Many of the thoughts that follow, although presented to the public in a lecture, are therefore more truly cautionary notes to myself, working methods I have developed for coping with my own particular volcanoes and glaciers. As such, they are insights into one person's search for balance, and are perhaps interesting to others more for the glimpses of the search itself than for the specific methods that search has produced.

I would like to thank Ken Sallows for providing me with the transcription of the original lecture and the opportunity to present it to a wider audience. For cosmetic reasons, I have made certain revisions and added some footnotes to what was, for the most part, an extemporaneous dialogue between myself and the audience, whom I thank for their interest and participation. I have also updated some technical points and added an afterword that considers the impact that nonlinear, digital editing has had on the process of filmmaking.

Special thanks also to Hilary Furlong (then of the Australian Film Commission), who was instrumental in bringing me to Australia, where the lecture was originally given.

Walter Murch
Rome, August 1995

It is frequently at the edges of things that we learn most about the middle: ice and steam can reveal more about the nature of water than water alone ever could. While it is true that any film worth making is going to be unique, and the conditions under which films are made are so variable that it is misleading to speak about what is "normal," *Apocalypse Now*, by almost any criteria—schedule, budget, artistic ambition, technical innovation—qualifies as the cinematic equivalent of ice and steam. Just considering the length of time it took to complete the film (I was editing picture for one year and spent another year preparing and mixing the sound), it turned out to be the longest post-production of any picture I have worked on, but that may consequently spill some light on what "normal" is, or might be.\(^1\)

One of the reasons for that length was simply the amount of film that had been printed: 1,250,000 feet.

---

\(^1\) And I had come on relatively late in the process. Richie Marks and Jerry Greenberg had already been editing for nine months when I joined them in August 1977, a few months after the end of shooting, and the three of us worked together until Jerry left in the spring of 1978. Richie and I then continued together, joined by Lisa Fruchtman, until I began to work on the soundtrack.
which works out to be just over 230 hours. Since the finished film runs just under two hours and twenty-five minutes in length, that gives a ratio of ninety-five to one. That is to say, ninety-five “unseen” minutes for every minute that found its way into the finished product. By comparison, the average ratio for theatrical features is around twenty to one.

Traveling across that ninety-five-to-one landscape was a little like forging through a thick forest, bursting upon open grassland for a while, then plunging into a forest again because there were areas, such as the helicopter sequences, where the coverage was extremely high, and other scenes where the coverage was correspondingly low. I think the Colonel Kilgore scenes alone were over 220,000 feet—and since that represents twenty-five minutes of film in the finished product, the ratio there was around one hundred to one. But many of the connecting scenes had only a master shot: Francis had used so much film and time on the big events that he compensated with minimal coverage on some of these linking scenes.

Take one of the big scenes as an example: The helicopter attack on “Charlie’s Point,” where Wagner’s Ride of the Valkyries is played, was staged as an actual event and consequently filmed as a documentary rather than a series of specially composed shots. It was choreography on a vast scale of men, machines, cameras, and landscape—like some kind of diabolical toy that you could wind up and then let go. Once Francis said, “Action,” the filming resembled actual combat: Eight cameras turning simultaneously (some on the ground and some in helicopters) each loaded with a thousand-foot (eleven-minute) roll of film.

At the end of one of these shots, unless there had been an obvious problem, the camera positions were changed and the whole thing was repeated. Then repeated again, and then again. They kept on going until, I guess, they felt that they had enough material, each take generating something like 8,000 feet (an hour and a half). No single take was the same as any other—very much like documentary coverage.

Anyway, at the end of it all, when the film was safely in the theaters, I sat down and figured out the total number of days that we (the editors) had worked, divided that number by the number of cuts that were in the finished product, and came up with the rate of cuts per editor per day—which turned out to be . . . 1.47!

Meaning that, if we had somehow known exactly where we were going at the beginning, we would have arrived there in the same number of months if each of us had made just under one-and-a-half splices per day. In other words, if I had sat down at my bench in the morning, made one cut, thought about the next cut, and gone home, then come in the next day, made the cut I thought about the day before, made another cut, and gone home, it would have taken me the same year it actually took to edit my sections of the film.

Since it takes under ten seconds to make one-and-a-half splices, the admittedly special case of Apocalypse Now serves to throw into exaggerated relief the fact that editing—even on a “normal” film—is not so

---

\(^3\) By comparison, an average theatrical feature might have a cuts-per-day figure of eight.
much a putting together as it is a discovery of a path, and that the overwhelming majority of an editor's time is not spent actually splicing film. The more film there is to work with, of course, the greater the number of pathways that can be considered, and the possibilities compound upon each other and consequently demand more time for evaluation. This is true for any film with a high shooting ratio, but in the particular case of *Apocalypse* the effect was magnified by a sensitive subject matter and a daring and unusual structure, technical innovations at every level, and the obligation felt by all concerned to do the very best work they were capable of. And perhaps most of all by the fact that this was, for Francis, a personal film, despite the large budget and the vast canvas of the subject. Regrettably few films combine such qualities and aspirations.

For every splice in the finished film there were probably fifteen "shadow" splices—splices made, considered, and then undone or lifted from the film. But even allowing for that, the remaining eleven hours and fifty-eight minutes of each working day were spent in activities that, in their various ways, served to clear and illuminate the path ahead of us: screenings, discussions, rewinding, re-screenings, meetings, scheduling, filing trims, note-taking, bookkeeping, and lots of plain deliberative thought. A vast amount of preparation, really, to arrive at the innocuously brief moment of decisive action: the cut—the moment of transition from one shot to the next—something that, appropriately enough, should look almost self-evidently simple and effortless, if it is even noticed at all.

**Why Do Cuts Work?**

Well, the fact is that *Apocalypse Now*, as well as every other theatrical film (except perhaps Hitchcock's *Rope*), is made up of many different pieces of film joined together into a mosaic of images. The mysterious part of it, though, is that the joining of those pieces—the "cut" in American terminology—actually does seem to work, even though it represents a total and instantaneous displacement of one field of vision with another, a displacement that sometimes also entails a jump forward or backward in time as well as space.

It works; but it could easily have been otherwise, since nothing in our day-to-day experience seems to prepare us for such a thing. Instead, from the moment we get up in the morning until we close our eyes at night, the visual reality we perceive is a continuous

---

2 A film composed of only ten shots, each ten minutes long, invisibly joined together, so that the impression is of a complete lack of editing.

3 I was aware, talking to an Australian audience, of the bias inherent in our respective languages. In the States, film is "cut," which puts the emphasis on separation. In Australia (and in Great Britain), film is "joined," with the emphasis on bringing together.
stream of linked images: In fact, for millions of years—tens, hundreds of millions of years—life on Earth has experienced the world this way. Then suddenly, at the beginning of the twentieth century, human beings were confronted with something else—edited film.

Under these circumstances, it wouldn't have been at all surprising to find that our brains had been "wired" by evolution and experience to reject film editing. If that had been the case, then the single-shot movies of the Lumière Brothers—or films like Hitchcock's Rope—would have become the standard. For a number of practical (as well as artistic) reasons, it is good that it did not.

The truth of the matter is that film is actually being "cut" twenty-four times a second. Each frame is a displacement from the previous one—it is just that in a continuous shot, the space/time displacement from frame to frame is small enough (twenty milliseconds) for the audience to see it as motion within a context rather than as twenty-four different contexts a second. On the other hand, when the visual displacement is great enough (as at the moment of the cut), we are forced to re-evaluate the new image as a different context: miraculously, most of the time we have no problem in doing this.

What we *do* seem to have difficulty accepting are the kind of displacements that are neither subtle nor total: Cutting from a full-figure master shot, for instance, to a slightly tighter shot that frames the actors from the ankles up. The new shot in this case is different enough to signal that something has changed, but not different enough to make us re-evaluate its context: The displacement of the image is neither motion nor change of context, and the collision of these two ideas produces a mental jarring—a jump—that is comparatively disturbing.⁵

At any rate, the discovery early in this century that certain kinds of cutting "worked" led almost immediately to the discovery that films could be shot discontinuously, which was the cinematic equivalent of the discovery of flight: In a practical sense, films were no longer "earthbound" in time and space. If we could make films only by assembling all the elements simultaneously, as in the theater, the range of possible subjects would be comparatively narrow. Instead, Discontinuity is King: It is the central fact during the production phase of filmmaking, and almost all decisions are directly related to it in one way or another—how to overcome its difficulties and/or how to best take advantage of its strengths.⁶

The other consideration is that even if everything *were* available simultaneously, it is just very difficult

---

⁵A beehive can apparently be moved two inches each night without disorienting the bees the next morning. Surprisingly, if it is moved two miles, the bees also have no problem: They are forced by the total displacement of their environment to re-orient their sense of direction, which they can do easily enough. But if the hive is moved two yards, the bees will become fatally confused. The environment does not seem different to them, so they do not re-orient themselves, and as a result, they will not recognize their own hive when they return from foraging, hovering instead in the empty space where the hive used to be, while the hive itself sits just two yards away.

⁶When Stanley Kubrick was directing *The Shining*, he wanted to shoot the film in continuity and to have all sets and actors available all the time. He took over almost the entire studio at Elstree (London), built all the sets simultaneously, and they sat there, pre-lit, for however long it took him to shoot the film. But *The Shining* remains a special exception to the general rule of discontinuity.
to shoot long, continuous takes and have all the contributing elements work each time. European filmmakers tend to shoot more complex master shots than the Americans, but even if you are Ingmar Bergman, there's a limit to what you can handle: Right at the end, some special effect might not work or someone might forget their lines or some lamp might blow a fuse, and now the whole thing has to be done again. The longer the take, of course, the greater the chances of a mistake.

So there is a considerable logistical problem of getting everything together at the same time, and then just as serious a problem in getting it all to "work" every time. The result is that, for practical reasons alone, we don't follow the pattern of the Lumière Brothers or of Rope.

On the other hand, apart from matters of convenience, discontinuity also allows us to choose the best camera angle for each emotion and story point, which we can edit together for a cumulatively greater impact. If we were limited to a continuous stream of images, this would be difficult, and films would not be as sharp and to the point as they are.7

---

7 Visual discontinuity—although not in the temporal sense—is the most striking feature of Ancient Egyptian painting. Each part of the human body was represented by its most characteristic and revealing angle: head in profile, shoulders frontal, arms and legs in profile, torso frontal—and then all these different angles were combined in one figure. To us today, with our preference for the unifying laws of perspective, this gives an almost comic "twisted" look to the people of Ancient Egypt—but it may be that in some remote future, our films, with their combination of many different angles (each being the most "revealing" for its particular subject), will look just as comic and twisted.

And yet, beyond even these considerations, cutting is more than just the convenient means by which discontinuity is rendered continuous. It is in and for itself—by the very force of its paradoxical suddenness—a positive influence in the creation of a film. We would want to cut even if discontinuity were not of such great practical value.

So the central fact of all this is that cuts do work. But the question still remains: Why? It is kind of like the bumble-bee, which should not be able to fly, but does.

We will get back to this mystery in a few moments.
"Cut Out the Bad Bits"

Many years ago, my wife, Aggie, and I went back to England for our first anniversary (she is English, although we’d been married in the United States), and I met some of her childhood friends for the first time.

“Well, what is it that you do?” one of them asked, and I replied that I was studying film editing. “Oh, editing,” he said, “that’s where you cut out the bad bits.” Of course, I became (politely) incensed: “It is much more than that. Editing is structure, color, dynamics, manipulation of time, all of these other things, etc., etc.” What he had in mind was home movies: “Oop, there’s a bad bit, cut it out and paste the rest back together.” Actually, twenty-five years down the road, I’ve come to respect his unwitting wisdom.

Because, in a certain sense, editing is cutting out the bad bits, the tough question is, What makes a bad bit? When you are shooting a home movie and the camera wanders, that’s obviously a bad bit, and it’s clear that you want to cut it out. The goal of a home movie is usually pretty simple: an unstructured record of events in continuous time. The goal of narrative films is much more complicated because of the fragmented time structure and the need to indicate internal states of being, and so it becomes proportionately more complicated to identify what is a “bad bit.” And what is bad in one film may be good in another. In fact, one way of looking at the process of making a film is to think of it as the search to identify what—for the particular film you are working on—is a uniquely “bad bit.” So, the editor embarks on the search to identify these “bad bits” and cut them out, provided that doing so does not disrupt the structure of the “good bits” that are left.

Which leads me to chimpanzees.

About forty years ago, after the double-helix structure of DNA was discovered, biologists hoped that they now had a kind of map of the genetic architecture of each organism. Of course, they didn’t expect the structure of the DNA to look like the organism they were studying (the way a map of England looks like England), but rather that each point in the organism would somehow correspond to an equivalent point in the DNA.

That’s not what they found, though. For instance, when they began to compare them closely, they were surprised to discover that the DNA for the human and the chimpanzee were surprisingly similar. So much so—ninety-nine percent identical—as to be inadequate to explain all of the obvious differences between us.

So where do the differences come from?

Biologists were eventually forced to realize that there must be something else—still under much dis-
cussion—that controlled the order in which the various pieces of information stored in the DNA would be activated and the rates at which that information would be activated as the organism grew.

In the early stages of fetal development, it is difficult to tell the difference between human and chimp embryos. And yet, as they grow, they reach a point where differences become apparent, and from that point on, the differences become more and more obvious. For instance, the choice of what comes first, the brain or the skull. In human beings, the priority is brain first, skull next, because the emphasis is on maximizing the size of the brain. Any time you look at a newborn human infant you can see that the skull is not yet fully closed around the top of the still-growing brain.

With chimpanzees, the priority is reversed: skull first, then brain—probably for reasons that have to do with the harsher environment into which the chimp is born. The command from the chimp's sequence is, "Fill up this empty space with as much brain as you can." But there's only so much brain you can get in there before you can't fill it up anymore. At any rate, it seems to be more important for a chimp to be born with a hard head than a big brain. There's a similar interplay between an endless list of things: The thumb and the fingers, skeletal posture, certain bones being fully formed before certain muscular developments, etc.

My point is that the information in the DNA can be seen as uncut film and the mysterious sequencing code as the editor. You could sit in one room with a pile of dailies and another editor could sit in the next room with exactly the same footage and both of you would make different films out of the same material. Each is going to make different choices about how to structure it, which is to say when and in what order to release those various pieces of information.

Do we know, for instance, that the gun is loaded before Madame X gets into her car, or is that something we only learn after she is in the car? Either choice creates a different sense of the scene. And so you proceed, piling one difference on top of another. Reversing the comparison, you can look at the human and the chimp as different films edited from the same set of dailies.8

I'm not assigning relative values here to a chimpanzee or a human being. Let's just say that each is appropriate to the environment in which it belongs: I would be wrong swinging from a branch in the middle of the jungle, and a chimpanzee would be wrong writing this book. The point is not their intrinsic value, but rather the inadvisability of changing one's mind in the process of creating one of them. Don't start making a chimpanzee and then decide to turn it into a human being instead. That produces a stitched-together Frankenstein's monster, and we've all seen its equivalent in the theaters: Film "X" would have been a nice little movie, perfectly suited to its "environment," but in the middle of production someone got an inflated idea about its possibilities, and, as a result, it became boring and pretentious. It was

---

8 By the same token, a chimpanzee and a cockroach are made from different "dailies" to begin with.
a chimpanzee film that someone tried to turn it into a human-being film, and it came out being neither.

Or film “Y,” which was an ambitious project that tried to deal with complex, subtle issues, but the studio got to it and ordered additional material to be shot, filled with action and sex, and, as a result, a great potential was reduced to something less, neither human nor chimp.

Most with the least

You can never judge the quality of a sound mix simply by counting the number of tracks it took to produce it. Terrible mixes have been produced from a hundred tracks. By the same token, wonderful mixes have been made from only three tracks. It depends on the initial choices that were made, the quality of the sounds, and how capable the blend of those sounds was of exciting emotions hidden in the hearts of the audience. The underlying principle: Always try to do the most with the least— with the emphasis on try. You may not always succeed, but attempt to produce the greatest effect in the viewer’s mind by the least number of things on screen. Why? Because you want to do only what is necessary to engage the imagination of the audience— suggestion is always more effective than exposition. Past a certain point, the more effort you put into wealth of detail, the more you encourage the audience to become spectators rather than participants. The same principle applies to all the various crafts of filmmaking: acting, art direction, photography, music, costume, etc.

And, of course, it applies to editing as well. You would never say that a certain film was well-edited
because it had more cuts in it. Frequently, it takes more work and discernment to decide where not to cut—don't feel you have to cut just because you are being paid to. You are being paid to make decisions, and as far as whether to cut or not, the editor is actually making twenty-four decisions a second: "No. No. No. No. No. No. No. Yes!"

An overactive editor, who changes shots too frequently, is like a tour guide who can't stop pointing things out: "And up there we have the Sistine Ceiling, and over here we have the Mona Lisa, and, by the way, look at these floor tiles..." If you are on a tour, you do want the guide to point things out for you, of course, but some of the time you just want to walk around and see what you see. If the guide—that is to say, the editor—doesn't have the confidence to let people themselves occasionally choose what they want to look at, or to leave things to their imagination, then he is pursuing a goal (complete control) that in the end is self-defeating. People will eventually feel constrained and then resentful from the constant pressure of his hand on the backs of their necks.

Well, if what I'm saying is to do more with less, then is there any way to say how much less? Is it possible to take this right to its absurd logical conclusion and say, "Don't cut at all?" Now we've come back to our first problem: Film is cut for practical reasons and film is cut because cutting—that sudden disruption of reality—can be an effective tool in itself. So, if the goal is as few cuts as possible, when you have to make a cut, what is it that makes it a good one?

The Rule of Six

The first thing discussed in film-school editing classes is what I'm going to call three-dimensional continuity: In shot A, a man opens a door, walks halfway across the room, and then the film cuts to the next shot, B, picking him up at that same halfway point and continuing with him the rest of the way across the room, where he sits down at his desk, or something.

For many years, particularly in the early years of sound film, that was the rule. You struggled to preserve continuity of three-dimensional space, and it was seen as a failure of rigor or skill to violate it. Jumping people around in space was just not done, except, perhaps, in extreme circumstances—fights or earthquakes—where there was a lot of violent action going on.

I actually place this three-dimensional continuity at the bottom of a list of six criteria for what makes a

---

9. The problem with this thinking can be seen in any multi-camera situation-comedy on television. Because the cameras are filming simultaneously, the actors are necessarily always "correct" as far as their spatial continuity and relation to each other is concerned, but that absolutely does not prevent bad cuts from being made all the time.
good cut. At the top of the list is Emotion, the thing
you come to last, if at all, at film school largely be-
cause it's the hardest thing to define and deal with.
How do you want the audience to feel? If they are feel-
ing what you want them to feel all the way through
the film, you've done about as much as you can ever
do. What they finally remember is not the editing, not
the camerawork, not the performances, not even the
story—it's how they felt.

An ideal cut (for me) is the one that satisfies all
the following six criteria at once: 1) it is true to the
emotion of the moment; 2) it advances the story; 3) it
occurs at a moment that is rhythmically interesting
and "right"; 4) it acknowledges what you might call
"eye-trace"—the concern with the location and move-
ment of the audience's focus of interest within the
frame; 5) it respects "planarity"—the grammar of three
dimensions transposed by photography to two (the
questions of stage-line, etc.); 6) and it respects the
three-dimensional continuity of the actual space
(where people are in the room and in relation to one
another).

1) Emotion 51%
2) Story 23%
3) Rhythm 10%
4) Eye-trace 7%
5) Two-dimensional plane of screen 5%
6) Three-dimensional space of action 4%

Emotion, at the top of the list, is the thing that
you should try to preserve at all costs. If you find
you have to sacrifice certain of those six things to
make a cut, sacrifice your way up, item by item, from
the bottom.

For instance, if you are considering a range of
possible edits for a particular moment in the film, and
you find that there is one cut that gives the right
emotion and moves the story forward, and is rhythm-
ically satisfying, and respects eye-trace and planar-
ity, but it fails to preserve the continuity of three-di-
dimensional space, then, by all means, that is the cut
you should make. If none of the other edits has the
right emotion, then sacrificing spatial continuity is well
worth it.

The values I put after each item are slightly tongue-
in-cheek, but not completely: Notice that the top two
on the list (emotion and story) are worth far more
than the bottom four (rhythm, eye-trace, planarity, spa-
tial continuity), and when you come right down to it,
under most circumstances, the top of the list—emot-
ion—is worth more than all five of the things under-
neath it.

And, in fact, there is a practical side to this, which
is that if the emotion is right and the story is advanced
in a unique, interesting way, in the right rhythm, the
audience will tend to be unaware of (or unconcerned
about) editorial problems with lower-order items like
eye-trace, stage-line, spatial continuity, etc. The gen-
eral principle seems to be that satisfying the criteria
of items higher on the list tends to obscure problems
with items lower on the list, but not vice-versa: For
instance, getting Number 4 (eye-trace) working prop-
erly will minimize a problem with Number 5 (stage-
line), whereas if Number 5 (stage-line) is correct but
Number 4 (eye-trace) is not taken into consideration, the cut will be unsuccessful.

Now, in practice, you will find that those top three things on the list—emotion, story, rhythm—are extremely tightly connected. The forces that bind them together are like the bonds between the protons and neutrons in the nucleus of the atom. Those are, by far, the tightest bonds, and the forces connecting the lower three grow progressively weaker as you go down the list.

Most of the time you will be able to satisfy all six criteria: the three-dimensional space and the two-dimensional plane of the screen and the eye-trace, and the rhythm and story and emotion will all fall into place. And, of course, you should always aim for this, if possible—never accept less when more is available to you.

What I'm suggesting is a list of priorities. If you have to give up something, don't ever give up emotion before story. Don't give up story before rhythm, don't give up rhythm before eye-trace, don't give up eye-trace before planarity, and don't give up planarity before spatial continuity.

Misdirection

Underlying these considerations is the central preoccupation of a film editor, which should be to put himself/herself in place of the audience. What is the audience going to be thinking at any particular moment? Where are they going to be looking? What do you want them to think about? What do they need to think about? And, of course, what do you want them to feel? If you keep this in mind (and it's the preoccupation of every magician), then you are a kind of magician. Not in the supernatural sense, just an everyday, working magician.

Houdini's job was to create a sense of wonder, and to do that he didn't want you to look here (to the right) because that's where he was undoing his chains, so he found a way to make you look there (to the left). He was "misdirecting" you, as magicians say. He was doing something that would cause ninety-nine percent of you to look over here when he wanted you to. And an editor can do that and does do that—and should do that.

Sometimes, though, you can get caught up in the details and lose track of the overview. When that hap-
pens to me, it is usually because I have been looking at the image as the miniature it is in the editing room, rather than seeing it as the mural that it will become when projected in a theater. Something that will quickly restore the correct perspective is to imagine yourself very small, and the screen very large, and pretend that you are watching the finished film in a thousand-seat theater filled with people, and that the film is beyond the possibility of any further changes. If you still like what you see, it is probably okay. If not, you will now most likely have a better idea of how to correct the problem, whatever it is. One of the tricks I use to help me achieve this perspective is to cut out little paper dolls—a man and a woman—and put one on each side of the editing screen: The size of the dolls (a few inches high) is proportionately correct to make the screen seem as if it is thirty feet wide.

Seeing Around the Edge of the Frame

The film editor is one of the few people working on the production of a film who does not know the exact conditions under which it was shot (or has the ability not to know) and who can at the same time have a tremendous influence on the film.

If you have been on and around the set most of the time, as the actors, the producer, director, cameraman, art director, etc., have been, you can get caught up in the sometimes bloody practicalities of gestation and delivery. And then when you see the dailies, you can’t help, in your mind’s eye, seeing around the edge of the frame—you can imagine everything that was there, physically and emotionally, just beyond what was actually photographed.

“We worked like hell to get that shot, it has to be in the film.” You (the director, in this case) are convinced that what you got was what you wanted, but there’s a possibility that you may to forcing yourself to see it that way because it cost so much—in money, time, angst—to get it.
By the same token, there are occasions when you shoot something that you dislike, when everyone is in a bad mood, and you say under protest: "All right, I'll do this, we'll get this one close-up, and then it's a wrap." Later on, when you look at that take, all you can remember was the hateful moment it was shot, and so you may be blind to the potentials it might have in a different context.

The editor, on the other hand, should try to see only what's on the screen, as the audience will. Only in this way can the images be freed from the context of their creation. By focusing on the screen, the editor will, hopefully, use the moments that should be used, even if they may have been shot under duress, and reject moments that should be rejected, even though they cost a terrible amount of money and pain.

I guess I'm urging the preservation of a certain kind of virginity. Don't unnecessarily allow yourself to be impregnated by the conditions of shooting. Try to keep up with what's going on but try to have as little specific knowledge of it as possible because, ultimately, the audience knows nothing about any of this—and you are the ombudsman for the audience.

The director, of course, is the person most familiar with all of the things that went on during the shoot, so he is the most burdened with this surplus, beyond-the-frame information. Between the end of shooting and before the first cut is finished, the very best thing that can happen to the director (and the film) is that he say goodbye to everyone and disappear for two weeks—up to the mountains or down to the sea or out to Mars or somewhere—and try to discharge this surplus.

Wherever he goes, he should try to think, as much as possible, about things that have absolutely nothing to do with the film. It is difficult, but it is necessary to create a barrier, a cellular wall between shooting and editing. Fred Zinnemann would go climbing in the Alps after the end of shooting, just to put himself in a potentially life-threatening situation where he had to be there, not day-dreaming about the film's problems.

Then, after a few weeks, he would come down from the Alps, back to earth; he would sit down in a dark room, alone, the arc light would ignite, and he would watch his film. He would still be, inherently, brimming with those images from beyond the edge of the frame (a director will never be fully able to forget them), but if he had gone straight from shooting to editing, the confusion would be worse and he would have gotten the two different thought processes of shooting and editing irrevocably mixed up.

Do everything you can to help the director erect this barrier for himself so that when he first sees the film, he can say, "All right, I'm going to pretend that I had nothing to do with this film. It needs some work. What needs to be done?"

And so you try as hard as you can to separate out what you wish from what is actually there, never abandoning your ultimate dreams for the film, but trying as hard as you can to see what is actually on the screen.