockwork controversy', *The Kubrick Site*. [online]. Available at: http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0012.html [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Burch, N. (1981) *Theory of film practice. Series: Princeton legacy library*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Burlingame, J. (2012) 'A lost masterpiece discovered: Alex North's score for "2001: A Space Odyssey"', *Alex North 2001*. [online]. Available at:

http://www.alexnorth2001.com/ABOUT_THE_SCORE.html [Accessed 9 December 2018].

Burton, A. and Chibnall, S. (1999) 'Promotional activities and showmanship in British film exhibition', *Journal of Popular British Cinema*, (2), pp. 83-99.

Burton, A. and Chibnall, S. (2013) *Historical dictionary of British cinema*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.

Buscombe, E. (1973) 'Ideas of authorship', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 76-83.

Cahill, T. (1987) 'The Rolling Stone interview: Stanley Kubrick in 1987', *Rolling Stone*, [online] 27 August. Available at: https://www.rollingstone.com/movies/movie-news/the-rolling-stone-interview-stanley-kubrick-in-1987-90904/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Caldwell, J. T. (2008) *Production culture*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Canudo, R. (1995) *Manifeste des Sept Arts*. Paris: Séguier.

Carlos, W. (1996) '*Wendy Carlos Photos 1*', *Wendy Carlos*. [online]. Available at: http://www.wendycarlos.com/photos.html [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Case, D. (2001) *Film technology in post production*. 2nd ed. New York; London: Focal Press.

Castle, A. (2005) *The Stanley Kubrick archives*. Köln: Taschen.

Castle, A. (2011) *Stanley Kubrick's Napoleon: The greatest movie never made*. Köln: Taschen.

Cattani, G. and Ferriani, S. (2008) 'A core/periphery perspective on individual creative performance: Social networks and cinematic achievements in the Hollywood film industry', *Organization Science*, [online], 19 (6), pp. 824-844. Available at: https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/orsc.1070.0350 [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Caughie, J. (1981) *Theories of authorship*. London: Routledge.

Chandler, D. (2007) *Semiotics: The basics*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge.

Chapman, J., Glancey, M. and Harper, S. (2007) *The New Film History: Sources, methods, approaches*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke.

Charles River Editors (2014) *American Legends: The Life of Stanley Kubrick*.

Ciment, M. (1983) *Kubrick*. London: William Collins Sons and CO Ltd.

Cipriani, C. (2014) 'Stanley Kubrick's longtime producer trashes "Room 237" and lists "Eyes Wide Shut" as his favorite Kubrick film', *Indie Wire*, [online] 31 March. Available at: https://www.indiewire.com/2014/03/stanley-kubricks-longtime-producer-trashes-room-237-and-lists-eyes-wide-shut-as-his-favorite-kubrick-film-28457/ [Accessed 13 December 2018].

Clines, F. (1987) 'Stanley Kubrick's Vietnam', *The New York Times*, [online], pp. 1, 34. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/1987/06/21/movies/stanley-kubrick-s-vietnam.html [Accessed 4 January 2019].

Cocks, G. (2004) *The wolf at the door: Stanley Kubrick, history, and the Holocaust*. New York: P. Lang.

Cole, N. L. (2018) 'what is cultural capital? Do I have it? An overview of the concept', *Thought Co*. [online] 15 January. Available at: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-cultural-capital-do-i-have-it-3026374 [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Cook, B. W. (2012) *Interview with Brian Cook*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Corrigan, T. (1991) *A cinema without walls*. London: Routledge.

Corrigan, T. (2015) *A short guide to writing about film*. 9th ed. Boston: Pearson Education Limited.

Cousineau, P. Ed. (1990) *The hero's journey: Joseph Campbell on his life and work*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Cowan, P. (2016) *Persistence of vision: Film authorship and the role of the cinematographer (with a case study of Gregg Toland)*. Ph.D., Manchester Institute for Research and Innovation in Art and Design. Available at: https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/608795/ [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Crittenden, R. (2018) *Fine cuts: Interviews on the practice of European film editing*. New York: Routledge.

Daniels, R. (2015) 'Selling the war film: Syd Stogel and the *Paths of Glory* files', in T. Ljujić, P. Krämer and R. Daniels (eds.) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing. pp. 80-97.

Darlington, J. (2016) '*A Clockwork Orange*: The art of moral panic?', *The Cambridge Quarterly*, 45 (2), pp. 119-134. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/camqtly/article/45/2/119/2566403 [Accessed 23 December 2018].

Deb, S. (2018) 'Confused by sound mixing vs. sound editing? We've got you', *The New York Times*, [online] 2 March. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/02/movies/sound-mixing-sound-editing-explainer.html [Accessed 23 December 2018].

Derrida, J. and Prenowitz, E. (1995) 'Archive fever: A Freudian impression', *Diacritics*, [online], 25 (2), pp. 9-63. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/465144?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 23 December 2018].

Doherty, T. (1988) 'Full Metal Genre: Stanley Kubrick's Vietnam Combat Movie', *Film Quarterly*, [online], 42 (2), pp. 24-30. Available at: http://fq.ucpress.edu/content/42/2/24 [Accessed 23 December 2018].

Eason, P. (2012) *Interview with Paddy Eason*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Ebert, R. (1980) 'Interview with Shelley Duvall', *Interviews Roger Ebert*. [online] 14 December. Available at: https://www.rogerebert.com/interviews/interview-with-shelley-duvall [Accessed 8 November 2018].

Ebert, R. (1999) 'Cruise opens up about working with Kubrick' *Interviews Roger Ebert*. [online] 15 July. Available at: https://www.rogerebert.com/interviews/cruise-opens-up-about-working-with-kubrick [Accessed 22 December 2018].

Ebert, R. (1999) '*Eyes Wide Shut* Movie Review & Film Summary' *Reviews Roger Ebert*. [online] 16 July. Available at: https://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/eyes-wide-shut-1999 [Accessed 14 December 2018].

Eckert, C. W. (1973) 'The English cine-structuralists', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 101-109.

Edwards, P. (2013) 'The life and myths of Stanley Kubrick', *Death by Films*. [online] 28 November. Available at: http://www.deathbyfilms.com/the-life-and-myth-of-stanley-kubrick [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Ekvall, G. (1996) 'Organizational climate for creativity and innovation', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, [online], 5 (1), pp. 105-123. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13594329608414845 [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Elsaesser, T. (1986) 'The New Film History', *Sight and Sound*, 55 (4), pp. 246-251. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254771215_The_new_film_history [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Falsetto, M. (1996) *Perspectives on Stanley Kubrick*. New York: G.K. Hall; London: Prentice Hall International.

Faraci, D. (2013) 'Why Stanley Kubrick banned *A Clockwork Orange*', *Birth. Movies. Death.* [online]. Available at: https://birthmoviesdeath.com/2013/08/01/the-disappearance-of-a-clockwork-orange [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Farber, S. (1972) *The movie rating game*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press.

Farber, S. and Changas, E. (1972) 'Putting the hex on "R" and "X"', *The New York Times*, [online] 9 April, p. 1. Available at: https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1972/04/09/91324928.html?action=click&contentCollection=Archives&module=LedeAsset&region=ArchiveBody&pgtype=article&pageNumber=196 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Feeney, F. (2013) 'In the trenches with Stanley Kubrick - James Harris on Stanley Kubrick', *Directors Guild of America*. [online]. Available at: http://www.dga.org/Craft/DGAQ/All-Articles/1302-Spring-2013/James-Harris-on-Stanley-Kubrick.aspx [Accessed 13 January 2019].

Fenwick, J. Ed. (2018) *Understanding Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey: Representation and interpretation*. Bristol: Intellect Books Ltd.

Fenwick, J., Hunter, I. Q. and Pezzotta, E. Eds. (2017) 'The Stanley Kubrick Archive: A dossier of new research', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, [online], 37 (3), pp. 367-372. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01439685.2017.1342329 [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Fitzpatrick, R. (2015) 'Jan Harlan remembers Stanley Kubrick and their time in Ireland', *Irish Examiner,* [online] 18 March. Available at: https://www.irishexaminer.com/lifestyle/artsfilmtv/jan-harlan-remembers-stanley-kubrick-and-their-time-in-ireland-319002.html [Accessed 8 December 2018].

Foucault, M. (1969) 'What is an Author?', in J. Marsh, J. Caputo and M. Westphal (eds.) *Modernity and its discontents* (1992). New York: Fordham University Press. pp. 299-314. Available at:

https://www.open.edu/openlearn/ocw/pluginfile.php/624849/mod_resource/content/1/a840_1_michel_foucault.pdf [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Freedman, C. (2008) 'On Kubrick (review)', *Science Fiction Film and Television*, [online], 1 (1), pp. 133-138. Available at: PROJECT MUSE http://muse.jhu.edu/article/269149/pdf [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Freer, I. (2018) '"I haven't got it yet!": The relentless, ridiculous perfectionism of Stanley Kubrick', *The Telegraph*, [online] 26 July. Available at: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/films/0/havent-got-yet-relentless-ridiculous-perfectionism-stanley-kubrick/ [Accessed 13 January 2019].

Frewin, A. (2012) *Interview with Anthony Frewin*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Frewin, A. (2018) *2001: Beyond 50-Film Symposium*. [podcast] 2 August. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hF2Y9A4_yAI (Accessed 7 November 2018). [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Friedman, J.M. (1973) 'The motion picture rating system of 1968: A constitutional analysis of self-regulation by the film industry', *Columbia Law Review*, [online], 73 (2), pp. 185-240. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/1121227?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Fusco, J. (2016) 'How Stanley Kubrick built atmosphere with diegetic sound', *No Film School*. [online] 10 May. Available at: https://nofilmschool.com/2016/05/digetic-sounds-stanley-kubrick [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Gambin, L. (2011) 'Interview: Shelley Duvall on *The Shining*', *Coming Soon*. [online] 18 November 2016. Available at: https://www.comingsoon.net/horror/features/787573-interview-shelley-duvall-on-the-shining [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Gaut, B. (2003) 'Creativity and imagination', in B. Gaut and P. Livingston (eds.) *The creation of art*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. pp. 148-173.

Gaut, B. (2010) *A philosophy of cinematic art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaut, B. and Livingston, P. Eds. (2003) *The creation of art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geller, L. (1990) 'Anton Furst by Lynn Geller', *Bomb*, [online], (31). Available at: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/anton-furst/ [Accessed 20 November 2018].

Gelmis, J. (1971) *The film director as superstar*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Gelmis, J. (1970) 'The Film Director as Superstar: Stanley Kubrick', reprinted in G.D. Phillips (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews* (2001). Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi. pp. 80-104.

Gengaro, C. (2014) *Listening to Stanley Kubrick*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Incorporated.

Genova, A. (2016) 'Malcolm McDowell says "A Clockwork Orange" is becoming reality, 44 years after its release', *Daily Mail*, [online] 2 February. Available at: https://redice.tv/news/malcolm-mcdowell-says-a-clockwork-orange-is-becoming-reality-44-years-after-its-release [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Gilbert, M. (2000) *Sociality and responsibility*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ginna, R. (1999) 'Stanley Kubrick speaks for himself', *Entertainment*, [online] 9 April. Available at: https://ew.com/article/1999/04/09/stanley-kubrick-speaks-himself/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Glăveanu, V. (2011) 'How are we creative together? Comparing sociocognitive and sociocultural answers', *Theory & Psychology*, [online], 21 (4), pp. 473-492. Available at: LSE Library Services http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/38611/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Gomery, D. (2005) *The Hollywood studio system: A history*. London: British Film Institute.

Goodridge, M. (2001) 'DreamWorks Universal extend distribution pact', *Screen International*, 20 April, p. 2.

Grant, B. K. Ed. (2008) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gray, T. (2016) 'Visual-effects pioneer Douglas Trumbull on *2001: A Space Odyssey*, digital innovations', *Variety*, [online], 29 July. Available at: https://variety.com/2016/film/features/visual-effects-pioneer-douglas-trumbull-1201823941/ [Accessed 6 December 2018].

Greene, F. (2013) 'Working in the world of propaganda: Early trailers & modern discourses of social control', *Frames Cinema Journal*, pp. 1-21. Available at: http://framescinemajournal.com/article/working-in-the-world-of-propaganda-early-trailers-modern-discourses-of-social-control/ [Accessed 8 November 2018].

Grove, L. (1987) 'Stanley Kubrick, at a distance', *The Washington Post*, [online] 28 June. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/style/1987/06/28/stanley-kubrick-at-a-distance/543f1135-e5ab-44ba-ad83-37c539057f13/?utm_term=.c345ae614d8f [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Hall, S. (1997) *Representation*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Halligan, F. (2012) *Film craft: Production design*. East Sussex: Ilex Press.

Haralovich, M. (1982) 'Advertising heterosexuality', *Screen*, 23 (2), pp. 50-60.

Hargadon, A. and Bechky, B. (2006) 'When collections of creatives become creative collectives: A field study of problem solving at work', *Organization Science*, [online], 17 (4), pp. 484-500. Available at: PUBSONLINE https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1060.0200?journalCode=orsc [Accessed 29 November 2018].

Harris, J. B. (2010) *Interview with James B. Harris*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Hartman, D. and Zimberoff, D. (2009) 'The hero's journey of self-transformation: Models of higher development from mythology', *Journal of Heart-Centreed Therapies*, [online], 12 (2), pp. 3-93. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272742085_The_Hero's_Journey_of_Self-transformation_Models_of_Higher_Development_from_Mythology [Accessed 29 November 2018].

Hastings, C. (2008) 'The Stanley Kubrick files', *The Telegraph*, [online] 7 July. Available at: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/3555934/The-Stanley-Kubrick-files.html [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Herr, M. (1978) *Dispatches*. London: Pan.

Herr, M. (2000) *Kubrick*. London: Picador.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2011) *Creative labour*. London: Routledge.

Heymann, D. (1987) 'Stanley Kubrick's Vietnam', reprinted in A. Castle (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick archives* (2005), London: Taschen. pp. 730-743.

Hill, R. (n.d.) '*Full Metal Jacket*', reprinted in A. Castle (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick archives* (2005). Köln: Taschen Gmbh. pp. 694-729.

Hobbs, T. (2018) 'How Eyes Wide Shut's uniquely unsettling score was made', *Dazed*. [online] 30 October. Available at: http://www.dazeddigital.com/music/article/41996/1/eyes-wide-shut-stanley-kubrick-soundtrack-jocelyn-pook-interview [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Hodge, C. (2009) 'Film collaboration and creative conflict', *Journal of Film and Video*, [online], 61 (1), pp. 18-30. Available at: PROJECT MUSE https://muse.jhu.edu/article/258822/summary [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Hofler, R. (2014) *Sexplosion: From Andy Warhol to A Clockwork Orange - How a generation of pop rebels broke all the taboos*. New York: It Books.

Holmes, S. (2005) *British film and television culture of the 1950s*. Bristol: Intellect Books.

Howard, J. (1999) *Stanley Kubrick companion*. London: B.T. Batsford.

Howard, J. (2000) 'UK clock ticks again for Kubrick's Orange', *The Kubrick Site*. [online]. Available at: http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0088.html [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Hughes, D. (2000) *The complete Kubrick*. London: Virgin.

Hughes, J. (2017) 'Interview: Tony Lawson', *Film Comment*, [online] 7 April. Available at: https://www.filmcomment.com/blog/interview-tony-lawson/ [Accessed 8 December 2018].

Hunter, I. Q. (2015) 'Introduction: Kubrick and adaptation', *Adaptation*, [online], 8 (3), pp. 277-282. Available at: Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/article/8/3/277/2274581 [Accessed 8 December 2018].

Hunter, I. Q. Ed. (2015) *Special Issue: Kubrick and Adaptation*, [online], 8 (3), pp. 277-390. Available at: Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/issue/8/3 [Accessed 8 December 2018].

Jacobs, E. (2007) 'Exclusive: Jan Harlan creates *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures*', *Movie Web*. [online] 24 October. Available at: https://movieweb.com/exclusive-jan-harlan-creates-stanley-kubrick-a-life-in-pictures/ [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Jaunas, V. and Baillon, J. Eds. (2017) 'Stanley Kubrick, Nouveaux Horizons', *Miranda*, [online], (15). Available at: https://journals.openedition.org/miranda/11266#quotation [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Jenkins, G. (2007) *Stanley Kubrick and the art of adaptation: Three novels, three films*. London: McFarland.

Johnson, P. (1998) 'Classical music: She's making plans for Stanley', *Independent*, [online] 19 June. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/classical-music-shes-making-plans-for-stanley-1165975.html [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Johnson-Laird, P. (1988) 'Freedom and constraint in creativity', in R. Sternberg (ed.) *The nature of creativity: contemporary psychological perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 202-219.

Johnston, K. M. (2009) *Coming soon*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.

Johnston, K. M. (2013) 'Introduction: still coming soon? Studying promotional materials', *Frames Cinema Journal*, [online], 3. Available at: http://framescinemajournal.com/article/introduction-still-coming-soon-studying-promotional-materials/ [Accessed 6 January 2019].

Jones, C. and DeFillippi, R. (1996) 'Back to the future in film: Combining industry and self-knowledge to meet the career challenges of the 21st century', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, [online], 10 (4), pp. 89-103. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/4165356?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 6 January 2019].

Jones, J. (2016) 'Stanley Kubrick and me: designing the poster for *A Clockwork Orange*', *The Guardian*, [online] 7 July. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2016/jul/07/stanley-kubrick-and-me-designing-clockwork-orange-poster [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Jones, L. (2009) 'Make-up guru Barbara Daly: "There is no such thing as a perfect face"', *Daily Mail*, [online] 30 March. Available at: https://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/you/article-1164989/Make-guru-Barbara-Daly--8216-There-thing-perfect-face-8217.html [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Kael, P. (1963) 'Circles and squares', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 46-54.

Kael, P. (1972) '*A Clockwork Orange*: Stanley Strangelove', *The New Yorker*, [online] 1 January. Available at: http://archives.newyorker.com/?i=1972-01-01#folio=CV1 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Kagan, N. (2000) *The cinema of Stanley Kubrick*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Roundhouse.

Kaplan, M. (2012) 'How Stanley Kubrick kept his eye on the budget, down to the orange juice', *Huffington Post*, [online] 20 February. Available at: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-kaplan/how-stanley-kubrick-budget_b_1287552.html?guccounter=1 [Accessed 4 December 2018].

Kauffmann, S. (1987) '*Full Metal Jacket*: Blank cartridge - review by Stanley Kauffmann', *Scraps from the Loft*. [online] 2 March. Available at: https://scrapsfromtheloft.com/2018/03/02/full-metal-jacket-stanley-kauffmann/ [Accessed 5 January 2019].

Kemal, S., Gaskell, I. and Conway, D. (1998) *Nietzsche, philosophy and the arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kenny, G. (2009) '"Mein Führer! I can walk!": "Dr. Strangelove" editor Anthony Harvey on the lost ending on Notebook', *Mubi*. [online] 24 June. Available at: https://mubi.com/notebook/posts/mein-fuhrer-i-can-walk-dr-strangelove-editor-anthony-harvey-on-the-lost-ending [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Kent, D. (2016) *Kubrick's game*. USA: Evolved Publishing.

Kernan, L. (2004) *Coming attractions: Reading American movies trailers*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Klinger, B. (1989) 'Digressions at the cinema: Reception and mass culture', *Cinema Journal*, 28 (4), pp.3.

Kohn, E. (2012) 'Critical consensus: Stephen Farber discusses the MPAA, "Bully" and what the future holds', *Indie Wire*, [online] 29 March. Available at: https://www.indiewire.com/2012/03/critical-consensus-stephen-farber-discusses-the-mpaa-bully-and-what-the-future-holds-242200/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Kolker, R. P. (2000) *A cinema of loneliness: Penn, Stone, Kubrick, Scorsese, Spielberg, Altman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kolker, R. P. (2003) '*A Clockwork Orange* … ticking', in S. McDougal (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 19-36.

Kolker, R. P. (2006) *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey: New essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kolker, R. P. (2017a) *The extraordinary image: Orson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick, and the reimagining of cinema*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Kolker, R. P. (2017b) 'The legacy of Stanley Kubrick and the Kubrick archives', *Oxford University Press*. [blog post] 26 July. Available at: https://blog.oup.com/2017/07/stanley-kubrick-archives/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Kolker, R. P. and Abrams, N. (forthcoming) *Eyes Wide Shut: Stanley Kubrick and the making of his final film*. Oxford University Press.

Krämer, P. (2006) *The new Hollywood: From Bonnie and Clyde to Star Wars*. London: Wallflower.

Krämer, P. (2010) *2001: A Space Odyssey*. London; New York: British Film Institute: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krämer, P. (2011) *A Clockwork Orange*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krämer, P. (2015) 'Adaptation as exploration: Stanley Kubrick, literature, and A.I. Artificial Intelligence', *Adaptation*, [online], 8 (3), pp. 372-382. Available at: Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/article/8/3/372/2274524 [Accessed 22 January 2019].

Krämer, P. (2017) 'Stanley Kubrick: Known and unknown', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, [online], 37 (3), pp. 373-395. Available at: Taylor & Francis Online https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01439685.2017.1342330 [Accessed 22 January 2019].

Krämer, P. (2018) *Internationales Kubrick symposium*. [podcast] 21 July. Available at: https://deutsches-filminstitut.de/blog/kubricks-2001/ [Accessed 22 January 2019].

Krämer, P. and Tzioumakis, Y. (2018) *The Hollywood renaissance: Revisiting American cinema's most celebrated era*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Kuberski, P. (2012) *Kubrick's total cinema: Philosophical themes and formal Qualities*. London: Continuum.

Labrecque, J. (2014) 'Malcolm McDowell on Stanley Kubrick: An all-too-human artistic genius', *Entertainment*, [online] 29 November. Available at: https://ew.com/article/2014/11/29/malcolm-mcdowell-stanley-kubrick-clockwork-orange/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Lamberti, E. (2012) *Behind the scenes at the BBFC*. London: Palgrave Macmillan on behalf of the British Film Institute.

Lauten, E. (2001) 'A chat with Bill Butler, editor of "A Clockwork Orange"', *Editors Net*. [online] November. Available at: http://www.geocities.ws/malcolminterviews/butler.html [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1955) 'The structural study of myth', *The Journal of American Folklore, Myth: A Symposium*, 68 (270), pp. 428-444. Available at: https://yale.imodules.com/s/1667/images/gid6/editor_documents/flick_readings/flick_sup_readings/levi-strauss-the_structural_study_of_myth.pdf?sessionid=d4bf31fa-8ebd-48a0-91cd-0249756b759c&cc=1 [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Lewis, J. D. and Weigert, A. (1985) 'Trust as a social reality', *Social Forces*, [online], 63 (4), pp. 967-985. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/2578601?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Lightman, H. A. (1968) 'Filming *2001: A Space Odyssey*', *American Cinematographer*, 49 (6), pp. 412–14, 442–7. Available at: http://leonidkonovalov.ru/cinema/bibl/Odissey2001.pdf [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Lightman, H. A. (1980) 'Photographing Stanley Kubrick's *The Shining*', *American Cinematographer*, 61 (8), pp. 780-854. Available at: https://imgur.com/a/HWeZF [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Livingston, P. (1999) 'Cinematic authorship', in R. Allen and M. Smith (eds.) *Film theory and philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 132-148.

Ljujić, T., Krämer, P. and Daniels, R. (2015) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing.

LoBrutto, V. (1999) *Stanley Kubrick: A biography*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Logan, B. (2016) 'Working with Stanley Kubrick on *2001: A Space Odyssey*', *Zacuto.* [online]. Available at: https://www.zacuto.com/working-with-stanley-kubrick [Accessed 29 November 2018].

Luckhurst, R. (2013) *The Shining*. London: BFI: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lunn, O. (2014) 'Revisiting "Full Metal Jacket": An interview with Stanley Kubrick's editor', [Twitter] 6 December. Available at: http://http: //ow.ly/VxOOy [Accessed 17 November 2015].

MacIntyre, A. (2007) 'M&C interview: 'Full Metal Jacket' rafterman Kevyn Major Howard talks to M&C [Archive]', *Marine Corps - USMC Community*. [online] 5 October. Available at: http://www.leatherneck.com/forums/archive/index.php/t-54938.html [Accessed 23 November 2018].

Mackenzie, S. (2004) 'What if ...', *The Guardian*, [online] 24 April. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/film/2004/apr/24/1 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Magid, R. (1987) '*Full Metal Jacket*: Cynic's choice', *American Cinematographer*, [online], 68 (12), pp. 74-84. Available at: https://issuu.com/lafamiliafilm/docs/fmj [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Magid, R. (1999) 'Quest for perfection', *American Cinematographer*, [online] October, pp. 40–51. Available at: https://scrapsfromtheloft.com/2016/11/30/quest-for-perfection/ [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Maitland, S. (1999) 'Arts: My year with Stanley', *Independent*, [online] 12 March. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/arts-my-year-with-stanley-1079966.html [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Martinez, F. (2001) 'Conversazione con Gordon Stainforth', *Archivio Kubrick*. [online]. Available at: http://www.archiviokubrick.it/opere/film/shining/stainforth.html [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Mather, P. (2013) *Stanley Kubrick at Look magazine: Authorship and genre in photojournalism and film*. Bristol: Intellect.

McAvoy, C. (2015) 'Creating *The Shining*: Looking beyond the myths', in T. Ljujić, P. Krämer and R. Daniels (eds.) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing. pp. 280-307.

McAvoy, C. (2015) 'The uncanny, the gothic and the loner: Intertextuality in the adaptation process of The Shining*', *Adaptation*, [online], 8 (3), pp. 345-360. Available at: Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/adaptation/article/8/3/345/2274408 [Accessed 1 December 2018].

McDougal, S. (2003) *Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDowell, M. (2014) *Malcolm McDowell raw interview*. [video interview-online] Interviewed and published by David Weiner. 12 May. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fG2UTauKCjo&t=3s [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Melia, M. (2017) 'Altered states, altered spaces: Architecture, space and landscape in the film and television of Stanley Kubrick and Ken Russell', *Cinergie*, [online], (12), pp. 139-152. Available at: https://cinergie.unibo.it/article/view/7352 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Melia, M. (2017) 'The post-Kubrickian: Stanley Kubrick, Steven Spielberg, adaptation and *A.I. Artificial Intelligence*', *Screening the Past*, [online], (42). Available at: http://www.screeningthepast.com/2017/09/the-post-kubrickian-stanley-kubrick-steven-spielberg-adaptation-and-a-i-artificial-intelligence/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Mepsted, S. (2011) 'Full transcript – Interview with illustrator, Philip Castle, poster designer for Stanley Kubrick', *On Reflection*. [blog post] 24 August. Available at: https://stevemepstedblog.wordpress.com/2011/08/24/full-transcript-interview-with-illustrator-philip-castle/ [Accessed 20 November 2018].

Metz, C. (1991) *Film language: A semiotics of the cinema*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Millar, M. (1994) 'Helping exhibitors: Pressbooks at Warner Bros. in the late 1930s', *Film History*, 6 (2), pp. 188-196.

Milsome, D. (2011) *Interview with Douglas Milsome*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Milum, L. (2003) 'The hero's journey: A Campbellian look at the metaphorical path to personal transformation', *Mythic Hero*. [online]. Available at: http://www.mythichero.com/what_is_mythology.html [Accessed 17 November 2018].

Mitry, J. (2000) *The aesthetics and psychology of the cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Modine, M. (2005) *Full Metal Jacket diary*. New York: Rugged Land Books.

Molina Foix, V. (1980) 'An Interview with Stanley Kubrick', originally published in *El Pais – Artes*, 2.59, [online] 20th December 1980. Available at: http://www.archiviokubrick.it/english/words/interviews/1980mystery.html [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Morawski, S. and Baxandall, L. (1973) *Marx & Engels on literature & art: A selection of writings*. [online]. St. Louis/Milwaukee: Telos Press. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/b/b3/Baxandall_Morawski_eds_Marx_and_Engels_on_Literature_and_Art.pdf [Accessed 8 November 2018].

Morrow, J. (2013) '"It was nerve-destroying': Legendary set designer Ken Adam recalls working with Kubrick', *No Film School*. [online] 20 August. Available at: https://nofilmschool.com/2013/08/set-designer-sir-ken-adam-working-with-kubrick [Accessed 7 November 2018].

Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (2019). *MPAA*. [online]. Available at: https://www.mpaa.org/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Nabokov, V. (1955) *Lolita*. Paris: Olympia Press.

Naremore, J. (2007) *On Kubrick*. London: BFI Book.

Nelson, T. A. (2000) *Kubrick: Inside a film artist's maze*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nietzsche, F., Bittner, R. and Sturge, K. (2003) *Writings from the late notebooks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

North, A. (2012) 'Alex North's Lost Score for Kubrick's 2001', *ASCAP*. [online] 7 December. Available at: https://www.ascap.com/playback/2012/12/wecreatemusic/fmf-alex-norths-lost-score-for-kubricks-2001 [Accessed 9 December 2018].

Odino, S. (2017) '"Dear Arthur, what do you think?" The Kubrick-Clarke collaboration in their correspondence from the Smithsonian and London archives', *Miranda*, [online], (15), pp. 173-191. Available at: http://journals.openedition.org/miranda/11266 [Accessed 24 January 2019]

Olson, R. L. (1999) *Art direction for film and video*. Boston: Focal Press.

Parnell, L. (2016) 'The French New Wave: Revolutionising cinema', *Culture Trip*. [online] 15 November. Available at: https://theculturetrip.com/europe/france/articles/the-french-new-wave-revolutionising-cinema/ [Accessed 25 December 2018].

Pearce, D. (1999) 'Kubrick's "Clockwork Orange" will be re-released uncut after 27 years', *Independent*, [online] 7 December. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/media/kubricks-clockwork-orange-will-be-re-released-uncut-after-27-years-738993.html [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Peldszus, R. (2015) 'Speculative systems: Kubrick's interaction with the Aerospace industry during the production of *2001*', in T. Ljujić, P. Krämer and R. Daniels (eds.) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing. pp. 200-217.

Perkins, V. (1972) 'Direction and authorship', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 65-75.

Pezzotta, E. (2013) *Stanley Kubrick: Adapting the sublime*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Pezzotta, E. (n.d.) 'Making time in Stanley Kubrick's *Barry Lyndon*. Art, history, and empire (review)', *Journal of Irish Studies*, [online]. Available at: https://www.estudiosirlandeses.org/reviews/making-time-in-stanley-kubricks-barry-lyndon-art-history-and-empire/ [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Phillips, G. D. Ed. (2001) *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Pizzello, S. (1999) 'A sword in the bed', *American Cinematographer*, [online] October. Available at: https://theasc.com/magazine/oct99/sword/index.htm [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Ponech, T. (1999) 'Authorship and authorial autonomy: The personal factor in the cinematic work of art', *Canadian Aesthetics Journal*, [online], 4. Available at: https://www.uqtr.ca/AE/vol_4/trevor(frame).htm [Accessed 12 November 2018].

Posner, E., Spier, K. and Vermeule, A. (2009) 'Divide and conquer. Discussion paper no. 639', [discussion paper]. Harvard Law School Cambridge, MA. file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/SSRN-id1414319.pdf

Pramaggiore, M. (2015) *Making time in Stanley Kubrick's Barry Lyndon: Art, history, and empire*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Prévost-Balga, A. (2017) 'Three Kubrickian machinic characters and their technical malfunctions', *Cinergie*, [online], (12), pp. 9-19. Available at: https://doaj.org/article/80f0f1fc30ba41ddbdb6a401a8f9dcad? [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Pursell, M. (1988) '*Full Metal Jacket*: The unravelling of patriarchy', *Literature/Film Quarterly*, [online], 16 (4), pp. 218-225. Available at: https://search.proquest.com/openview/649521fe8b07bda6abee3e5a4984dce4/1?pq -origsite=gscholar&cbl=5938 [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Ragins, B. and Kram, K. (2007) 'The roots and meaning of mentoring', in B. Ragins and K. Kram (eds.) *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. pp. 3-15.

Raphael, F. (1999) *Eyes wide open: A memoir of Stanley Kubrick*. London: Orion.

Raphael, F. (2017) *Frederic Raphael - Stanley Kubrick's modus operandi (122/144)*. [video interview-online] Published by: Web of Stories - Life Stories of Remarkable People. Available at: YOUTUBE https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ATLiH2vCOJU. 2017 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Reeves, P. (1994) 'Obituary: Frank Wells', *Independent*, [online] 6 April. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituary-frank-wells-1368186.html [Accessed 6 January 2019].

Rehm, L. (2016) 'Video explains Kubrick's use of innovative camera tech when shooting *Barry Lyndon*', *Digital Photography Review*, [online] 25 July. Available at: https://www.dpreview.com/news/0784327645/video-essay-explains-stanley-kubrick-s-use-of-innovative-camera-tech-when-shooting-barry-lyndon [Accessed 12 January 2019].

Ritzenhoff, K. (2015) '"UK frost can kill palms": Layers of reality in Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*', in T. Ljujić, P. Krämer and R. Daniels (eds.) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing. pp. 326-341.

Ross, A. (2013) 'Space is the place', *The New Yorker*, [online] 23 September. Available at: https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/09/23/space-is-the-place [Accessed 9 December 2018].

Rossen, C. (1973) 'The movie rating game by Stephen Farber', *Film Comment*, [online], 9 (4), pp. 56-57. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/43450637 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Rowlands, L. (2009) *An addictive environment: New Zealand film production workers' subjective*. Masters. Massey University. Available at: https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1083/02whole.pdf [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Rutter, M. (2005) 'How the environment affects mental health', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, [online], 186 (01), pp. 4-6. Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-british-journal-of-psychiatry/article/how-the-environment-affects-mental-health/9CDA36F86AB77783F88F9B76D03FD69F [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Sarris, A. (1962) 'Notes on the auteur theory in 1962', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 35-45.

Schreiber, B. (2013) 'On Kubrick: An interview with Leon Vitali', *Tin House*. [online] 19 June. Available at: https://tinhouse.com/on-kubrick-a-conversation-with-leon-vitali/ [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Schwam, S. (2000) *The making of 2001, A Space Odyssey*. New York: Modern Library.

Searle, J. R. (1990) 'Collective intentions and actions', in P. Cohen, J. Morgan and M. Pollack (eds.) *Intentions in Communication*. Cambridge, Mass.: Bradford Books, MIT Press. pp. 401-415. Available at: PhilPapers https://philpapers.org/rec/SEACIA-3 [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Sellors, C. P. (2007) 'Collective authorship in film', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, [online], 65 (3), pp. 263-271. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/4622239 [Accessed 1 December 2018].

Sellors, C. P. (2010) *Film authorship*. London: Wallflower.

Sigel, Z. (2016) 'The good man Stanley - Los Angeles review of books', *Los Angeles Review of Books*, [online] 2 November. Available at: https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-good-man-stanley/#! [Accessed 17 November 2018].

Silverstein, J. (2011) 'People with passion: Matthew Modine', *Read Jack*. [online] 26 April. Available at: https://readjack.wordpress.com/2011/04/26/a-people-with-passion-correspondence-with-matthew-modine/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Siskel, G. (1987) 'Candidly Kubrick', *Chicago Tribune*, [online]. Available at: https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-xpm-1987-06-21-8702160471-story.html [Accessed 11 March 2017].

Smith, L. (2012) *Interview with Larry Smith*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Sokol, T. (2015) '*Full Metal Jacket* and its troubled production', *Den of Geek*. [online] 17 June. Available at: https://www.denofgeek.com/us/movies/full-metal-

jacket/246528/full-metal-jacket-and-its-troubled-production [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Sonenreich, B. (2013) *The art of adaptation through the analysis of Stanley Kubrick films*. Undergraduate. The Florida State University: College of Arts & Sciences. Available at: https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu%3A204669 [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Sperb, J. (2013) 'Love and death in Kubrick: A critical study of the films from *Lolita* through *Eyes Wide Shut* by Patrick Webster (review)', *Film & History: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, [online], 43 (1), pp. 42-44. Available at: PROJECT MUSE https://muse.jhu.edu/article/506162/pdf [Accessed 24 December 2018].

Staiger, J. (1990) 'Announcing wares, winning patrons, voicing ideals: Thinking about the history and theory of film advertising', *Cinema Journal*, [online], 29 (3), pp. 3-31. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/1225178?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 24 December 2018].

Staiger, J. (2003) 'Authorship approaches', in D. Gerstner and J. Staiger (eds.) *Authorship and film*. New York: Routledge. pp. 27-60.

Staiger, J. (2003) 'The cultural productions of *A Clockwork Orange*', in S. McDougal (ed.) *Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 37-60.

Stainforth, G. (2015) '*The Shining* music – Introductory note', *Gordon Stainforth*. [online] 22 September. Available at: http://www.gordonstainforth.co.uk/shining-music-intro [Accessed 9 December 2018].

Stam, R. (2000) 'Beyond fidelity: The dialogics of adaptation', in J. Naremore (ed.) *Film adaptation*. New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press. pp. 54-76.

Sternberg, R. (1988) *The nature of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stillinger, J. (1991) *Multiple authorship and the myth of solitary genius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stollery, M. (2009) 'Technicians of the unknown cinema: British critical discourse and the analysis of collaboration in film production', *Film History: An International Journal*, [online], 21 (4), pp. 373-393. Available at: PROJECT MUSE https://muse.jhu.edu/article/364737/summary [Accessed 13 December 2018].

Strick, P. and Houston, P. (1972) 'Modern times: An interview with Stanley Kubrick', reprinted in A. Castle (ed.) *The Stanley Kubrick Archives* (2005). Köln: Taschen Gmbh. pp. 526-549.

Strickland, C. (1994) '"Hold on to that shot," Kubrick said', *The New York Time*, [online] 13 March. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/1994/03/13/nyregion/hold-on-to-that-shot-kubrick-said.html [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Stuckey, K. (2019) 'Re-writing Nabokov's *Lolita*: Kubrick, the creative adaptor', in T. Ljujić, P. Krämer and R. Daniels (eds.) *Stanley Kubrick: New perspectives*. London: Black Dog Publishing. pp. 115-135.

Taylor, C. (1988) 'Various approaches to and definitions of creativity', in R. Sternberg (ed.) *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 99-121.

Tennent, S. (2013) 'Full Metal Jacket diary: A Q&A with Matthew Modine', *Unframed*, [online] 4 March. Available at: https://unframed.lacma.org/2013/03/04/full-metal-jacket-diary-a-qa-with-matthew-modine [Accessed 7 November 2018].

The British Society of Cinematographers (2016) '*Barry Lyndon' Q and A with Doug Milsome BSC ASC*. [online]. Available at: https://vimeo.com/163371026 [Accessed 17 November 2018].

The Kubrick Site (2013-2014) Available at: http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Traynor, C. (2018) 'The story of Stanley Kubrick's go-to problem-solver: An unsung hero', *Huck,* [online] 25 July. Available at: https://www.huckmag.com/art-and-culture/film-2/filmworker-leon-vitali-interview-stanley-kubrick/ [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Trew, G. (2013) 'A title earned', *Trew Audio*. [online] 15 March. Available at: https://www.trewaudio.com/sound-mixer-profiles/a-title-earned/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

Truffaut, F. (1954) 'A certain tendency in French cinema', reprinted in B. K. Grant (ed.) *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader* (2008). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 9-18.

TV Store Online (2014) 'Rachel Elkind, producer/co-composer of the scores for the Stanley Kubrick films A *Clockwork Orange* (1971) and *The Shining* (1980) talks with TV Store Online about Kubrick and the haunting images of *The Shining…*', *Cinephilia and Beyond*. [online]. Available at: http://cinephiliabeyond.tumblr.com/post/96638220455/rachel-elkind-producerco-composer-of-the-scores [Accessed 9 November 2018].

Ulivieri, F. (2001-2016). *Archivio Kubrick: The ultimate database on Stanley Kubrick*. [online]. Available at: http://www.archiviokubrick.it/english/index.html [Accessed 24 January 2019].

Ulivieri, F. (2016) *Stanley Kubrick and me: Thirty years at his side*. New York: Arcade Publishing.

Ulivieri, F. (2017) 'From "boy genius" to "barking loon": An analysis of Stanley Kubrick's mythology', *Miranda*, [online], (15), pp. 221-242.

Ulivieri, F. (2018) 'Dangerous arts: Anthony Burgess's conflictual relationship with A Clockwork Orange and Stanley Kubrick's cinematic adaptation', unpublished paper presented at *A Clockwork Symposium: A Clockwork Orange - New perspectives*, London, 1-2 November.

Vitali, L. (2012) *Interview with Leon Vitali*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Vogler, C. (2007) *The writer's journey: Mythic structure for writers*. Studio City, CA: Michael Wiese Productions.

Vreeland, W. (2014) 'Episode 30: Anthony Harvey', *Interview with the Artist*. [online] 12 December. Available at: https://www.interviewwiththeartist.com/all-episodes/episode-30-anthony-harvey [Accessed 4 December 2018].

Walker, A. (1972) *Stanley Kubrick directs*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Walker, A., Taylor, S. and Ruchti, U. (1999) *Stanley Kubrick, director: A visual analysis*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Watson, I. (2012) *Interview with Ian Watson*. [radio interview-online] Interviewed by Jamey DuVall. The Kubrick Series. Available at: http://www.thekubrickseries.com/ [Accessed 10 November 2018].

Webster, P. (2011) *Love and death in Kubrick: A critical study of the films from Lolita through Eyes Wide Shut*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Weintraub, B. (1972) 'Kubrick tells what makes *A Clockwork Orange* tick', *The New York Times*, [online], 3 January. Available at: http://www.archiviokubrick.it/english/words/interviews/1972clockworktick.html [Accessed 3 December 2018].

Weishaupt, I. (2014) *Kubrick's code*. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform.

White, R. (2012) '8 of Stanley Kubrick's greatest technological innovations', *Popular Science*, [online] 9 November. Available at: https://www.popsci.com/technology/article/2012-11/8-stanley-kubricks-greatest-technological-innovations [Accessed 18 November 2018].

White, S. (1988) 'Male bonding, Hollywood orientalism, and the repression of the feminine in Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*', *Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory*, [online], 44 (3), pp. 120-144. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/article/444865/summary [Accessed 18 November 2018].

Whitington, P. (2015) 'Kubrick in Ireland: the making of *Barry Lyndon*', *Independent*, [online] 22 March. Available at: https://www.independent.ie/entertainment/movies/kubrick-in-ireland-the-making-of-barry-lyndon-31073211.html [Accessed 9 November 2018].

Willoquet-Maricondi, P. (1994) 'Full-Metal-Jacketing, or masculinity in the making', *Cinema Journal*, [online], 33 (2), pp. 5-21. Available at: JSTOR https://www.jstor.org/stable/1225514?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 9 November 2018].

Wise, D. (2017) 'How we made Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*', *The Guardian*, [online] 1 August. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2017/aug/01/how-we-made-full-metal-jacket-stanley-kubrick-matthew-modine [Accessed 22 November 2018].

Wollen, P. (1972) *Signs and meaning in the cinema*. 3rd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wright, E. (2013)' Glamorous bait for an amorous killer! How post-war audiences were lured by Lucille and the working-girl investigator', *Frames Cinema Journal*, (3), pp. 1-20. Available at: http://framescinemajournal.com/article/glamorous-bait-for-an-amorous-killer/ [Accessed 22 November 2018].

Wright Wexman, V. (2003) *Film and authorship*. New Brunswick (N.J.): Rutgers University Press.

Xypolia, I. (2016) 'Divide et impera: Vertical and horizontal dimensions of British imperialism', *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, [online], 44 (3), pp. 221-231. Available at: http://aura.abdn.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/2164/9956/Xypolia_Divide_et_Impera_V

ertical_and_Horizontal_imperialism.pdf;jsessionid=EFE3555E8964088BE039E9
AA39C9EB8C?sequence=1 [Accessed 22 November 2018].

Archival sources

Airport camp (UK) (1984). Images of Barracks. London, Stanley Kubrick
Archive. SK/16/2/2/33/14.

Army video (1984). Kubrick's handwritten notes on army video tapes. London,
Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/12.

Art department (1985). *Full Metal Jacket* photographs, manipulated for set
dressing and related paperwork. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3.

Art department (1985). *Full Metal Jacket* team notes and memos with the
instructions to the construction sector. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive.
SK/16/2/3/6.

Art department diary (1985). *Full Metal Jacket* art department diary notes.
London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/7.

Article - Apocalypse Now (1979). Copy of the review of the film in *Life* magazine.
London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/1/2/2.

Behind the scenes slides (1985-1986). Slides of cast, crew and set shots of
buildings at Beckton Gas works. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/9/2/1.

Castle, P. (1970) *Philip Castle artwork development* for *A Clockwork Orange*.
Photographs of two variations on design. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive.
SK/13/4/14/2/8.

Clockwork Orange stamps (1971). Stamps. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive.
SK/13/5/38.

Columbia and VL [Victor Lyndon] Dr Strangelove production (1963-1965). Letter form V. Lyndon on specifics of Wally Veevers' work. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/11/3/7.

Contracts (1979). Papers related to contracts for actors and crew in *The Shining*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/15/2/4/2.

Daily charts (1985). Charts, detailing tasks for the construction crew of *Full Metal Jacket*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/11.

Diary 1973 (1973). Entries of costume acquisition, research for *Barry Lyndon*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/14/2/5/5.

Diary - construction (1985). *Full Metal Jacket* construction crew work breakdowns and a crew list. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/9.

Grading (1980). Grading notes for *The Shining* original negative. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/15/4/3.

Hansard, Bill (1984). Letters between Bill Hansard and S. Kubrick on orders/consideration of projectors, lenses and costings. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/8/3/22.

Insignia and wardrobe (1984). File with lists of recommendations, notes on wardrobe, measurements for *Full Metal Jacket*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/8/3/23.

Iron-on patches (1971). Promotional material for *A Clockwork Orange*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/5.

Jobs done (1985). A letter from George Crawford, confirming jobs done, 10 August. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/12.

Kubrick, S. (1972) *Stanley Kubrick letter*. Response to *The New York Times* (Fred Hechinger's article on *A Clockwork Orange*). London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/8/3/62.

Kubrick, S. (1974) *Production.* Stanley Kubrick's letter to Frank Wells regarding cuts to *A Clockwork Orange* for Hong Kong, 6 June. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/8/5/9.

Kubrick, S. (1983) *Vietnam still/movie sources SK copy*. USA Marine, army and government sources – images and videos. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/1/2/13.

Kubrick, S. (1976) *1976 Release*. Letter from Kubrick to Bob (no surname), confirming that cuts were made for the film to obtain an R rating in America, 27 August. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/5/33.

Leon Vitali's file (1998). Various documentation on post-production and distribution. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/17/5/13.

Lieberfarb, W. (1974) *Portugal*. Letter from W. Lieberfarb to Albert Salem, regarding distribution of *A Clockwork Orange* in Portugal. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/11.

Ma, D. et al. (1972) *Telex communications*. Fax to S. Kubrick regarding the censorship clearance protests in New Zealand. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/5/3.

Media proposals (1971). Advertising plan. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/5/36.

Merchandising (1972). A letter from Mike Kaplan to Barry Schneider, regarding sweaters for *A Clockwork Orange* promotion campaign, 16 Feb. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/7.

Newspaper restrictions - advertising - USA (n.d.). Lists of newspapers/magazines and their policy regarding advertising. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/8/4/16.

Orders to construction (1985). Request forms to George Crawford, the construction manager. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/13.

Overtime claims (1976-1977). Sheets for overtime claims by staff of *Barry Lyndon*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/14/4/15.

Postcards (1971). English and French postcards featuring artwork from *A Clockwork Orange*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/4.

Powell, I. (1967) *Correspondence*. A note to Roger Caras. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/12/8/3/50.

Pre-production meetings (1985-1986). Drafts and minutes of pre-production meetings. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/8.

Press binders (1970-1979). Photocopied press cuttings for *A Clockwork Orange*, media response to the film. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/30.

*Press Book (*1971). Warner Bros.' official press book for *A Clockwork Orange*. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/5/2/7.

Press book and final approved advertising booklet development (1971). Mock up of the final press book. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/4/14/2/9.

Lyndon, V. (1963) *Production notes and research*. Letter of recommendation for Ray Lovejoy's promotion. By Victor Lyndon, 26 April. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/11/3/5.

Frewin, A. (1983) *Production plans*. Anthony Frewin's prop list, including wardrobe. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/8/3/32.

Programmes (1983). Videos of Vietnam. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/1/2/14.

Prop lists - Rod (1985). A list of props for Parris Island barracks with Stratfold's comments on quantity and type of items needed. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/17.

Prop lists - Tony (1985). Anthony Frewin's prop list. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/16/2/3/16.

Prop orders and miscellaneous orders (1963-1965). Documentation on exchanged/returned purchases/rentals and letters of communication. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/11/2/8.

SFX call sheets (1965-1967). A list of scenes and models to be filmed. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/12/3/2/1.

Sound (1978). A letter to Kubrick regarding Sharrock's requirements for a new sound filming device, by Brian W. Cook, 27 February. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/15/9/24.

Souvenir programmes (1971). Foyer souvenir brochures; in English and German. London, Stanley Kubrick Archive. SK/13/6/27.

Filmography

2001: The Making of a Myth (2001) Directed by P. Joyce. [film]. UK: Atlantic Celtic Films, Lucida Productions.

A Clockwork Orange (1971) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. UK: Warner Bros.

A.I. Artificial Intelligence (2001) Directed by S. Spielberg. [film]. USA: Warner Bros.

An Examination of Kubrick's 'A Clockwork Orange' (1972) Directed by John Musilli. [short film – television broadcast]. CBS, 1972. 29 mins. Available at: https://vimeo.com/83681624 [Accessed 23 January 2019].

Apocalypse Now (1979) Directed by F. F. Coppola. [film]. USA: Zoetrope Studios.

Barry Lyndon (1975) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. UK: Warner Bros.

Bonnie and Clyde (1967) Directed by A. Penn. [film]. USA: Warner Bros.

Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb (1964) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. USA: Columbia Pictures Corporation.

Eyes Wide Shut (1999) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. UK: Warner Bros.

Filmworker (2017) Directed by T. Zierra. [film]. USA: True Studio Media.

Full Metal Jacket (1987) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. UK: Warner Bros.

Full Metal Jacket: Between Good and Evil (2007) Directed by G. Leva. [film]. USA: Leva FilmWorks.

Inside: 'Dr. Strangelove or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb' (2000) Directed by D. Naylor. [film]. USA: David Naylor.

Jurassic Park (1993) Directed by S.Spielberg. [film]. USA: Universal Pictures.

Kubrick's Odyssey: Secrets Hidden in the Films (2011) Directed by J. Weidner. [film]. USA: Cubed Brick Productions.

Lolita (1962) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. USA: A.A. Productions Ltd.

Making The Shining (1980) Directed by V. Kubrick. [video]. UK: Eagle Film SS.

Midnight Cowboy (1969) Directed by J. Schlesinger. [film]. USA: MGM.

Platoon (1986) Directed by O. Stone. [film]. USA: Hemdale.

Room 237 (2012) Directed by R. Ascher. [film]. USA: Highland Park Classics.

S is for Stanley (2015) Directed by A. Infascelli. [film]. Italy: Kinethica Lock & Valentine.

Saving Private Ryan (1998) Directed by S. Spielberg. [film]. USA: Dreamworks.

Spartacus (1960) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. USA: Bryna Productions.

Staircases to Nowhere: Making Stanley Kubrick's 'The Shining' (2013) Directed by H. Berry. [film]. UK: The Elstree Project.

Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures (2001) Directed by J. Harlan. [film]. USA: Warner Bros.

Stanley and Us (1999) Directed by M. Di Flaviano and F. Greco [video]. Italy: Flying Padre Productions.

Stanley Kubrick's Boxes (2008) Directed by J. Ronson. [film]. UK: World of Wonder.

The Dirty Dozen (1967) Directed by R. Aldrich. [film]. USA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

The Shining (1980) Directed by S. Kubrick. [film]. UK: Warner Bros.

The Visions of Stanley Kubrick (2007) Directed by G. Leva. [film]. USA: Leva FilmWorks.