Dear Reader…

Two years ago, I promised to make a zine. I set up a Kickstarter to fund the project. The plan was for me to handmake four issues, eight pages each, and send them to 100 backers around the world. You wonderful champions backed me, and then I dropped the ball on delivering even a single issue of the zine. So here we are in 2019, and I'm finally trying to make good on my promise.

There are plenty of excuses for my failure, but the primary reason is that I vastly overestimated how much free time I would have while we made our next three movies: *Blindspotting*, *Corporate Animals*, and *Little Monsters*. Now that those movies are finished, I finally have a window of time for this fun personal project.

Having a couple years to think this over, I've re-conceived the project. As you can see, I dropped the idea of four short handmade issues, and have combined everything into a single 32-page Snoot Zine. The general structure of the zine is arranged around the creative process of filmmaking, as seen through the eyes of an independent producer. I'm not going to delve much into the financing/business side of filmmaking, but I think it might be interesting to share some of my experiences and thoughts on how I think a movie should be made.

But first, I want to make it clear that there are many different ways to make a movie. The approach I will write about works well for me, and I think works well for the types of movies I make. I like to think it also works well for the other artists I'm lucky enough to collaborate with. Please steal anything you can from here, but feel free reject anything that won't help you on your own path.

- Keith Calder

“Film writing and directing cannot be taught, only learned, and each man or woman has to learn it through his or her own system of self-education.”

- Alexander Mackendrick

“There are no rules in filmmaking. Only sins. And the cardinal sin is dullness.”

- Frank Capra

“I learn the most from making my own mistakes.“

- David Fincher

The Structure...

In film, structure is everything. The masts upon which the sails are unfurled. The poles that hold up the tent. The bones that supports the flesh. For this zine, I'm going to follow the structure of how movies are made. These steps don't always happen in this order, but it's a good general guide to the phases of filmmaking.

1. **Chasing the Rights -or- Choosing the Right Concept**
2. **Finding and Forming the Key Creative Team**
3. **Development Heaven**
4. **Casting**
5. **Pre-production**
6. **Production**
7. **Editing**
8. **Finishing**
9. **Delivery**
10. **Release**
11. **Malaise**

Every producer is different. They enter the life-cycle of a movie at different stages. They bring their expertise and focus to different stages. There are plenty of successful producers who only spend meaningful time in stages one and two, and then basically disengage for the rest of the filmmaking process. For most Snoot movies, we're there from step one to step eleven. But these stages can match up to calenders in very different ways. On *Blindspotting*, it took ten years to go from concept to casting but just over a year from pre-production to release. On *You're Next*, we went from concept to delivery in less than a year. And then the release took two years! I think most independent films go from pre-production to finishing in just under a year, but the first four stages could take anywhere from a few months to several years.

A producer also needs to decide how many movies they can do at the same time. For me, the limit is two movies in the Casting to Finishing phases at the same time. More than that, and I spread myself too thin.

From: **Jessica Wu**
To: **Rafael Casal**
Date: **June 24, 2007**
Subject: **Future Collaboration**

Rafael,

You probably hear this all the time, but I checked out your work on Youtube/Def Poetry, and I was really blown away by the honesty and passion that came from your every performance. Researching more, I found Youthspeaks, and I just wanted to say that I really respect and value what you guys are trying to do.

I work for a small independent production company called Snoot Entertainment, and I would really love the chance to develop something with you. Your work felt very raw, relevant, and real. I am sure that your voice would translate well to film.

We've only been around for 3 years, and all we know is that we want to make films that we really care about and that have something to say that is different from the hundreds of films already out there. If you're into that, awesome! And I'd love to hear from you. If not (or if you're already working with another production company), that's cool too, I just wanted to let you and Youthspeaks know that your message really had an impact on me.

Jessica Wu
Snoot Entertainment

Chasing the Rights -or- Choosing the Right Concept

It's taken me a while to realize this, but I find it to be true. 90% of the quality of a movie comes from the accumulation of micro-decisions that are made throughout the filmmaking process, but 90% of what makes a movie commercially appealing and financially successful are a handful of core decisions. Who are the stars? Who should write? Who should direct? Who are the key department heads? What is the right budget? Does it have "must see" moments? Can the concept and the appeal of the concept be clearly marketed?

Quality comes from craftsmanship, but success comes from getting a few of these big things right. There are plenty of producers and studio execs who seem to *only* care about those major decisions, and they delegate everything else. You hear stories of greenlight committees who don't read the screenplays for the movies they're evaluating. It's not an approach that I find enticing, but I can understand why it's successful. For most mainstream movies, you are a success or a failure from the first day of release. And the first day grosses are based entirely on external elements related to the movie (the cast, the filmmakers, the poster, the trailer, the TV spots, the publicity chatter). The quality of the movie itself is somewhat irrelevant for this initial success, and because of saturation marketing and 3000+ screen releases, "initial success" ***is*** overall financial success.

I'm not saying this to make you depressed, but to make it abundantly clear that these fundamental decisions are important. If you take a bad concept and great execution, you can make a good movie, but it will have a hard time finding an audience. For marketability, "execution" only matters as far as it shows up in the trailer.

So how do you choose what to make? As a creative producer, I want to make the film that deals with the themes I want to explore, in a genre that I'm excited about playing with, and that will stretch what I'm capable of doing as a producer. As a businessperson, I want to make the film that has the potential to be a hit, but can be made at a budget that can be recouped even if the film isn't a hit.

“It should be remembered that it is the absence of a powerful and reverberating theme that distinguishes forgettable commercial entertainment from something more interesting. A story with a theme that is trivial, unexplored or not clearly identified in the action may be enjoyable while it lasts. But it is not going to linger in your memory very long. Such a narrative is not about anything that deeply concerns the author, and if the author doesn’t care it is unlikely that the audience will either.”

- Alexander Mackendrick

“If you think that you can hide what your interests are, what your prurient interests are, what your noble interests are, what your fascinations are, if you think you can hide that in your work as a film director, you’re nuts.”

- David Fincher

Most of what I've written so far is about what makes a concept appealing in terms of commercial success. But what makes a concept interesting creatively?

When I stumble upon a new film concept, or when developing a concept, I try to ask myself the following yes/no questions. If the answer is "yes" to most or all of them, then I think the concept is in good shape and worth exploring. If the answer is "no," then I either try to build on the concept to make it a "yes" or I tend to toss aside the concept.

1. Does the concept delight me?
2. Does the concept lead to an exploration of themes I find compelling?
3. Does the concept imply one or more lead characters that I would be interested in spending time with? Do I want to get to know them?
4. Does the concept put pressure on the lead character to take action in ways that would be interesting to watch?
5. Does the concept imply at least one relationship for the lead character to have with another major character, and for those characters to have tension regarding the themes we would explore?
6. Can the concept, the main characters, and the core character relationships be explored through cinema? Meaning, can you use action and dialog to tell the story?
7. Does the concept lead to a satisfying ending?
8. Does the concept provide good opportunities for all craft departments to contribute to the storytelling, the themes, and the characters?
9. Would a compelling exploration of this concept and these characters fit in a movie-sized length of time?
10. Am I more excited about this concept than most of the other ones I'm exploring?

In general, I don't make a movie unless almost all of these questions result in a "yes" answer. But I'm perfectly happy to keep developing a concept and a screenplay if some of the answers are "yes." The hope is that continuing to develop the concept will lead to more of these answers becoming a "yes" and ultimately setting the foundation for a great movie.

In my career, I've been lucky to mostly make original movies. But I acknowledge that this is a luxury that doesn't seem to be the industry norm, and I suspect it won't be the norm for future Snoot productions. The film industry is addicted to "IP" (Intellectual Property). Movies have stopped being the place where new storyworlds and characters are invented, and have become the place where existing storyworlds and characters are given their most expensive media platform.

I get how we got here. There is a growing glut of ways that people can spend their free time. New movies are not only competing against sequels, remakes, reboots, and cinematic universes. They're also competing with video-games, social media, novels, comic books, reality television, YouTube stars, live sports, Twitch streamers, dozens of new Netflix/Hulu/Amazon series, and instant access to vast libraries of almost every creative work in the history of mankind including many older movies that are definitely better than whatever you decide to make.

Amongst these various media options, new movies are often the most expensive to make. Because they're often the most expensive to make, movie studios have extremely high revenue targets. Because they have extremely high revenue targets, they will spend huge advertising budgets to create an awareness and anticipation in audiences that will drive that revenue.

That's a big risk to take on a movie concept that has nothing going for it other than a couple smart creative people saying they've done the homework to make it interesting and compelling. There are a handful of creative people who can win that argument. People like Chris Nolan or Jordan Peele. Or movie star attachments that can overpower the built in lack-of-awareness for the concept. But most of the time, the studio will favor the concept that's already proved itself in other media. The theory is that if a storyworld and/or a character is already beloved in one media, then that commercial success is likely to translate over to a movie. I'm not going to argue whether this thinking totally makes sense, because that's somewhat irrelevant…

If the gatekeepers all think it's true, then those are the rules of the game.

This means that Jess and I spend a lot of time trying to find potentially interesting movie concepts that are already popular in other forms of media. And once we find those opportunities, we spend a lot of time trying to get the rights to make movies based on this IP. That can sometimes be years, and require building strong relationships with the original authors and the original rights holders.

We're putting together a new film called *One Night In Miami* that we are hoping to shoot later this year. It's based on a play that we first saw six years ago at a 99-seat theater in Los Angeles. We immediately knew it had the potential to be an incredible movie, and started developing a relationship with the playwright, Kemp Powers. He let us know that because the play is full of Sam Cooke music, the commercial rights to the play and the film rights ended up being controlled by ABKCO, the company that owns Sam Cooke's music.

Jess and I spent the next few years continuing to build a relationship with Kemp and with ABKCO. This meant phone calls, emails, meetings, and travel. They were hesitant about working with us on a film adaptation. The play continued to tour, and ended up being produced at the Donmar Warehouse in London, one of the most prestiguous theatres in the world. It was nominated for an Olivier Award, and our initial instincts about the play were being proven right by the market.

Five years after we saw the original production, we finally were able to convince ABKCO and Kemp to partner with us on developing it as a movie. By the time a final decision was made, we were competing with several other bigger companies and producers for the rights. There were three factors that I think gave us the edge: we were the first to pursue the project, we built a strong relationship with the creator and the rights holder, and the rights holders loved our most recent film *Blindspotting*.

If you're not a brand-name filmmaker or affiliated with a giant movie studio, this is generally what it takes to successfully get the rights to make movies based on interesting intellectual property: passion, persistence, and taste.

Finding and Forming the Key Creative Team

If I have one central theory of filmmaking it's that most bad movies exist for one of four reasons:

1. The concept was inherently flawed.
2. The people in the key creative positions were not capable of making a good movie.
3. The key creative people were put in a situation that made it impossible to make a good movie.
4. The key creative people envisioned drastically different movies from each other.

We've already talked about the first of these points, and I'll touch on the other three in this section. But first, what do I mean when I say the "key creative people"? In general, I mean the writer, the director, the creative producers, the movie stars, and the department heads who directly impact the creative content of the movie (including but not limited to the cinematographer, production designer, costume designer, make up and hair department heads, editor, and composer). In some situations, this would also include the executives at the studio or financing entity.

When you are forming the key creative team, you need to make sure you're hiring people who are capable of executing the movie, can achieve their aspect of the production with the resources that are going to be available, and have a vision of the film that is significantly overlapping with the other key creative team. The eventual movie will hopefully exist inside the overlapping circles of "vision" for the various members of the key creative team. When there is no overlap, the film is going to be a constant creative struggle, with creative "winners" and "losers" on the core team. That's a situation I always try to avoid. In a best case scenario, it will be an unpleasant experience. In a worst case scenario, it results in a disastrous movie that is *also* an unpleasant experience.

While it's less essential than creative overlap, it's also helpful for the core creative team to overlap on the preferred process of making a movie. I find that most people flourish creatively when there is a calm and purposeful process around them. But some artists only flourish inside chaos. I suspect there are producers who know how to work that way, but I don't. I try to avoid working with these types of artists.

The calm/chaos dichotomy is the most extreme version of process conflict, but there are other ways that this problem can manifest. What happens if you have a director who requires rehearsals and an actor who works best without rehearsals? What about a cinematographer who needs a lot of time for lighting and an actor who requires longer than usual turnaround each night? What about a director who visualizes coverage best after seeing actor blocking, but you're making a movie that requires extensive planning for VFX and stunt work? What about a writer/director who wants lines delivered verbatim and an actor who does their best work when improvising around the written dialog?

It's part of the producer's job to help resolve these process conflicts. It's impossible to avoid all of them, but the more you can determine the potential conflicts before you start production, the more you can come up with compromises that will do the least damage to the movie and to the experience of making the movie. This is one of the reasons why I think it's important for producers to be involved in the process of hiring all key creatives. You can use the interview process to figure out what people will bring to the project creatively, and you can start to get a sense of their preferred process. One of my first questions is: "How do you like to work?"

It's also why it's incredibly important to **do your homework**. Speak with people who have previously worked with the candidates. Ask other producers, but also reach out to people who worked under them and at the same level as them. Every experience is different, but you'll start to see patterns. This will help you not only hire the right people, but also figure out how to get the best work out of them. Sometimes you are stuck choosing a great creative fit who you know will create a process problem. Such is life! At least you'll know what you're stepping into.

“Everybody always talks about *my vision* in this film. The truth is, everybody has a vision of it, everybody who’s working on it. A great movie evolves when everybody has the same vision in their heads.”

- Alan Parker

“It’ll be all of our efforts together. It won’t won’t ever be exactly the way I imagined it. And that is, I think, an important lesson as well. In any group enterprise, it’s going to be the sum total of the group.”

- James Cameron

“With a good script, a good director can produce a masterpiece; with the same script, a mediocre director can make a pass-able film. But with a bad script, even a good director can’t possibly make a good film.”

- Akira Kurosawa

Development Heaven

Obviously this section heading is a play on the concept of "development hell." But I do think there are ways to manage the process of development that doesn't turn it into a confrontational and emotionally draining experience. One of the key things I hope you take from this zine is that I believe it's the producers obligation to have a clear sense of how they like to work, but also to be able to shift that process to fit the requirements of the key creative people that they'll be working with. That starts in the development phase.

There are a lot of ways for a writer to get from the blank page to a shooting script. I mean this both in terms of the logistical process (brainstorming, outlining, writing, notes, rewriting, notes, and more rewriting) and the emotional process (the loneliness of the blank page and balancing the emotional reality of the screenplay feeling like a portion of oneself and the requirement of accepting suggestions and requirements from external sources). Every writer has a slightly different process for how they get to the finish line. I find that experienced writers tend to have a pretty good understanding of their logistical and emotional process, and newer writers are still on the path to figuring these things out.

As a producer, I think it's important to form a view as to what approach will work best for the writer. Where in the process are your notes going to be the most helpful? Where in the process are your notes going to be received in a way that will be productive? Some writers respond best to notes given during the brainstorming phase, and some respond best when there's a finished draft. How should your notes be presented? Some writers prefer discussing the script with the key creative team, and coming to a notes consensus together. Some writers want a clear document outlining the suggested problems and changes. What should the tone and tenor of your notes be? Some writers have enough detachment from their work to be able to have very direct conversations about the script. Some writers are so emotionally attached that any note must be delivered delicately and surrounded by praise.

At this point of my career, I have a good sense of my own preferred process. I prefer to come up with the actionable notes during a conversation amongst the key creative team. This can sometimes be a long meeting. It's generally at least two hours, but could be most of a day. I try to come into the meeting with a clear sense of what I think the script/outline/story is, and a general sense of what I hope the movie will be. I'll usually have a list of questions or thoughts on how I think this divide can be breached.

But first, there are three things to establish…

1. How do the other people feel about the current work-document?
2. How do they each picture the eventual movie?
3. How do they view the size of the gap between these two things?

If there's a huge divide on the first point, then notes can still be helpful, but you probably need to adjust your approach. The tricky thing is when you think the current work document is subpar, and other people think it's excellent (or the reverse). This is where you get into matters of taste, and it's hard to build shared creative trust when it becomes clear that you have wildly disparate taste and/or creative standards. You need to figure out ways to help the others see the current work document the way you see it, or figure out how to see it the way they do. That can be a challenging process. On the other hand, if everyone agrees that it still needs a lot of work, and agree on the areas that aren't working yet, then you can easily dive into a nuts and bolts development conversation.

If there's a huge divide on the second point, then you're in real trouble. Notes won't help you get to the promised land, because you're all picturing different promised lands! This is where you need to have a conversation about the nature of the project. Can you find creative overlap? If so, then focus on that overlap. See if there's a movie there that's exciting for everyone. If not, then it's probably time to either change the key creative team or move on from the project. This might be harsh, but I honestly think it's a waste of everyone's time once it becomes clear that there isn't a potential shared vision for the movie.

The third question is less essential, but it raises a practical point regarding the next stage of work that the writer will be doing. It's helpful to go into a notes meeting knowing if you're talking about a polish, a rewrite, or a total reconception of the project.

One side note, if this is a project with a lot of non-writers who are empowered to give notes (director, producers, executives, etc) then I think it's usually helpful for those people to get together *before* they meet with the writer(s), and figure out their own creative overlap. And determine who really needs to be able to give creative notes. The larger the group of empowered note-givers, the harder it is to find creative overlap. When multiple empowered execs at the same company have consistently conflicting notes, it is a bad situation. Either one of those execs needs to disempower themselves creatively (which will lead to everyone on the project loving them forever) or it's going to be a horrible process that will most likely result in a bad movie or the movie never being made.

I know I'm not really diving into the nature of the creative notes given on a script, and that's partly because I think the most broken aspect of "notes" is the process of giving them. It's also because I think it's beyond the scope of a document like this. You give notes using a set of tools you build by watching a lot of movies, reading a lot of screenplays, analyzing those artifacts, and practice from the process of making those things.

But to get into specifics, my notes can range from catching typos to suggesting massive structural or tonal changes. When it's a bigger note, I try to identify what bothers me about the current incarnation, and try to come up with at least one "solution" that synthesizes elements that already work in the script rather than applying an unrelated band-aid. The last part is very important to me. I value a screenplay and a movie that is resonant within itself. That's hard to sustain when the natural problems that emerge during development are resolved with solutions that feel like they're cut from a different piece of cloth than the rest of the movie. This is also why I like the notes process to be a conversation. We talk about the nature of the problems and solutions, and through that process we discover and grow our creative trust and our shared vision for the movie.

“A close-up on screen can say all a song can.”

- Stephen Sondheim

“The magic doesn’t come from within the director’s mind, it comes from within the hearts of the actors.”

- James Cameron

“I think I’m good at amplifying an actor’s strengths, and minimizing their weaknesses. And they all have strengths and weaknesses.”

- Steven Soderbergh

“Good actors aren’t enough. You need charisma. Can you imagine ‘Casablanca’ without Bogart and Bergman?”

- Sydney Pollack

Casting

Several years ago, I wrote a guest article about the casting process for Wordplayer. You can find the full article at http://www.wordplayer.com/pros/pr17.Calder.Keith.html Because of this, I won't spend too much time here on the casting process, but more on ways to think about the process.

First off, I should acknowledge that casting can be a horribly frustrating process. Before you start casting, your project exists inside a protective cocoon, surrounded by people who are trying to cultivate a movie. Once you start casting, your project will face the uncaring world. This can be a shock. People are reading your script, they are forming opinions about it, they are having conversations about it with people you don't know, and they are judging it. Actors have an offer, the deadline is about to pass, and you don't even know if they've read the script. You are entering a valley of indifference and rejection, and you need to figure out how you and your team are going to make it through without losing faith in the movie.

This is also why I recommend holding off on casting until you love the screenplay. There can be a tendency to want to start casting while you're still figuring out the script, and I think it's a mistake unless you have an external deadline you're fighting to hit. If you're secure in the screenplay you're sharing with agents, then it's a lot easier to handle the emotional anguish that can come along with the casting process.

Once you start casting, I think it's important to know the star-level your movie needs in each role. On a practical level, this will help you avoid wasting time chasing "offer only" stars in roles that don't need it. But it also can have a big impact on how a character works creatively in the movie. Stars draw the eye, and you need to decide which characters need that audience-attention magnetism. Audiences also enter a movie with a history of actor knowledge, and this is something that you can play towards or play against as needed. For example, if you're making a comedy, people are primed for laughter if the lead actor is someone they already know is funny. But in some supporting roles, the joke can only land if the audience thinks the actor is incapable of being funny!

When you are casting a role, whether via audition, via creative meetings, or via offer, you are hoping to find an actor who will do the best job of helping build that character within the ensemble. A lot of that comes from instinct and taste. You know it when you see it. Or at least you hope you know it when you see it! But there are also ways to think about this intellectually, and in ways that have a practical impact.

Some questions it can be helpful to ask…

- Does this actor excel at capturing the aspects of the character that are most important?
- Can you be confident in their performance based on prior work, or do you need to see them audition?
- What character relationships are so crucial that you can't cast those roles without seeing the potential actors do chemistry reads?
- Does the character's dialog need to be delivered by an actor who knows how to make intent land and shift with every single word, or can the actor spread across the dialog like a jungle cat in the branches of a tree?
- Does the actor's "resting face" capture an aspect of the character that you find important and interesting?
- How would playing this character fit with how audiences already view this actor from their prior work or off-screen life?
- Does the character need to grasp the audience's attention? If so, is it with presence or with dialog? Through motion or through stillness? Can this actor capture the audience the way the character is designed to do it?
- Will this actor help the rest of the cast be better?
- And the toughest and most important question… Will this actor, through personality or craft, be a net-negative on the process of making the movie? Do your homework! Call people and ask.

A lot of these questions are about the intersection of an actor and a character. If you aren't getting the answer you like, sometimes the solution is to change the character to fit the actor. Sometimes the solution is to cast someone else.

"I take every failure hard. The one I took the hardest was The Thing. My career would have been different if that had been a big hit… The movie was hated. Even by science-fiction fans. They thought that I had betrayed some kind of trust, and the piling on was insane."

- John Carpenter

"Several weeks after the film opened I was approached in a bar by writer/actor Buck Henry (creator of GET SMART, writer of THE GRADUATE, one of the stars of THE MAN WHO FELL TO EARTH) who told me THE THING was 'twenty five years ahead of its time'. Alone in his sentiments then, it now seems he was pretty much on the money..."

- Stuart Cohen, producer of The Thing

"One night, over dinner, I told John Carpenter how much all generations love The Thing. How amazing it was that it had 'found its audience' and was now revered. 'What fucking good does that do to me?' he said. We ordered dessert."

- Guillermo del Toro

Malaise

The next section of the zine was supposed to be about pre-production, and then on to production, post-production, etc. But ten minutes ago, I wrote a note to you announcing that I was canceling the Snoot Zine. This page is written in the freshness of acknowledging that disappointment. I dropped the ball.

And what better time to talk about the malaise that comes from the completion or abandonment of a project.

It took me a while to realize that there are three emotional low-points on every movie that I will always experience.

The first is when you get that first “pass.” The first time you ask someone to join your carnival, and they say no. It might be a writer you’re trying to hire. It might be the studio exec you pitch to. It might be the movie star you’re trying to entice. Every project has that moment where you are confronted with the fact that other dream-collaborators aren’t interested in collaborating with you on this project. And that first “no” always feels like shit.

The second is when I watch the first rough cut. I’ve produced 20 movies, and I think I’ve only had a handful of experiences where I was relatively happy with the first rough cut. When I saw the first cut of ALL THE BOYS LOVE MANDY LANE, my fellow producers and I all thought we had to quit making movies and find another career. Over time, you start to realize that this moment is *always* an emotional low-point. On one hand, you have a lifetime of watching movies and only experiencing a finished vision. But a rough-cut is never a finished vision. On the other hand, you have an idealized version of the movie in your head, that has been sustaining you for the years of development and production. A rough-cut is never an idealized version. But that doesn’t change the emotional wallop of watching that first cut and seeing where the movie (currently) falls short, of both the vision in your head and the version you’ll eventually release.

For me, the third emotional low-point is a bit trickier. It starts from the moment you "finish" the movie. That's probably the final creative note to the colorist, or the final tweak to the sound mix. The moment that you realize that you've done all you can do. The movie has shifted from potential to completion. And that emotional low-point lasts until it goes away…

And that can be a very long time.

It helps to have another movie in the pipeline. I'm sure it helps if you're good at separating yourself from your work, which is something I've always struggled with. If you don't, then it's hard to keep your emotions untangled from the performance of the movie. Your emotions hang on every critic's reaction, every festival screening, every piece of tracking data, and of course the financial performance of the movie.

When I started the Snoot Zine project, I was at an emotional low-point. **Blair Witch** had come out a few months earlier, and taken a critical and financial drubbing. On top of that, there was an exciting studio project that I thought I was going to be producing, and the rug was pulled out from underneath us by another producer on the project. A big opportunity was taken away just on the whim of a more powerful producer.

Building a career in the film business can feel like a Sisyphean task. Each movie is a boulder pushed to the top of a hill, hoping that this time it won't roll back and crush you. But the truth is that they always crush you.

Around the same time I launched the Kickstarter for the Snoot Zine, Jess and I got back in touch with our old friends Rafael Casal and Daveed Diggs. We suddenly had an open year, and **Blindspotting** was always the project we felt had gotten away. It was a hard one to make a business case for, but it was always our passion project. So we doubled-down on our passion, and committed ourselves to getting the movie made that year.

Instead of working on the Snoot Zine, I worked on **Blindspotting**.
In a way, the Snoot Zine died so that **Blindspotting** could live. I'm OK with that sacrifice, and I hope you are too.

The Snoot Filmography

A list of Snoot movies as of August 2019, listed in chronological order of when they started production. I honestly didn't realize we had actually produced twenty movies until I saw them all written down here!

1. **All The Boys Love Mandy Lane***
2. **Battle For Terra**
3. **The Key Man***
4. **The Wackness***
5. **Bunraku**
6. **Thunder Soul**
7. **Peep World***
8. **Undocumented**
9. **The Greatest Movie Ever Sold**
10. **You're Next**
11. **Anomalisa**
12. **The Guest**
13. **Faults**
14. **The Devil's Candy**
15. **Dude Bro Party Massacre 3**
16. **Blair Witch**
17. **Super Size Me 2**
18. **Blindspotting**
19. **Little Monsters**
20. **Corporate Animals**

* - Movies produced by Snoot's sister company Occupant Films

There are a few movies that we're involved with that didn't make this list, as I consider our involvement to be too minimal to take any real credit for how the films turned out. Those are *Better Living Through Chemistry*, *The Hallow*, *Cheap Thrills*, *Field Guide to Evil*, and the first two *V/H/S* movies.

100% AUTHENTIC SCOUT BOOK
SCOUT BOOKS®
WWW.SCOUTBOOKS.COM